

*

	()	(1450)
(3.69)	(3.92)	
		.(.66)

:

.(2003)

2009/1/25

.2009/6/3

*

/

-3

(Byham and Cox, 1988)

(Blasé and

Blasé, 2001)

500

(Bogler and Somech, 2004)

-1

-2

.2008/2007

" (2007) : -

38

20

(Bogler and Somech, " 2004)

" (Conger and Kanungo, 1988)

(983)

(Bennis and Townsend, 1995)

(Maeroff, 1988)

(.65 -.34) (Short, Greer and Meliven, 1994)

(Manheim, Moore, Grunberg and Greenberg, " 2003) (Carl, 2002)

" (2007)

"

(281)

(Pan and Wang, 2000)

"

"

:

(Crosswell and Elliott,

2004)

:

.(2003)

" (2003)

"

(Buchanan, 1974)

(658)

:

(0.86)

Identificcation

Involvement

(0.43)

Loylty

(O'reilly and Chatman, 1986)

.(0.44)

(Celep, 2000)

(1999)

:

(375)

(Turan, 1998)

.2008/2007 (40) (900)
 (26090)
)
 .(2007
 (1450)
 (1)

(1)

10	10-6	5-1							
568	347	535	662	788	619	831	795	655	
%39	%24	%37	%46	%54	%43	%57	%55	%45	
%100			%100		%100		%100		

(Short and Rinehart, 1992)

:

(Mowday, Steers

and Porter, 1979)

()
 (%86)
 .(2) () () (-)

(2)

(-)		
0.88		
0.88		
0.83		
0.75		
0.72		
0.78		

(3)

	.57	4.22		4
	.64	4.16		3
	.66	3.96		5
	.61	3.88		6
	.91	3.31		1
	.44	2.28		2
	.54	3.92		

(3)

.(4) (3)) .() (

.(3.92)

:

(4.22)

									(4.16)
		" (12)						(3.96)	
		"							
			(4.10)						
(11)								(3.88)	
	"								
		(3.68)							
	"								(3.3)
	"								
								(2.28)	
	"								
	"								
	"		(4.41)	" (15)	(4)	"		(2)	
	" (18)								(3.80)
	(3.81)	"							
								" (3)	
	"								(2.46)
(20)	"								
		(4.39)							
	" (21)								
	"								
			(4.16)						

(4)

	1.12	3.80		2
	1.12	3.67		5
	1.73	3.45		1
	1.24	3.20		4
	1.13	2.46		3
	.96	4.10		12
	.92	4.05		9
	1.01	3.93		10
	1.06	3.91		8
	.96	3.86		7
	1.07	3.86		6
	.95	3.68		11
	.66	4.41		15
	1.49	4.37		17
	.89	4.27		13
	.81	4.22		14
	.88	4.14		16
	.92	3.89		19
	1.06	3.81		18
	.66	4.39		20
	.73	4.186		24
	.79	4.18		23
	.72	4.17		22
	.76	4.16		21
	1.23	4.47		27
	.75	4.38		25
	1.87	4.29		26
	.97	3.85		28
	.98	3.84		29
	1.19	3.76		31
	1	3.12		30

	.73	4.28		36
	.74	4.21		34
	.75	4.14		35
	.73	3.96		37
	1.07	3.48		32
	1.08	3.18		33

:

" (27) " "

(4.47)

.(5)

(5)

(38) .(3.69) ()

(4.52)

" (30)

(3.12)

(41) " " (47)

" (43) "

" (36)

(4.28)

(4.28)

(4.00) (4.15)

" (33)

(3.18)

" (42)

(3.00)

:

(Bogler and Somech, 2004)

(Manheim, Moore,

(Pan and Grunberg and Greenberg, 2003)

" (50)

(2007)

Wang, 2000)

(2.89)

(2.78)

" (44)

(5)

	.66	4.52		38
	0.85	4.28		47
	1.38	4.15		41
	0.98	4.00		43
	0.99	3.98		49
	1.02	3.93		56
	1.18	3.90		52
	0.99	3.90		40
	1.08	3.84		53
	1.09	3.83		45
	1.07	3.82		57
	1.12	3.80		51
	1.03	3.79		48
	1.03	3.70		55
	1.13	3.67		54
	1.24	3.46		46
	1.12	3.00		42
	1.19	2.89		50
	1.09	2.78		44
	1.18	2.59		39
	0.60	3.69		

(2.59)

" (39)

(Turan, 1998) (2003)
 (Celep, 2000) (2007)

(6)

*0.66	*0.46	*0.44	*0.44	*0.61	*0.66	*0.41	

:
0.05

(Bogler and Somech, 2004) ()
 (Manheim, Moore, (6)
 (Pan Grunberg and Greenberg, 2003) (6)
 (Turan, 1998) (2003) and Wang, 2000) 0.66
 (0.66 - 0.41)
 " "
 " " (0.66) (0.61)
 " " (0.46) " "
 " " " (0.44)
 " " " (0.44)
 (0.41)

Byham, W. C. and Cox, J. (1988). *Zapp! The lightening of empowerment: How to improve productivity, quality, and employee satisfaction*. NY: Random House. 2003

Carl, A.E. (2002). *Teacher Empowerment through Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice*, 2nd Ed. Juta and Company. 2003

Celep, C. (2000). Teachers' organizational commitment in the organizations. National Forum of Teacher, *Educational Journal*, 3. Retrieved on December 21, 2008 from <http://www.nationalforum.com/17celep/htm>. 2003

Crosswell, L.J. and Elliott, B. (2004). *Committed Teachers, Passionate Teachers: the dimension of passion associated with teacher commitment and engagement*. In: AARE 2004 Conference, 28th November – 2nd December, Melbourne, Australia. 2007

Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process intergrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(13) 1999

Manheim, L. J., Moore, S., Grunberg, L. and Greenberg, E.S. (2003). *Pre- and Post-Termination Organizational Commitment and the Effects of Leaving*. Research Program on Political and Economic Change, University of Colorado at Boulder. Retrieved on December 21, 2008 from <http://www.colorado.edu/ibs/pubs/pec/pec2003-0004.pdf> 2007

Maeroff, G. (1993). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (7): 472-477. <http://dryasserhendawy.jeeran.com/researches> htm

Mowday, R.R, Steers, R.M. and Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14: 224-247 .(2008/2007)

O'reilly, C. and Chatman, J. J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of complianace identification, and international on pro-social behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, I (1): 492-499

Pan, H. and Wang, L. (2000). *Empowering teachers through teacher associations*. Paper Presented at the Bennis, W. and Townsend, R. (1995). *Reinventing leadership: Strategies to empower the organizations*. NY: William Morrow.

Blase, J. and Blase, Jo. (2001). *Empowering teachers' what successful principals do*. CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Bogler, R. and Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20: 277-289.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19 (1): 533-547.

951-961.

- Short, P., Greer, J. and Melvin, W. (1994). Creating empowered schools: Lessons in change. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32 (4): 38-52.
- Turan, S. (1998). *Organizational climate and organizational commitment in human organizations*. Ph.D. Dissertation, the Ohio University, Ohio.
- Thirteen Annual Conference of The International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, January 4-8, 2000, Hong Kong.
- Short, P.M. and Rinehart, J.S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52:

The Degree of Principals' Practice for Teachers' Empowerment and its Relationship with Teachers' Organizational Commitment as Perceived by the Capital Governorate Teachers'

*Aieman A. Al-Omari and Neda'a M. Kamal**

ABSTRACT

This study aims at recognizing the degree of principals' practice of teachers' empowerment and its relationship to teachers' organizational commitment as perceived by the Capital Governorate teachers. The data were collected through distributing teachers' empowerment, and organizational commitment questionnaires among sample of (1450) of teachers at Amman education directorates.

The results of study reveal that the degree of principals' practice of teachers' empowerment was high with mean (3.92). Also, teachers' organizational commitment were high with mean (3.69). There is a positive relationship (0.66) between the degree of principals' practice of teachers' empowerment and teachers' organizational commitment. Regarding to the study results a number of recommendations were offered to emphasize on teachers' empowerment, communicate with teachers and avoiding bureaucracy, encourage teachers to apply and test their ideas in schools. And develop training programs for new teachers, and develop online internet training programs for teachers.

Keywords: Teachers Empowerment, Organizational Commitment, Schools Principals, schools.

* Department of Educational Foundations and Administration, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. Received on 25/1/2009 and Accepted for Publication on 3/6/2009.