

*

(56)

(97)

Tukey

F-test

:

:

:

National Council of Teachers of)
(Mathematics(NCTM), 2000

Barron and Ivers,)
(1996

(1999)

.2009/3/23

()
2007/12/23

*

/

- and Matthews, 2004; Sarason and Banbury, 2004)
(Benek- Rivera
- (Ward and LaBranche, 2003)
- Johnsot,)
Driscoll,) (Killion and Oomen, 2005
(2002
- Quitadamo and Brown,)
E-Math (2001
-) (Honebein, 1996)
(2003
(Scriven and Paul, 2004)
(NCTM)
- E- learning,)
(2003
- (Laine, 2003)
- Hara) (Brown,1996)
(and Kling, 2000
- (Condie and Livingston, 2007)
- (Rubenstein, 2003)

(Vaughan, 2005)

(38)

(Welker and Berardino, 2006)

22

(Futch, 2005)

Karl and James,)

(2005

Akkoyunlu and)

(64)

(Soylu, 2006

(Fitzgibbon and Jones, 2004)

Tyler

(1984)

()

Stifflebeam

Stake

Scriven

Eisner

()

(1)

(2)

Stifflebeam

(3)

(2003)

(4)

(5)

(6)

Stakeholders

:

()

:

.()

()

:

(1)

(2)

:

:

:

2.25-1.25: 3.50-2.26 : 4.25-3.51
.1.25 :
:

4.25-3.51 : 5.0-4.26 : :) .(NCTM)
: 2.25-1.25: 3.50-2.26 :
.1.25 (.
:

13 2006/2005 (20)

.2006/2005

(Laptop)

13

()

(Media)

56

(14) :

(13) : (42)

(Laptop)

10 : (6) (37)

(Data Show)

(13) 20 (26) 19-10 (17)

.(34) (22)

(36)

.()

(7)

(I CDL)

(Intel)

: 5.0-4.26 : :

32

..... (30)

:() (97)
 (64) (33)) :
 (12) (11) (9) :
 (12) (14) (11)
 (4) (5) (15) (13)

(1) (2) (3) 20
 : (1) 20 %40
 (12) %70
 57
 %70 %40
 (19) (14)
 : (97)

..(1))
 : (2)
 (14)

Smart and Cappel, 2006;)

(Welker and Beradino, 2006

..(2))
 : (3)
 (10)
 :

3.96 ()

.3.43 ()

()

:

()

:

(2)

)

(14)

(

(1.04)

(1)

**		*		
	0.89	3.96		11
	0.75	3.94		4
	0.96	3.90		6
	0.83	3.88		9
	0.85	3.78		2
	0.73	3.61		1
	0.98	3.59		10
	0.81	3.59	()	7
	1.10	3.55		3
	1.04	3.47		5
	0.81	3.47		8
	0.82	3.43		12
	0.58	3.68	(12)	

.5

*

**

(2)

**				
	0.58	4.31		5
	0.71	4.29		12
	0.76	4.27		1
	0.65	4.22		4
	0.64	4.20		11
	0.74	4.20		6
	0.73	4.18		3
	0.61	4.14		10
	0.72	3.94		13
	0.79	3.92		2
	0.75	3.76		14
	0.83	3.67		9
	0.79	3.59		7
	0.87	3.53		8
	0.49	4.01	(14)	

.5

*

**

(2)

0.49

4.01

(3.53)

(4.31)

)

)

4.31

(

.3.53 (

:

:

:

(3)

()

(10)

(3)

**				
	0.80	3.84		1
	0.83	3.76		10
	0.79	3.61		9
	0.82	3.57		2
	0.74	3.55		4
	0.74	3.55		8
	0.85	3.49		3
	0.73	3.41		5
	0.89	3.39		7
	0.82	3.22		6
	0.51	3.54	(10)	

.5

*

**

(3)

()

.0.51

3.54

:

(3.22)

(3.84)

(1)

)

)

3.84

(

(2)

.3.22

(

(3)

(4)

:

(5)

(6)

()

12

:

()

:

(4)

(4)

(%) [*]			
60.7	34		1
44.6	25	(ICDL)	2
35.7	20		3
30.4	17	()	4
28.6	16		5
25.0	14		6
23.2	13		7
21.4	12	()	8
16.1	9	(INTEL)	9
14.3	8		10
10.7	6		11
7.1	4		12
5.4	3		13

%100

*

(4)

INTEL

ICDL

ICDL

()

: ()

(5)

(5)

*			
58.9	33)	1
		(
28.6	16		2
25.0	14		3
21.4	12		4
14.3	8		5
12.5	7		6
12.5	7		7
10.7	6		8
10.7	6		9
10.7	6		10
8.9	5		11
7.1	4		12

.%100

*

(5)

)

(

(6)

(%9)

:

:

(7)

(6)

(6)

*(%)			
30.4	17		1
30.4	17		2
28.6	16	()	3
23.2	13		4
19.6	11		5
17.9	10		6
14.3	8		7
12.5	7		8
10.7	6		9

.%100

*

(7)

*			
(%)			
82.1	46		1
32.1	18		2
28.6	16		3
26.8	15		4
19.6	11		5
16.1	9		6

%100

*

(7)

()

.%82

(%7)

:

(8)

:

(9)

(8)

(9)

()

(8)

(%)	*		
58.9	33		1
19.6	11		2
14.3	8		3
12.5	7		4
10.7	6		5
8.9	5		6
7.1	4		7

%100

*

(9)

(%)	*		
41.1	23		1
33.9	19	()	2
25.0	14		3
23.2	13		4
21.4	12		5
19.6	11	()	6
12.5	7		7
10.7	6		8
10.7	6		9
8.9	5		10

%100

*

" " :
" ()

(1) .(1) 14
 (14) (4) (5) :
 (2) (3)

(10)

**		*		
	1.01	4.19		9
	1.07	3.89		6
	1.05	3.89		11
	1.09	3.87		8
	1.13	3.81		12
	0.88	3.79		3
	0.97	3.77		1
	1.07	3.71		13
	1.05	3.67		10
	1.10	3.67		14
	1.08	3.63		5
	1.07	3.61		7
	1.06	3.46		2
	1.31	3.32		4
	0.64	3.7	(14)	

.5 *
 **

(10)

.0.64 3.7

(3.32) (4.19)
)

4.19 ()
)
 .3.32 (

:

1.31

!

(F-

Test)

(11)

(11)

* 0.00	14.43	4.271	2	8.543	
* 0.00	15.86	4.695	1	4.695	
0.22	1.493	0.442	2	0.884	
		0.296	91	26.930	×
			96	41.052	

$\alpha=0.05$

*

(11)

(P-

(15.86)

)

value=0.00)

(

0.65 3.91
 .0.65 3.39

(P-value=0.00) (14.43)

Tukey (12)

: ()

:

(1) (12)

(2)

15 ()

		-	
0.118	0.128	0.257	-
0.000 *	0.169	0.933	-
0.000 *	0.159	0.676	-

$\alpha=0.05$ *

(12)

:

(0.47= 3.99=

(13)

(P-value=0.000)

3.06=)

(13)

.(0.71=

)

(0.56= 3.74=

:

(14)

(13)

* (%)			
35.9	28		1
34.6	27		2
32.1	25		3
29.5	23		4
24.4	19		5
24.4	19		6
19.2	15		7
19.2	15		8
19.2	15	()	9
15.4	12		10
15.4	12	()	11
15.4	12		12
12.8	10		13
10.3	8		14
10.3	8		15

%100

*

(14)

(%)	*		
30.8	24		1
21.8	17		2
19.2	15		3
16.7	13		4
16.7	13	()	5
10.3	8		6
9.0	7	()	7
9.0	7		8
7.7	6		9

%100

*

(14)

.(: (2) .
(3)) (.
(4) .
:)
() . (.
: .()
:
: (1)
(2)
: () -
: () -
: ()
()
:
: (1)
(3))

/

- based Distance Education Course: An Ethnographic Study of Participants' Experiences. *Information, Communication and Society*, 3(4), 557-579. 1995
- Honebein, P.C. 1996. Seven Goals for the Design of Constructivist Learning Environments. In B. G. Wilson (ED.), *Constructivist Learning Environments: Case Studies in Instructional Design*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications. (1987) 2003
- Johnston, J., Killion, J. and Oomen, J. 2005. Student Satisfaction in the Virtual Classroom. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*. 3. retrieved January 26th, 2006, <http://ijahsp.nova.edu/articles/Vo13num2/Johnston%20-%20Printer%20Version.pdf>. 1998 .306-292 (27)7 2003
- Karl, L.S. and James, J.C. 2005. Student Perceptions of Online Learning: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 5. Akkoyunlu, B. and Yilmaz S. M. 2006. A Study on Students' Views on Blended Learning Environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 7(3), 43-56.
- Laine, L. 2003. Is E-learning Effective for IT Training? *T+D*, 57(6), 55-60. Barron, A. and Ivers, K. 1996. *The Internet and Instruction-Activities and Ideas*. Englewood: Libs Unlimited.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. 2000. *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author. Benek-Rivera, J. and Matthews, V. E. 2004. Active Learning with Jeopardy: Students Ask the Questions. *Journal of Management Education*, 28, 104- 118.
- Quitadamo, I. J. and Brown, A. 2001. Effective Teaching Styles and Instructional Design for Online Learning Environments. *National Educational Computing Conference*, July 25-27, 2001 (Chicago, IL). Retrieved January 10th, 2006 http://confreg.uoregon.edu/NECC2001/program/research_pdf/Quitadamo.pdf. Brown, K. M. 1996. The Role of Internal and External Factors in the Discontinuation of off-campus Students. *Distance Education*, 17(1), 44-71.
- Rubenstein, H. 2003. Recognizing E-learning's Potential and Pitfalls. *Learning and Training Innovation's*, 4(4), 38. Condie, R. and Livingston, K. 2007. Blending Online Learning with Traditional Approaches: Changing Practices. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(2), 337-348.
- Sarason, Y. and Banbury, C. 2004. Active Learning Facilitated by using a Game-show Format or Who Doesn't. *Journal of Management Education*, 28(4), 509-518. Driscoll, M. 2002. How People Learn (and What Technology Might Have To Do With It). Eric Clearing-House on Information and Technology Syracuse, NY. Retrieved January 5th 2006 from <http://www.ericdigests.org/2003-3/learn.htm>
- Scriven, M. and Paul, R. 2004. Defining Critical Thinking. Available Online January 26, 2006, at <http://www.criticalthinking.org/aboutCT/definingCT.html>. E-learning Replaces Classroom. 2003. *Health Management Technology*, 24(4), 50-51.
- Smart, K. and Capple, J. 2006. Students' Perceptions of Online Learning: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Information Technology Education*. 5, 201-219. Fitzgibbon, K. M. and Jones, N. 2004. Jumping the Hurdles: Challenges of Staff Development Delivered in a Blended Learning Environment, *Journal of Educational Media*, 29(1), 25-35.
- Vaughan, N. 2005. Investigating How A Blended Learning Futch, L. S. 2005. *A Study of Blended Learning at a Metropolitan Research University*. Florida: University of Central Florida.
- Hara, N. and Kling, R. 2000. Students' Distress with a Web-

- Welker, J. and Berardino, L. 2006. Blended Learning: Understanding The Middle Ground Between Traditional Classroom And Fully Online Instruction. University of New York Institute of Technology, Utica. *Journal Educational Technology Systems*. 34(1),33-55.
- Ward, J. and LaBranche, G. 2003. Blended Learning: The Convergence of E-learning and Meetings. *Franchising World*, 35(4), 22-23.

An Evaluative Study for Implementing the Experiment of E-math on Ministry of Education Discovery Schools from Teachers and Students Point of View

*Younes M. Alyounes, Eman R. Abed, Ismael S. Alborsan **

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating the implementation of E-math on the Ministry of Education discovery schools from teachers and students point of view. A sample of 56 teachers and 97 students from discovery schools were randomly selected, and asked to fill a structured questionnaire and respond to a set of open questions. Evidence of reliability and validity for the instruments were established before collecting the data. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and F-Test were calculated. F-Test was found significant, so it followed by post hoc comparison test (Tukey).

From teachers point of view, the most important results were the degree of their satisfaction which was the highest on the multimedia, followed by the subject matter, then the worksheets. Moreover, the results showed: the most important prerequisites to teach e-math, the most important obstacles that encountered teachers during teaching math, the main things that teachers expected to change in their instruction, the most thing that affected students during learning e-math, the most positive thing on e-math. However, from students point of view, the main results were: the degree of their satisfaction about the contribution of e-math in improving their achievement was great, and their satisfaction, in general, was in the lower classes higher than in the upper classes. It also showed that the most important things that impressed them on e-math, and the most obstacles that faced most of them while they: learning it. Some recommendations were suggested.

Keywords: Educational Evaluation, E- learning and Teaching, Math Teaching.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, The University of Jordan; Faculty of Educational Sciences/UNRWA/, The Ministry of Education. Received on 23/12/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 23/3/2009.