

The Actual Administrative Practices Of Public Basic School Principals in Jordan as Perceived By Directors Of Education Principals and Teachers	العنوان:
مجلة كلية التربية	المصدر:
جامعة أسيوط - كلية التربية	الناشر:
Al Sa'id, Anwar	المؤلف الرئيسي:
Dirani, Eid(Co - Author)	مؤلفين آخرين:
ع13, ج2	المجلد/العدد:
نعم	محكمة:
1997	التاريخ الميلادي:
يونية	الشهر:
454 - 474	الصفحات:
680668	رقم MD:
بحوث ومقالات	نوع المحتوى:
EduSearch	قواعد المعلومات:
الإدارة الفعلية، الإدارة المدرسية، الأردن، التعليم	مواضيع:
<a href="http://search.mandumah.com/Record/680668">http://search.mandumah.com/Record/680668</a>	رابط:

**The Actual Administrative Practices of Public  
Basic School Principals in Jordan as  
Perceived by Directors of Education,  
Principals and Teachers**

**Eid Dirani  
Assot. Prof. of Education**

**Anwar Al- Sa'id  
Assit. Prof. of Education**

**Faculty of Educational Sciences  
The University of Jordan**



## ABSTRACT

### **The Actual Administrative Practices of Public Basic School Principals in Jordan as Perceived by Directors of Education, Principals and Teachers**

**Eid Dirani**  
Assot. Prof. of Education

**Anwar Al - Sa'id**  
Assit . Prof. of Education

**Faculty of Educational Sciences  
The University of Jordan**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the actual administrative practices of the basic school principal in Jordan as perceived by the Directors of Education , the principals , and their teachers . The four areas of administrative practices ( tasks) considered were those identified by Article (6) of Act (11) for 1981.

Based on these tasks a (92) items questionnaire was constructed, its validity & reliability were established .

The study instrument was applied on a sample of (22) Directors of Education, (225) basic school principals , and (800) teachers , randomly selected from (225) schools from (13) Directorates of Education .

The results of the analysis revealed various levels of differences of perceptions with regards to the actual practices of the basic school principal . However, the perceptions of the Directors of Education of the principals' execution of the four tasks were noticeably lower than those of the principals' and teachers' . As might be expected , the teachers' perceptions of the principals' execution of the four tasks were very high. As for the principals themselves, the results revealed that they were very content with the way they carry out their duties and they highly ranked the execution of the four tasks.

## **The Actual Administrative Practices of Public Basic School Principals in Jordan as Perceived by Directors of Education, Principals & Teachers**

The tasks of the present-day school principals are quite different from those of the principals of yesterday. Today's principal has to exert simultaneous activation of two sub-roles that deeply penetrate each other: the role of the leading professional and the role of chief executive<sup>(1)</sup>. To accomplish this, he will need to focus on the people he associates with, on the relationship which exist among them, and on the adequacy of skills and competencies which they possess in order to achieve the school goals and objectives. The major task of the present-day principal is to utilize all means and resources available for him to improve the teaching-learning process. Therefore, he is considered to be the key factor in the well being and survival of his school and its effectiveness. He is, also, the administrator of direct - line action, having first-hand contact with the parents and the local community, with the teachers needing resources and direction, with the students in the learning environment, with the staff in the central office, and with outside agencies<sup>(2)</sup>.

During the last three decades, Jordan has witnessed major political, social and economic changes. These changes have markedly affected its educational system: its goals and objectives, its curriculum, and its teaching methods, which in turn caused similar changes in the functions and responsibilities of school principals.

In reviewing several surveys conducted to analyze the principal's job, it was found that the tasks and duties of the school principal in Jordan are not drastically different from those of principals in many other educational systems, whether Arab or Foreign. Article (6) of Rules No. (11) for 1981, entitled "The Description of Duties of School Administrators and Faculty Members," issued by the Ministry of Education defines the major task of the school principal as "the execution of the administrative process skillfully and effectively through the coordination and direction of the efforts of all school personnel in order to enable the teacher to perform his major task (teaching) perfectly, and to assume his responsibilities to achieve the educational goals and objectives. The Article also specifies four main functions (or tasks) for school principals: the development and improvement of the educational process; the supervision of student affairs; the supervision of the school organization and its administrative affairs; and demonstrating interest in the local community<sup>(3)</sup>.

Without question, the principal's duties need to be performed the best possible way so that school could operate smoothly, properly, and effectively. Needless to say that the principal's commitment to the proper execution of his duties, and the teachers' perceptions of the execution of these duties affect the teaching behavior and the classroom performance, as well as the school climate as a whole and consequently, students achievement. A study conducted by Natriello (1984), in which he investigated teachers' perceptions of the administrators frequent evaluation activity and teachers' assessment of their own effort and effectiveness. He found a positive relationship between the frequency of evaluation and teacher leverage (defined as a

---

degree of effort applied to teaching tasks)<sup>(4)</sup>. Ellett and Walberg (1979) reported that teachers' perceptions of principals' effectiveness were related to teachers' attitudes towards their schools, which in turn, were related to student attendance<sup>(5)</sup>. Gell and others used a quasi-experimental design to investigate the relationship between principals' involvement in teacher in-service training and on-task behavior in mathematics. The data supported the belief that involving principals in a staff development program positively affects implementation of the program objectives<sup>(6)</sup>. Chui, H. and McCormick, J. (1996) have proposed five dimensions of leadership behavior of school principals. Those dimensions were: communication of values, professional development of teachers, empowerment of teachers, people orientation and structural leadership<sup>(7)</sup>.

In a local study conducted by Awwad (1985) aimed at finding out the extent of implementation of administrative tasks by public secondary school principals, he found no indicative differences in the degree of implementation of these tasks attributable to academic qualifications or administrative experience<sup>(8)</sup>. Another study aimed at evaluating the performance of public secondary school principals in Jordan as perceived by directors of education and their assistants, school principals, and teachers, Salah (1985) reported that school principals ranked the performance of their own administrative tasks higher than did the other three groups ranked them<sup>(9)</sup>. In a recent study in Jordan, conducted by Shihada (1990) to define the administrative and technical tasks of public secondary school principals, and the extent to which principals execute their duties, he reported that the following tasks were performed highly by the percentages of principals shown in front of each task: a) improving the curriculum and teaching methods, (84%); b) supervising student affairs, (79%); c) supervising school facilities, (87.8%); d) initiating professional growth of teachers, (81.5%); and, e) demonstrating interest in the local community, (62.1%)<sup>(10)</sup>.

### **A Brief Description of the Educational System in Jordan**

Jordan is divided into (26) school districts, called Directorates of Education (DOE). Each is headed by a director of education, a position almost similar to that of the superintendent of schools in the U. S. A. However, the director's authority is limited since he functions within a bureaucracy in a highly centralized system of administration. The main responsibility of the director of education, as specified by Article (3) of regulations No. (9) for 1981, known as "description of Responsibilities of Educational Offices directorates for 1981," is to improve, develop, and enhance all aspects of the teaching-learning process in order to be more effective in achieving the educational goals and objectives. Another responsibility is to implement all rules, regulations, and instructions issued by the Ministry of Education throughout the school year<sup>(11)</sup>. One of these directorates, called the Directorate of Private Education is a centralized one which is designated to supervise all private sector schools in Jordan to ensure that they comply with the educational policy of the Country.

Until 1988, the educational structure in Jordan was divided into three stages: the elementary stage which included grades 1 through 6; the preparatory stage comprised grades 7 through 9, both were also known as the compulsory stage; and, the secondary stage which included grades 10 through 12. The new Law of Education No. (3) for 1994, was enacted upon the recommendation of the First National Conference for

Education Development (Educational Reform) which was held in 1987, and reorganized the educational structure into three different stages. These stages are: the kindergarten stage for pre-school children (ages 4 and 5); the basic stage including grades 1 through 10, which is a free and compulsory stage; and the secondary stage which includes grades 11 and 12 <sup>(12)</sup>.

Teaching in Jordan public schools is segregated where male and female students attend separate schools except for some schools located in villages or remote areas co-ed schools exist. However, most private schools are coeducational in all stages of education.

### **Objectives of the study**

The purposes of this study were: first, to investigate the actual administrative practices of public basic school principals, and the extent to which they execute these practices as perceived by the directors of education, the principals, and teachers. Second, to find out whether or not there are indicative differences in the execution of these practices as perceived by these three groups. Thirdly, to find out whether or not there are indicative differences in the perceptions of the three groups attributable to gender, academic qualifications, and number of years of administrative experience for the directors and the principals, and teaching experience for the teacher.

To achieve these objective, the following questions were formulated:

- 1) What are the actual administrative practices of public basic school principals in Jordan as perceived by directors of education, principals, and teachers?
- 2) Are there significant differences in the implementation of the administrative practices by the school principals as perceived by the directors of education, the principals and the teachers?
- 3) Are there significant differences in the execution of the administrative tasks by school principals as perceived by the directors of education due to:
  - a. administrative experience (5 years or less / more than 6 years)?
  - b. academic qualifications (BA, BA + Diploma of Education, Master's of Education)?
- 4) Are there significant differences in the execution of the administrative tasks by the school principals as perceived by them due to:
  - a. sex?
  - b. administrative experience (3 years or less, 4-6 years, 7 years or more)?
  - c. academic qualifications (less than BA , BA , BA plus Diploma of Education , Master's of Education)?
- 5) Are there significant differences in the execution of the administrative tasks by the principals as perceived by the teachers due to:
  - a. sex?
  - b. teaching experience (5 years or less , 6-10 years , 11 years or more)?
  - c. academic qualifications (less than BA , BA , BA plus Diploma of Education, Master's of Education)?

## Population and sample of the study

The population of the study consisted of (26) directorates of education; 1965 basic school principals ( 765 male and 1200 female ); and 36,278 teachers (14, 132 males and 22, 146 females).

## Sample of the study

The sample of the study consisted of (22) directors of education; (225) basic school principals, and (800) teachers randomly selected from (225) schools from (13) directorates of education represent the geographic distribution of Jordan. Questionnaires returned were from (18) directors, (199) principals, and (739) teachers, Tables (1), (2), and (3) show the distribution of the sample of the study according to its variables.

**Table (1)**  
**Distribution of the sample of the directors**  
**of education according to qualification**  
**and administrative experience.**

Qualifications		Tot.	Experience		Tot.
B.A + Diploma	M. Ed		5 years or less	6 years or more	
8	10	18	9	9	18

**Table (2)**  
**Distribution of the sample of principals according**  
**to the variables of sex, qualifications and**  
**administrative experience**

Sex	Qualification				Total	Experience			Total
	Less than BA	BA	BA + Dip.	M. Ed		3 yrs. or less	4-6	7 yrs. or more	
<b>M</b>	45	36	28	7	116	21	22	73	116
<b>F</b>	62	16	5	0	83	10	24	49	83
<b>Total</b>	107	52	33	7	199	31	46	122	199



**Table (3)**  
**Distribution of the sample of teachers according**  
**to the variables of sex, qualifications and**  
**teaching experience**

Sex	Qualifications				Total	Experience			Total
	Less than BA	BA	B.A. + Dip.	M.Ed.		5 yrs. or less	6-10	7 yrs. or more	
<b>M</b>	217	135	55	5	412	127	67	218	412
<b>F</b>	232	76	14	5	327	87	93	146	326
<b>Total</b>	449	211	69	10	739	214	160	364	738

**Instrument and Methodology**

As mentioned previously, Article (6) of Rule No. (11) for 1981, specified four main tasks for school principals. These tasks are: (a) the development and improvement of the educational process; (b) the supervision of student affairs; (c) the supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs; and, (d) taking interest in the local community <sup>(13)</sup>. These four main tasks, the instructions mentioned at “the Daily Guide of the school principals” <sup>(14)</sup>, and other rules and regulations concerning school administration issued by the Ministry of Education directly, or through the directorates of education, were analyzed. Research tools used in previous studies pertaining to the evaluation of public secondary school principals were also reviewed. By utilizing this information, the researchers were able to construct a questionnaire consisted of (92) items to measure degree of execution of the four main tasks of the principal. The proposed questionnaire was presented to three different groups of experts and practitioners to establish its validity. The first group consisted of ten university faculty members specializing in Educational Administration and Supervision, Educational Psychology, Educational Planning, and Evaluation and Measurement. The second group comprised ten male and female basic school principals with a minimum of five years of principalship experience. And the third group consisted of ten male and female basic school teachers with a minimum of seven years of teaching experience. The suggestions, recommendations, and comments of all members of these three groups were reviewed and taken into consideration. As a result, twelve items were omitted, and several others were rephrased or modified. Thus, the instrument’s validity was established, and the tool was judged as valid to measure what it was intended to measure.

The instrument’s reliability was established by two methods: twenty male and female principals, thirty male and female teachers, and six directors of education were tested and retested over two-week interval. By using Pearson’s equation, the r value was found to be (0.87), (0.89), and. Split-halves methods was also used to determine the

correction between the answers of each the three groups: the principals, the teachers and the directors; and Pearson's correlation coefficients, after corrected by Spearman - Brown equation were found to be (0.96), (0.98), and (0.94) consecutively.

The questionnaire in its final form consisted of (80) items where items 1-20 were intended to measure Task I (improvement and development of the educational process); items 21-40 were intended to measure Task II (the supervision of student affairs); items 41-64 were intended to measure Task III (the supervision of the school organization and its administrative affairs); and, items 65-80 were intended to measure task IV (taking interest in the local community). Frequencies, percentages, relative importance, as well as t-test and analysis of variance were used in analyzing the data.

Respondents were asked to respond to the items of the questionnaire on a rating scale which ranged from very high to low as follows: very high = 5 points; high = 4 points, medium = 3 points; low = 2 points, and very low = 1 point and nil 0 points. In order to facilitate and simplify the interpretation of the data the two responses of very high and high were combined, as well as the other two responses of low and very low.

## **Results**

1. To answer the first question of this study, frequencies, percentages as relative importance were tabulated, and the following results were revealed:

### **Task I:**

- a) 39.4% of the directors of education perceived the execution of this task by the principals as high, 50.8% of them perceived it as medium, and 9.8% perceived it as low.
- b) 83.2% of the principals perceived their performance of this task as high, 12.9% as medium, and 2.6% as low. 1.2% of the principals indicated that they do not perform this task.
- c) 79.6% of the teachers perceived the execution of this task by the principals as high, 13.2% as medium, 2.4% as low, and 2.5% of them believed that their principals do not perform this task.

### **Task II:**

- a) 49.6% of the directors perceived the execution of this task by principals as high, 40.2% as medium, and 8.3% as low.
- b) 88.2% of the principals perceived their execution of this task as high, 9.1% as medium, 2.3% as low, and 1.7, believe that they do not perform this task.
- c) 84.8% of the teachers perceived the execution of this task by their principals as high, 9.9% as medium, 3.2% as low, and 2.1% of them believed that their principals do not perform it.

**Task 111:**

- a) 69.7% of the directors perceived the execution of this task by principals as high, 26.6% perceived their execution as medium, and 3.4% as low.
- b) 92.1% of the principals perceived their execution of this task as high, 4.7% as medium & 1.3% as low. While 1.7% of them believe that they do not execute this task.
- c) 88.5% of the teachers perceived the execution of this task by their principals as high, 6.9% as medium, 2.6% as low, and 2.0% of them believed that their principals do not perform this task.

**Task IV:**

- a) 67.9% of the directors perceived the execution of this task by the principals as high, 41.9% as medium, and 11% as low.
  - b) 83.9% of the principals perceived their execution of this task as high, 11.5% as medium, 3.3% as low, and 2.0% of them believe that they do not perform this task.
  - c) 81.4% of the teachers perceived the execution of this task by their teachers as high, 11.4% as medium, 4.4% as low, and 2.0% believe that their principals do not perform this task.
-

**Table (4)**  
**Distribution of the frequencies, percentages, degree of importance and relative importance of the responses of the directors of education, principals and teachers on the four administrative tasks of principals**

Category	Task	The extent to which the principals practice this task										Degree of importance	Relative importance		
		(5) V. high		(4) high		(3) Medium		(2) Low		(1) V. Low				(0) Nil	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Directors of education	Task I	22	6.1	120	33.3	183	50.8	27	7.5	8	2.2	-	-	3.3	65.6
	Task II	34	9.4	145	40.2	145	40.2	20	5.5	10	2.8	6	1.6	3.4	68.3
	Task III	85	19.3	222	50.4	117	26.6	7	1.6	8	1.8	1	0.2	3.3	66.5
	Task IV	33	12.1	95	34.9	114	41.9	15	5.5	15	5.5	-	-	3.4	68.5
Principals	Task I	1630	42.0	1600	41.2	501	12.9	72	1.9	29	0.7	50	1.2	4.2	83.5
	Task II	1778	46.0	1584	42.2	352	9.1	56	1.6	26	0.7	65	1.7	4.2	84.0
	Task III	2968	62.2	1429	29.2	226	4.7	49	1.0	15	0.3	79	1.7	4.05	89.5
	Task IV	1326	42.4	1277	40.8	359	11.5	70	2.2	35	1.1	62	2.0	4.2	83.0
Teachers	Task I	6298	43.8	5138	35.8	1900	13.2	347	2.4	291	2.0	373	2.5	4.1	82.0
	Task II	7632	51.6	4907	33.2	1403	9.9	287	1.9	195	1.3	296	2.1	4.2	84.6
	Task III	10679	60.6	4917	27.9	1214	6.9	277	1.6	180	1.0	255	2.0	4.4	87.9
	Task IV	5729	47.9	4005	33.5	1391	11.4	724	3.1	158	1.3	293	2.5	4.2	84.1

2. ANOVA was used to determine the differences between the perceptions of the directors of education, the principals, and the teachers. Means of scores of the three groups on the four tasks are shown in table (5).

**Table (5)**  
**Means of scores of the directors of education,**  
**the principals, and the teachers on the**  
**four tasks of principals**

Category	N	Task I	Task II	Task III	Task IV
<b>Directors of Education</b>	18	66.72	68.61	91.55	54.00
<b>Principals</b>	199	83.53	85.31	107.42	66.65
<b>Teachers</b>	739	82.14	85.16	105.41	67.03

The results of analysis of variance shown in table (6) reveal that there are significant differences between the means of scores of the three groups on (a) task I, where F value = (9.8) with DF (2.953) at 0.0001. Scheffe's task results showed that the difference between the means of scores of the principals and the directors of education was (16.81) for the benefit of the principals; and between the directors of education and the teachers was (15.24) for the benefit of the teachers; (b) task II, where F value = (11.42) with DF (3.953) at 0.0001. Scheffe's test results showed that the difference between the means of scores of the directors of education and the principals was (16.70); and between the mean of scores of the directors of education and the teachers was (16.54) for the benefit of the principals and teachers; (c) task III, where F value = (9.21) with DF (3.953) at 0.0001. Scheffe's test results showed that the difference between the means of scores of the directors of education was (15.87); and between the means of scores of the directors of education and the teachers was (13.85) for the benefit of the principals and the teachers. a) task IV, where F value = (9.06) with DF (3.953) at 0.0001. Scheffe's test results showed that the difference between the means of scores of the directors of education and the principals was (13.03), and (12.65) between the means of scores of the directors of education and the teachers for the benefit at the principals and the teachers.

**Table (6)**  
**Results of analysis of variance to determine differences**  
**between means of scores of the directors of**  
**education, the principals, and the**  
**teachers on the four tasks.**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>F Value</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Sum of squared</b>	<b>Mean of squared</b>	<b>PR&gt; F</b>
<b>I.</b>	<b>Improvement and development of the education process</b>	9.80	3 953	4718.43 152928.44	1572.81 160.47	0.0001
<b>II.</b>	<b>Supervision of student Affairs</b>	11.42	3 953	4906.90 136450.79	1635.63 143.18	0.0001
<b>III.</b>	<b>Supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs</b>	9.21	3 953	4271.52 147389.90	1423.84 154.65	0.0001
<b>IV</b>	<b>Taking interest in local school community</b>	9.06	3 953	2991.85 104937.04	997.28 110.11	0.0001

3. t-test results showed that there were no significant differences ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between the means of scores of the directors of education on the execution of the principal's four administrative tasks as they perceived them attributable to experience or qualifications as shown in table (7).

**Table (7)**  
**t-test results to determine differences between means**  
**of scores of the directors of education on the four**  
**tasks attributable to experience**  
**and qualifications.**

No	Task	Variable	N	n	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	T value	Pro > T
I.	Improvement & Development of the educational process	1-5 yr. Exp.	9	65.78	6.30	2.10	-0.47	0.64
		6 yr.	9	67.66	10.22	3.40		
		B.A. + Dip Qul. M.Ed.	10	66.80	6.03	1.90	0.04	0.96
II.	Supervision of student affairs	1-5 yes, Exp.	9	64.44	9.79	3.26	-1.79	0.09
		6 yr.	9	72.77	9.87	3.29		
		B.A.+Dip Qul. M.Ed.	10	65.50	10.90	3.44	-1.48	0.15
III.	Supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs	1-5 yr. Exp.	9	89.89	9.41	3.13	0.66	0.51
		6 yr.?	9	93.22	11.70	3.90		
		B.A.+Dip. Qul. M.Ed.	10	88.90	9.56	3.02	-1.20	0.24
IV.	Interest in the local school community	1-5 yr. Exp.	9	51.66	6.36	2.12	-1.01	0.33
		6 yrs.+	9	12.27	12.27	4.09		
		B.A.+Dip. Qul. M.Ed.	10	8.35	8.35	2.64	-1.46	0.16

4. t-test result showed that there were no significant difference, ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between the means of scores of the principals on the execution of the four administrative tasks as they are perceived by the principals themselves attributable to sex as indicated in table (8).

**Table (8)**  
**t-test results to determine differences between**  
**means of scores of the principals on the four**  
**tasks attributable to sex**

No.	Task	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	T value	Pro<T
<b>I.</b>	<b>Improvement and development of the education process</b>	M	116	84.13	9.4	0.85	1.10	0.26
		F	83	82.69	8.87	0.97		
<b>II.</b>	<b>Supervision of student affairs</b>	M	116	86.15	9.26	0.86	1.63	0.10
		F	83	84.13	8.06	0.88		
<b>III.</b>	<b>Supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs</b>	M	116	108.56	8.33	0.77	1.85	0.06
		F	83	105.83	11.47	1.25		
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Taking interest in local school community</b>	M	116	66.93	9.90	0.92	0.51	0.60
		F	83	66.26	8.57	0.94		

Results of analysis of variance showed that there were no significant differences ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between the mean of scores of the principals on the execution of their four administrative experience or academic qualifications as indicated in table (9).



**Table (9)**  
**Results of analysis of variance to determine**  
**differences between means of scores**  
**of the principals on the four tasks**  
**attributable to experience**  
**and qualifications**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Variable</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>DF</b>	<b>Sum of squares</b>	<b>Mean of squares</b>	<b>PR F</b>
<b>Improvement and development of the education process</b>	Exp.	1.46	3	360.81	120.27	0.22
			195	16024.66	82.17	
	Qul.	2.12	4	685.59	171.39	0.08
			194	15699.87	80.92	
<b>Supervision of student affairs</b>	Exp.	2.66	3	604.61	201.53	0.05
			195	14802.07	75.90	
	Qul.	2.41	4	728.08	182.02	0.05
			194	14678.59	75.66	
<b>Supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs</b>	Exp.	1.33	3	385.16	128.39	0.26
			19	18769.52	96.25	
	Qul.	2.13	4	804.82	201.20	0.07
			194	18349.86	94.58	
<b>Taking interest in the local school community</b>	Exp.	0.25	3	67.47	22.49	0.85
			195	17319.28	88.81	
	Qul.	0.81	4	286.20	71.55	0.05
			194	17100.55	88.14	

5. t-test results showed that there were no significant differences ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between the mean of scores of the teachers on the executive of the four administrative tasks of principals as they perceived them attributable to sex as showed in table (10).

**Table (10)**  
**t-test results to determine differences between**  
**means of scores of the teachers on the**  
**four tasks attributable to sex**

No.	Task	Sex	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	T value	Pro>T
I.	Improvement and development of the education process	M	412	82.54	13.92	0.60	0.92	0.35
		F	327	81.62	13.04	0.72		
II.	Supervision of student affairs	M	412	85.71	13.11	0.64	1.34	0.17
		F	327	84.46	12.16	0.67		
III.	Supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs	M	412	105.54	12.93	0.63	0.30	0.76
		F	327	105.24	13.28	0.73		
IV.	Taking interest in local community	M	412	67.66	11.12	0.54	1.80	0.06
		F	327	66.22	10.31	0.57		

Results on analysis of variance showed that there were no significant differences ( $\alpha= 0.05$ ) between the means of scores of the teachers attributable to qualifications. The results also showed that there were no significant differences between the means of scores of teachers attributable to experience on experience on tasks II and IV, and there are no significant difference between the mean of their scores on tasks I and II attributable to the same variable as shown in table (11).

**Table (11)**  
**Results of analysis of variance to determine differences**  
**between means of scores of the teachers on the**  
**four tasks attributable to experience and**  
**qualifications.**

No	Task	Variable	Value	DF	Sum of squares	Mean of squares	PR E
I.	Improvement & development of the educational process	Experience	3.95	3	2149.68	716.56	0.008
				5	13223.67	181.25	
		Qualifications	1.04	4	761.21	190.30	0.38
				4	134621.14	138.39	
II.	Supervision of students affairs	Experience	2.46	3	1183.66	394.55	0.06
				5	118000.17	160.54	
		Qualifications	1.34	4	861.49	215.37	0.20
				4	118322.34	161.20	
III.	Supervision of school organization and its administrative affairs	Experience	3.35	3	1705.41	568.47	0.01
				5	124675.34	169.62	
		Qualifications	0.88	4	606.31	151.57	0.47
				4	125774.45	171.35	
IV.	Taking interest in local school community	Experience	1.47	3	511.91	170.63	0.22
				5	45410.37	116.20	
		Qualifications	1.76	4	815.44	203.86	0.13
				4	85106.84	115.94	

Significant at the .05 level.

As for task I, F value = (3.95) with DF (3.735) at 0.008 level Scheffe's test results showed a difference of (4.44) between the means of scores of the teachers who have had five years of experience or less, and six or more years of experience for the benefit of the second group. And as for task III, where F = (3.35) with DF (36375) at level 0.01, the same test results showed a difference of (4.14) between the mean of scores of teachers who have had five years of experience or less, and between those who have had six or more years of experience for the benefit of the second group.

### **Discussion and conclusions**

The educational authorities in Jordan specified four specific administrative tasks for school principals to perform, and held them responsible for the execution of these tasks. This study aimed at investigating the actual implementation of these tasks by principals, and to determine the extent to which the basic school principals execute these tasks as perceived by the directors of education, the principals themselves, and their teachers. It also aimed at finding out whether or not there were differences in the perceptions of these three groups attributable to the variables of sex, administrative / teaching experience, and academic qualifications.

The results of the study revealed that the majority of the principals, or, 83.2%, 88.2%, 92.1%, and 83.2% of them have ranked their execution as high on tasks I, II, III, and IV consecutively. It was, also, noticed that approximately 88.7% of the principals have ranked their execution of all tasks as high, while only 9.5% ranked them as medium. This result might be attributed to the fact that most individuals usually respond favorably to the items of any questionnaire they feel it might evaluate their performance in order to give a better, or a positive impressions to others. It might also be attributed to the fact that the absence of a specific, unified criteria to depend on when evaluating the principals performance encourages most of them to interpret their actions in a way that serves their own purposes. It might be added that 61% of public basic school principals in Jordan (41.1% of whom are male principals, and 58.9% are female principals) are holders of the two years community college diploma <sup>(16)</sup>. This finding supports the results of a local study conducted by Saleh in 1985 to evaluate the performance of the public secondary school principals where he reported that principals over rated their own performance <sup>(17)</sup>.

As for how teachers perceive the execution of these tasks by their principals, the results revealed that 79.9%, 84.8%, 88.5%, and 81.4% of the teachers ranked their principals execution of task I, II, III, and IV as high; and 83.5% of them ranked the execution of the four tasks jointly as high, while 3.1% of them ranked the execution of these tasks as low. This might be attributed to two reasons: first, more than 60% of the basic public school teachers in Jordan are of community colleges level preparation. Which in turn, limits their expectations and perceptions of the domain of the administrative role of the principal; and second, most teachers believe that they do their principals favors when they, the teachers, over estimate their principals' performance. This finding also supports the results of

Saleh's study where he found that public secondary school teachers ranked the performance of their principals as high <sup>(18)</sup>.

The perceptions of the directors of education of the principals execution of the four tasks were noticeably lower than those of the principals and teachers. Table (4) shows that only 39.4%, 46.6%, 69.7% and 67.9% of the directors have ranked the actual execution of tasks I, II, III, and IV by principals as high; and 50.8%, 40.2%, 26.6%, and 41.9% of them have ranked the execution of these tasks by principals as medium. This might be attributed to the fact that the academic qualifications of the directors of education are higher than those of the principals, especially when we realize that nearly 60% of the directors of education hold Master's Degrees in education. (\*) This advantage gives them a better insight of what the principals tasks should be, and what role should they play in administrating their schools. This result also coincides with Saleh's study <sup>(19)</sup>. It might be noted here that the results of this study as to the perceptions of the directors of education, principals, and teachers contradict the results of an earlier study conducted by Sonbor in 1979 where he found no significant differences in the perceptions of educational administrators, principals and teacher of the role of the secondary school principal in Jordan <sup>(20)</sup>.

The results of the analysis of variance did not reveal any significant differences between the perceptions of the directors of education pertaining to the principals' execution of their tasks that can be attributed to experience or qualifications. These support the findings of the Sonbor's study mentioned earlier <sup>(21)</sup>. These findings might be attributed to the fact that all the directors of education are academically qualified for the positions they hold, and that they have had a considerable number of years of administrative experience. These factors make them apt to use a similar criteria in judging the performances of the principals under their authority.

The results also did not reveal any significant differences in the perceptions of principals of the execution of their task that might be attributed to gender. This result coincides with the findings of Shihada, where he reported no indicative differences between the perceptions of secondary school principals of their tasks attributed to sex <sup>(22)</sup>. This study did not show significant differences between the perceptions of the principals that might be attributed to experience or qualifications. This result contradicts the findings of Shihada <sup>(23)</sup>, and Saoub <sup>(24)</sup>, where both have indicated significant differences in the extent to which secondary school principals execute their tasks due to experience and levels of qualification. This result might be attributed to the lack of the proper skills and competencies supposed to be acquired by principals to take the initiative in innovations and creativity. Unfortunately this situation exists inspite of the efforts made by the Ministry of Education to requalify nearly 2400 principals, mainly of basic schools, during the period from 1988-1993.

---

(\*) Two directors hold doctorate degree in education were not included in this study.

The results of this study did not show indicative differences in the execution of the administrative tasks by principals as perceived by teachers due to gender. This result was inconsistent with Sonbor's findings where he indicated that there were significant differences between the perceptions of male and female teachers as to how the secondary school principals execute their duties <sup>(25)</sup>.

Finally, the results of this study revealed that there are no significant differences in the execution of the administrative tasks II and IV by the principals as perceived by the teachers that might be attributed to teaching experience, while there were as to the execution of tasks I and III attributed to the same variable. This might be explained by the fact that teachers who have had long teaching experience realize that most of the actions of their principals, or their "ways of running thing" in school are governed by rules and regulations set by higher educational authorities, so they tend to be fair in evaluating the performance of their principals. This result is consistent with Snobor's study where he reported significant differences in the perceptions of teachers of the role of secondary school principals attributable to experience <sup>(26)</sup>.

## **Conclusions**

The General Directorate for Educational Planning, Development, and Research reported that "it was noticed that school administration (in Jordan) is characterized by a set of characteristics which call for its development and improvement: (a) the low level of skills and competencies possessed by basic school principals obstructs them from performing their tasks efficiently and effectively; (b) the dependence of school administrator on managing only the routine, daily school work did not lead to the development of administrative practice, to innovations, or to creativity; and, (c) the limited role of school administration in preparation of teachers for better performance, and for better dealing with educational problems is attributed to the lack of administrative competencies on the part of principals, and to the lack of authorities delegated to them <sup>(27)</sup>.

To remedy these deficiencies, the Ministry of Education and upon the recommendation of the First National Conference for Educational Development, adopted new measures to requalify 2400 principals, both university or community college graduates, during the period from 1988-1993; and to requalify 22,000 teachers mainly those who hold community college diplomas during a period of ten years.

In the light of the results of this study, the researchers recommend the following:

- 1) A gradual systematic shift toward decentralization of administration to prevent "facsimile type" set of rules and regulations from being applied to all schools, all principals and teachers at all times.
- 2) An intensive study should be conducted to investigate why higher academic qualifications have no impact on the performance of principals or teachers.

Thus the researchers have drawn attention to the fact that a large number of studies has shown that academic qualifications did not affect neither the performance of the principals, nor the teachers, and therefore urged that this phenomenon should intensively be investigated.

---

## Bibliography

1. Hughes. M. (1985), Leadership in Professionally Staffed Organizations. In M. Hughes, R. Ribbins, and H. Thomas (Eds.). Managing Education: the System and the Institution. London: Cassell, P. 287.
2. Rpe, William H. and Drake, Thelbert L. (1974). Principalship. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., PV
3. Ministry of Education, Department of Teaching, (1981). A Guide for School Administration. Bulletin No. (5), Amman , Jordan (In Arabic). P. 59-61.
4. Natriello C. (1984). Teachers' Perception of the Frequency of Evaluation and Assessment of their Efforts and Effectiveness. American educational research Journal, 21(3) PP. 579-597.
5. Ellet, C.D. and Walberg, H.J. (1979). Principal Competency: Environment and Outcomes. In H.J. Walberg (LD.), Educational Environments and Effects, Berkeley: McCutchan, PP. 140-187.
6. Gall, M. et. al. (1985). Involving the Principal in Teacher and Staff Development. Effects on Mathematics Instruction and Achievement. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, P. 161.
7. Chui, H. and McCormick, J. and Sharpe, F. " Vision and Leadership of Principals in Hong Kong ". Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 34 No. 3, 1996.
8. Awad. Mazen A. (1985). Analytical Study to find out the Extent to which Public Secondary School Principals Practice their Administrative Task. Unpublished Master's thesis. Thesis Abstracts, Vol.4, Center of Education Research and Development, University of Yarmouk, Irbid, Jordan, P. 68, (In Arabic).
9. Saleh, Khalid A. (1985). Evaluation of the Performance of Public Secondary School Teachers in Jordan. Unpublished Master's thesis, College of education, University of Jordan, PP. 61-65, (In Arabic).
10. Shihada, H.A. (1990). The Administrative and Technical Tasks of Public Secondary School Principals in Jordan and the Extent to which they Execute them. Unpublished Master's thesis, College of Education, University of Jordan, PP. 50-107, (In Arabic).
11. Ministry of Education, (1981), op.ct., p.41.



12. Ministry of Education, the General Directorate for Educational Planning, Development and Research (1988). General Plan for Educational Development 1988-1998 in Light of the Recommendations of the first National Conference for Educational Development, Amman, Jordan, p.15, (In Arabic).
13. Ministry of Education, General Directorate for Teaching, Training, and Educational Supervision, Department of Training, (1990). A Plan for Principal Growth and Training. Amman, Jordan, pp. 24-27, (In Arabic).
14. Ministry of Education, (1981), op.ct., pp.58.61.
15. Ministry of Education, the directorate of general teaching, (1986). The Daily Guide for School Principals. Amman, Jordan, p.10, (In Arabic).
16. Ministry of Education, (1988), op.ct., pp.24-26.
17. Saleh, (1985), op.ct.,55.
18. Saleh, (1985) op.ct., p.56.
19. Saleh, (1985) op.ct., p.62.
20. Snobor, Shokri, (1979). The Role of the Secondary School Principal in Jordan. Unpublished Master's Thesis, College of Education, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan, p.77, (In Arabic).
21. Snobor, (1974), op.ct., p.78.
22. Shihada, (1990), op.ct., p.121.
23. Shihada (1990), op. ct., p. 123.
24. Soub, Ahmad, (1986). The Extent of the Understanding of Public Secondary School Principals in Jordan of their Administrative Tasks and Applications. Unpublished Master's thesis, College of Education, University of Jordan, p. 76, (In Arabic).
25. Snobor, (1979), op. ct., p.78.
26. Snobor, (1979), op. ct., p. 79.
27. Ministry of Education, (1988). op.ct., pp. 9-10.
28. Ministry of Education, the General Directorate for Educational Planning, Development, and Research, (1988) The Basic Outlines for Explaining the

Procedures of the Implementation of the Recommendations of the First National Conference of Educational Development. Amman, Jordan. pp. 15-26, (In Arabic).

### Appendix

#### Distribution of the qualifications of the basic school principals in Jordan (Population of the Study)

Qualifications	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Less than a community college diploma</b>	11	1.4	29	2.4	40	2.0
<b>Diploma from a community college</b>	315	41.1	882	73.5	1197	61.0
<b>Diploma from a community college plus diploma of educational qualification</b>	68	8.8	140	11.6	208	10.6
<b>Bachelor's of arts of science</b>	178	23.2	124	10.3	302	15.3
<b>B.A. + Diploma of education</b>	166	21.6	23	1.9	189	9.0
<b>Master's of education</b>	77	3.5		29	1.5	
<b>Total</b>	765		1200		1965	