

:

*

(22)

:

.1

2003)

Berian, 2001; 2005

2003

(Kaseman and Kaseman, 2000;

Information and Communications Technology (ICT)

.(2005)

)

1995

.(2005

*

.(Mallinen, 2001; Hardy, 1998)

.2008/1/21

2007/5/6

/

2009 ©

:
.1
:
.2
.
.3)
(McGhee and Kozman, 2000; 2003
.4
.5

.2

:
.1
.2
(Norton, McRobbie and Cooper, 2000)
.3

ICDL
Intel,

Word links

(Albion,

2003)

(%17)

(%37)

(Interview Schedule)

(%10)

(%33)

(%27)

(%27)

.(%29)

(%6)

(%47)

.2007/2006

(%31)

.(%44)

(%53)

(22)

(2000)

.1

.2

.3

.3

(Higgins

(Lam, 2000)

and Moseley, 2001)

1998 1998 1996 1995)

Williams, 1995; Khan, 1997; Schofield and 2005

.(Fabry and Higgs, 1997)

.(Davidson, 2000;

(2004)

(Smaldino, Russell, Heinich and Molenda, 2005;

Whetstone and Carr-Chellman, 2001)

(Grabe and Grabe, 1998; Can, and Cagiltay, 2006)

(Prensky

2001)

.(Jaber, 1997)

(Sugar, Crawley and Fine, 2004)

(Key Persons)

(Albion, 2003)

.4

.%60

%17

%83

(semi-structured

interviews)

(Honka, Lampinen and Virtanen, 2000),

(Participants)

(22)

(

(10)

(12))

(7)

(Windschitl and Sahl, 2002)

(Jacobson, 1993; Luan, Fung, Nawawi and Hong,

2005; Can and Cagiltay, 2006)

(ICDL)

.(Intel/World Links)

(Windschitl and Sahl, 2002)

-(%14)

-(%86)

(Can and Cagiltay, 2006)

()

(Crabe and Crabe, 1998)

.1

.....

.(1)

:

....

(O'Mahony, 2003)

...

.2

)
(

(Trotter, 2001)

:

....

(Intel;

:

:

World links)

.....

.3

(Intel, Word links)

)

:

-

:

:

-(

%32)

....

:

...

.4

:

-

-

.....

:

:

(1)

% 54	12	% 22	5	% 32	7	.1
% 81	18	% 32	7	% 49	11	.2
% 67	15	% 22	5	% 45	10	.3
% 45	10	% 18	4	% 27	6	.4
% 22	5	% 8	2	% 14	3	.1
% 90	20	% 45	10	% 45	10	.2
% 64	14	% 32	7	% 32	7	.1
% 36	8	% 14	3	% 22	5	.2
% 54	12	% 22	5	% 32	7	.3
% 36	8	% 22	5	% 14	3	.1
% 22	5	% 18	4	% 4	1	.2
% 40	9	% 18	4	% 22	5	.3

.(.1) :
 .2
 .3
 .(160) :
 .4
 .5 - (%54) :
 :

.6
:
.7
:
.8
.....
.9

(2)

%59	13	%23	5	% 36	8		
%32	7	%23	5	% 9	2		
%9	2	--	--	% 9	2		
%86	19	% 41	9	%45	10		
%14	3	% 5	1	% 9	2		
%32	7	% 18	4	%14	3		
%54	12	% 22	5	%32	7		
%14	3	% 5	1	% 9	2		
%23	5	%14	3	% 9	2		
%45	10	% 18	4	% 27	6		
%32	7	%14	3	% 18	4		

:
.....
:
:
.....
:
.1
.2
.3
.4
.5

-(%14)

(Khazaleh and Jawarneh, 2006)

(2)

1

.6

:

.1

(Lam, 2000; Higgins and Moseley, 2001)

.2

(2005)

.3

.(1)

1

.32-5 (4)25
1996

()

:

2005

.(10)2

:

2003

:

1998

231

.22-20 (1)42
2003

:

1998

.160-156 (4-3)41

:

2005

.(318)

-

.1998

15-13

2003

2005

(2003/4/23-21)

http://www. :

.190-170 (1)6

pssso.org.sa/arabic/pssolibrary/nadwa01/nadwa_2-

2005

- training needs by the year 2010. Anticipatory project to investigate teachers' initial and continuing training needs (OPEPRO), Report 10. National Board of Education. Available at: <http://www.opf.fi/cedefop/ttnet/ttnetreport.htm>. 1424h.htm.
- Jaber, W. 1997. *A survey of factors which influence teachers' use of computer-based technology*. Unpublished Dissertation, Faculty Virginia State University, Richmond. 1995 ()
- Jacobson, R. 1993. New computer technique seen producing a revolution in educational testing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 15, A22-23, 26. 2000
- Kaseman, L. and Kaseman, S. 2000. *How will virtual schools affect home schooling?* In Home-ed-magazine, November-December 2000-Articles. Available at: <http://www.home-ed-magazine.com/HEM/176/ndtch.html> .(1420 5-3)
- Khan, B. (Editor). 1997. *Web-based instruction*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications. 2005
- Khazaleh, T. and Jawarneh, T. 2006. Barriers to effective information technology in Jordanian schools as perceived by in-service teachers. *Jordan Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(4), 281-292. 2004
- Lama, Y. 2000. Technophilia vs. technophobia: A preliminary look at why second-language teachers do or do not use technology in their classrooms. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56 (3), 390-420. .336 -301 (57) 19
- Luan, W., Fung, N., Nawawi, M., and Hong, T. 2005. Experienced and inexperienced internet users among pre-service teachers: Their use and attitudes toward the Internet. *Educational Technology and Society*, 8 (1), 90-103.
- Mallinen, S. 2001. Teacher effectiveness and online learning. In J. Stephenson (Ed.), *Teaching and learning online: pedagogies for new technologies*, 139-149, Oxford: Routledge.
- McGhee, R. and Kozma, R. 2000. *World links for development: Accomplishments and challenges*. Monitoring and evaluation annual report: 1998-1999. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.
- Miles, M. and Huberman, A. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Norton, S., McRobbie, C. and Cooper, T. 2000. Exploring secondary mathematics teachers' reasons for not using computers in their teaching: Five case Albion, P. 2003. Graduating teachers' dispositions for integrating information and communications technologies into their teaching. Paper Presented at the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education 13th International Conference, Albuquerque, NM. Available at: <http://www.usq.edu.au/users/albion/papers/site03/3756.pdf>
- Berian, W. 2001. The e-school-fact or fiction? Available at: http://www.williams-jones.freemove.co.uk/eschool/left_right_frameset.htm.
- Can, G. and Cagiltay, K. 2006. Turkish prospective teachers' perceptions regarding the use of computer games with educational features. *Educational Technology and Society*, 9 (1), 308-321.
- Consultation Document. 2003. *Towards a unified e-learning strategy*. Department for Education and Skills: UK.
- Fabry, D. and Higgs, J. 1997. Barriers to the effective use of technology in education: Current status, *Journal of Educational Computing*, 17 (4), 385-395.
- Grabe, M. and Grabe, C. 1998. *Integrating technology for meaningful learning* (2nd Ed.), Boston, USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hardy, J. 1998. Teacher attitudes toward and knowledge of computer technology. *Computers in the Schools*, 14 (3-4), 119-136.
- Higgins, S. and Moseley, D. 2001. Teachers' thinking about information and communications technology and learning: beliefs and outcomes. *Teacher Development*, 5 (2), 191-210.
- Honka, J., Lampinen, L. and Virtanen, I. 2000. Towards a new teachership in vocational upper secondary education. Scenarios of change in teachers' work and

- Smaldino, S., Russell, J., Heinich, R. and Molenda, M. 2005. *Instructional media and technologies for learning* (8th Ed.), Columbus, OH, USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Sugar, W., Crawley, F. and Fine, B. 2004. Examining teachers' decisions to adopt new technology. *Educational Technology and Society*, 7 (4), 201-213.
- Trotter, A. 2001. Teachers complain of little time to use Internet. (Electronic Version), *Educational Week*, 24/4/2001, Vol., 20, Issue 32. p.15.
- Whetstone, L. and Carr-Chellman, A. 2001. Preparing pre-service teachers to use technology: Survey results. *TechTrends*, 45 (4), 11-17.
- Williams, B. 1995. *The internet for teachers*. California: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.
- Windschitl, M. and Sahl, K. 2002. Tracing teachers' use of technology in a laptop computer school: The interplay of teacher beliefs, social dynamics, and institutional culture. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39 (1), 165-205.
- studies. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 33 (1), 87- 109.
- O'Mahony, C. 2003. Getting the information and communications technology formula right: access + ability = confident use. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 12 (2), 295-311.
- Patton, M. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Prensky, M. 2001. *Digital game-based learning*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Richardson, V. 1994. *Teacher change and the staff development process: A case in reading instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Schofield, J. and Davidson, A. 2000. Internet use and teacher change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American education research association (New Orleans, Louisiana). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No: ED446748.
- Simsek, N. 2005. Perceptions and opinions of educational technologists related to educational technology. *Educational Technology and Society*, 8(4), 178-190.

Islamic Education Teachers' Perceptions of Electronic Learning: A Qualitative Study

*Mohammad A. Tawalbeh and Majdi S. Masha'lleh**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at exploring Islamic Education teachers' perceptions of electronic learning. In order to achieve this objective, data were gathered by conducting semi-structured interviews with 22 Islamic Education Teachers. After data analysis, teachers' responses were grouped into five main categories with some subcategories derived from each. Each category entails certain perceptions centered around e-learning concerning its importance to both teachers and student, obstacles of employing e-learning, suitability of training programs, and appropriateness of this type of learning for Islamic Education curriculum. In the light of these findings, some recommendations were presented such as developing particular e-learning training sessions for Islamic Education teachers.

Keywords: Electronic Learning, Islamic Education Teachers, Perceptions.

* Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Arab Open University, Amman, Jordan. Received on 6/5/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 21/1/2008.