

*

:

.1

.2

.3

(2267) (79)
(400) (27)

:

:
($\alpha=0.05$)

:

:

(Ferrat, 1981)

*

.2008/5/11

2007/9/19

/

.(1989)

.(1989)

)

.(1970 1982

.(1992)

:

.(1987)

:

.1

.(1993)

.2

:

.(1987)

:

: .1

: 1

" " " "

: 2

.(1997)

: .2 .(1986)

:(2000)

-

. 2005/2004

-

-

-

(Blake and

.3

:Mouton)

.5

:(House and Evans)

)

:(1993

: /

-

:

:

-

-

-

:

()

-

.(1993)

-

:(Reddin)

.6

(1993)

(Reddin)

-

:

(Hersey and

.7

:(Fiedler)

.4

:Blanchard)

(1972)

:

:

)

)

.(1998

.(1994

(1996)

:

)

(1984

:

(1997)

.(Keith, 1985) (1992)

(1982)

:

" : (2003)

.(1986)

."

2003/2002

(1141)

(10714)

.(1986)

(76)

(2000)

(433)

(2001)

) ()
()

(1515)
(459)

)

(2001)

(

(2002) Hawkins

(775)

(9)
(133)

" : (2000)

"

"

(2002) Wetherell

"

Morris

(1534)

(77)

(396)

(23)

(69)

(275)

Telling

(2002) Amoroso

(Seton Hall

University)

(2002) Lucks

(2267)

(79)

(1080)

(27)

(400)

(Bass and

Avolio)

(2001) Mayers

(6)

(36) (2001)

(2000)

(2) (4)

(3) (5)

()

" " " "

() () (12)

() ()

1996 (1988)

.2000

:

(12)

:

-(12)

(ANOVA)

" "

(35)

(Test-

(25) (15) Retest)

(1)

0.70

(1)

(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
() 10	() 4	() 8	() 3

(10) () (1)

(1996)

(Hersey and Blancherd, 1988) "

2000

(3)

:

(2)

(3)

(2)

(2)

12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

(3)

%14.8	4		1
%29.6	8		2
%44.5	12		3
%11.1	3		4
%100	27		

(4)

1		0.1740	4.97	10
2		0.2302	4.94	1
3		0.2751	4.92	6
4		0.2889	4.91	13
5		0.2960	4.90	8
6		0.3201	4.88	5
7		0.3294	4.88	7
8		0.3448	4.86	14
9		0.3822	4.82	2
10		0.3939	4.81	11
11		0.3956	4.81	15
12		0.4141	4.78	12
13		0.4451	4.73	9
14		0.4574	4.70	3
15		0.4379	4.26	4

(5)

1		0.2659	4.92		20
2		0.2659	4.92		21
3		0.2960	4.90		22
4		0.3028	4.90		23
5		0.3448	4.86		16
6		0.4034	4.80		18
7		0.4272	4.76		17
8		0.4304	4.76		19

(6)

1		0.2302	4.94		34
2		0.2659	4.92		29
3		0.2659	4.92		30
4		0.2960	4.90		31
5		0.3028	4.90		32
6		0.3094	4.89		33
7		0.3448	4.86		24
8		0.1608	4.84		28
9		0.1608	4.84		35
10		0.4034	4.80		26
11		0.4120	4.78		27
12		0.4272	4.76		25

(3)

(%44.5)

(%29.6)

: .2)

(2000

(5)

(5)

" "

(4.92)

(0.2659)

:

(4.76)

"

"

(15)

.1

(0.4304)

(5-4)

(2.99-1)

(3.99-3)

(4)

(4)

"

:"

(4.97)

:"

(0.1740)

"

"

"

(0.4379)

(4.26)

: .3

(12)

(6)

(34)

(6)

:"

"

(0.2302)

(4.94)

"

:"

(25)

"

"

(4.76)

(0.4272)

(7)

" "

*0.05	2.073-	4.81	4.60	
0.058	0.837-	4.60	4.50	
0.077	1.783-	4.85	4.77	

0.05 *

(8)

0.2494	4.80		
0.1761	4.72		
0.2397	4.74		
0.1852	4.72		
0.0843	4.96		
0.2314	4.87		
0.1840	4.90		
0.2234	4.88		
0.2066	4.84		
0.2585	4.83		
0.2409	4.86		
0.2539	4.83		

" :

:

."

" "

(7)
(7)

:
.1

(1999) (0.05) (0.05= α) (2.073-)

) (0.05= α)
 .(2003) (1990
 .(Tharrington, 1993)

(9)

(ANOVA)

	F					
0.366	1.010	0.0346	2	0.0692		
		0.0342	188	6.581		
			190	6.651		
0.450	0.802	0.0401	2	0.0802		
		0.05	188	9.604		
			190	9.685		
0.890	0.075	0.0048	2	0.0979		
		0.0951	188	12.500		
			190	12.510		

(10)

0.1585	4.73	51	5	
0.2114	4.72	71	10-5	
0.1752	4.71	69	10	
0.1847	4.72	191		
0.2245	4.83	51	5	
0.2484	4.87	71	10-5	
0.1947	4.91	69	10	
0.2251	4.88	191		
0.3065	4.76	51	5	
0.2159	4.89	71	10-5	
0.2409	4.81	69	10	
0.2554	4.83	191		
0.1361	4.84	69	10	
0.1626	4.83	191		

(11)
(ANOVA)

	F					
0.870	0.139	0.0047	2	0.0095		
		0.0334	188	6.471		
			190	6.481		
0.924	0.190	0.103	2	0.206		
		0.0501	188	9.148		
			190	9.624		
0.828	3.875	0.245	2	0.491		
		0.0366	188	11.0905		
			190	12.396		

(12)

0.1929	4.71		
0.1837	4.74		
0.2235	4.88		
0.1876	4.90		
0.2195	4.87		
0.2235	4.88		
0.2454	4.84		
0.2086	4.86		
0.2542	4.83		

(9)
(0.05= α)

.2

(ANOVA)

(8)

(8)

.(1992)

(1996)

)

.(

(13)
(ANOVA)
()

	F					
0.714	0.337	0.01	2	0.02		
		0.03	192	6.627		
			194	6.651		
0.755	0.281	0.014	2	0.028		
		0.050	192	9.665		
			194	9.693		
0.421	0.869	0.056	2	0.002		
		0.064	192	12.424		
			194	12.537		
			194	5.058		

(14)

*0.019	0.228-	0.273-	0.232-	0.243-	
0.14	0.410	0.502	0.328	0.372	
0.19	0.489	0.523	0.501	0.553	
*0.021	0.201	0.279	0.290	0.287	

. 0.05 *

" .3

"

(ANOVA)

(11 10)

(10)

(1999) (1996) (2001)
(1990)

-5 5)

.(10

10

" .4

(11)

(0.05= α)

"

(ANOVA)
() : (12)
(12)
(0.05 = α)
() (13)
(0.05 = α)

1984

2000

" 1996

" .65-49 (7)

- job satisfaction: elementary teachers' perceptions of leadership behaviors and their effect on teacher.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.
- Wetherell, Karen M. 2002. Principal Leadership Style and Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstract International*. A 63 /02: 460.
- Keith, Davis. 1985. *Human Behavior at Work: Organization Behavior*, 7th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Lucks, J. 2002. Transformational leadership and teacher motivation across New York City public schools. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 63 (06): 2067.
- Mayers, E. 2001. *The principals key factors in teacher*

The Patterns of Leadership of Basic Schools' Principals in The Governorate of Ajloun and Their Relation to Job Satisfaction of Employees from Those Principals, Point of View

*Sameh Mahafzah and Ruba Haddad**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at exploring the patterns of leadership practiced by the basic school's principals in Ajloun governorate and their relation to job satisfaction of the employees from the point of view of principals by answering the following questions:

1. What is the impact of the leadership pattern of basic school principals in Ajloun governorate on employees' job satisfaction?
2. Does the impact of the pattern of leadership of basic school principals in Ajloun governorate differ due to gender, academic qualification, experience, and school (private, public)?
3. Is there any statistical significant differences at level ($\alpha=0.05$) between the dominant leadership pattern and the degree of job satisfaction among teachers from the point of view of principals?

The study population consisted of (79) principals and (2267) teachers, whereas the sample was composed of (27) principals and (400) teachers.

This study reveals the following findings:

1. There is a high level of job satisfaction among participants.
2. There are no statistical significant differences at level ($\alpha=0.05$) on the impact of leadership patterns on job satisfaction due to gender, qualifications, experience, and school (private, public) variables.

In light of the findings, the researchers recommended the following: 1- reconsidering teachers' scale salaries, annual increments, and rewards at retirement to suit their profession, and efforts provided; 2- provide more incentives for teachers at the Ministry of Education, directorates of education, and schools levels such as: letters of thanks, merits, medals, and awards.

Keywords: Leadership Pattern, Job Satisfaction, Traits, Managerial Grid.

* The Hashimite University, Zarka, Jordan; and Latin Convent School, Ajloun. Received on 19/9/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 11/5/2008.