*

(57)   .
(400)

.(SPSS)

.

.   :

.(Harrison, 2004   2003   )

:   (2007)

.1

.   .

.2   (Binder, 1993)

:

.1

.

.3

(2000   )

.

.4   "

."

.2

.   .

.5   .3

(2001   )

.4

.6   .

.5

.   .

.6

.(2004   )

(Rodny,   2002)   .   .7

.8 .8

(1988)

.

.

(90)   (1989)

(160)

(AKHTER)

(2003/2001)

(3000)   (250)

(750)

.(2001   )

(2005)

.

.(2005   )

.(2001   )

International

(ICDL) Computer Driving License

Intel Teach to The Future (   )

(1985/1984)

.(2004   )

(1987)

(   ) World links

(40)   (IBM)

/   )

.(2009

International Computer Driving

(ICDL) License   .

(EXCEL)

(   )

:

.1

.2

(Power Point)

.3

(ITAC-

GL)

.

:

.

:

.

:

.1

.

.

.

.2

.

.3

.

(3100)   (43)

(310)

(68)   .1

:   .   /

.2

.

(2002)

:

.

(81)

.

(2003)

(182)

(81)

.

(2002)

.

(2004)

(ICDL)

(107)

.

(ICDL)   (2003)

(210)   (405)

(ICDL)

.

(2004)

(148)

.

(2005)

(66)

(197)

(Office)

(2006/2005)

(2005)

.

.

(2006)

(76)　　　　(25)　　　　　　　:

(14)

.

:

.

(2006)

.

(2006)

:　　　　(77)

.

.

(2006)

(Data Show)   .

(2007)

.

(Harris, 2000)   300

(133)

.

(Bevacqua, 2001)

(60)

(35)

(Edward, 2005)

(Rodrigo, 2003)

(12)

(-   )

(75)

:

.

:

:   :

:

–

.

(Edward, 2005) (2006   ) (2007   )   .

.(Rodrigo, 2003)   (Forgasz, 2003)

–

(1613)

.(2003   )   (-   )

–

.(Rodrigo, 2003) (2007   )

–   (%89)

(2005   ) (2006   ) .   (2001)

.(Bevacqua, 2001)   (2003)   (%81)

–

.(2004   )

–

.(2002   )

–

) (Office)

.(2005

.(2005   ) (2003   ) (2002   (excel)   -
) (2007   )   -   -
) (2003   ) (2002   ) (2005
.(2006   )

.(2004

:

-

(1)   ) (2003   ) .
) (2006   ) (2006   ) (2004
.(2007

.2011/2010   -
)

(1)

/

14	229	2362	71	14		
19	345	2659	82	19		
6	84	930	21	6		
39	658	5951	174	39		

(2)

4	25	120	4		
5	25	120	5		
2	19	90	2		
11	69	320	11		

(3)

%71	23	32	2			1
%61	19	31	2			2
%71	22	31	2			3
%70	21	30	2			4
%65	20	31	2			5
%66	21	32	2			6
%77	24	31	2			7
%65	20	31	2			8
%70	21	30	2			9
%69	11	16	1			10
%71	11	14	1			11
%69=	213	309 15 =	20			

(400)

(17)

:

:   (11)

.   (22)

:   (2)

(18)

)   .   .

:

.(

:

) :

) (2007   ) (2002   ) (2004

(Redrigo, 2003) (1991

.   /

.   :   (57)

(,85) :

(,79) (165)

(60) (80) (25)

(,81) (,83)

.(,87) (,77)

(4)

%66	12	18		1
%61	11	18		2
%71	10	14		3
%33	3	9		4
%54	110	218		5
%91	10	11	( )	6
%73	80	110		7
%74	81	110		8
%77	14	18	(power point, word, excel…)	9
%73	8	11		10
%44	4	9		11
%48	138	286		12
%51	145	284		13
%60	6	10		14
%50	6	12		15
%100	8	8		16
%100	8	8		17

: 4.

:

1.

.

.((3)(2))

2. -

( ) (×)

.

3.

(400) (

(SPSS)

.

.

(5)

	1.1	1.8	.	1
	1.1	1.7	.	2
	1.12	1.8	.	3
	1.4	2.8	.	4
	1.38	2.5	.( )	5
	1.2	1.6	.	6
	1.32	2.1	.	7
	1.3	2.7	.	8
	1.31	2.3	.	9
	1.29	2.0	.	10
	1.14	1.6	.	11
	1.15	1.8	.	12
	1.2	1.4	.	13
	1.15	1.7	.	14
	1.17	1.4	.	15
	1.02	1.2	.	16
	1.12	1.8	.	17
	1.3	2.3	.	18
	1.31	2.4	.	19
	1.26	2.1	.	20
	1.27	2.7	.	21
	1.16	1.4	.	22

(309)

%69 (213)

. (15) (3)

(4)

. .

(4) (3)

(18)   %90 (%33) (%44)

(9) %45   .(%100) (%91)

(6)

	1.1	1.5	.	1
	1.2	1.6	.	2
	1 .2	1.6	.	3
	.8	3	.	4
	1.38	2.7	) .(	5
	1.1	1.9	.	6
	1.30	2.3	.	7
	1.21	2.6	.	8
	1.3	2.5	.	9
	1.2	2.2	.	10
	1.1	1.8	.	11
	1.2	2	.	12
	1.03	1.9	.	13
	1.01	1.6	.	14
	1.2	1.7	.	15
	1.3	1.2	.	16
	1.12	2.1	.	17
	.8	3	.	18
	1.27	2.1	.	19
	1.2	2.2	.	20
	1.2	1.9	.	21
	1.26	1.3	.	22

.(5)

(5)

) (2.8) (1.2)

(2.8)　　　　　(12)　　　　　　　　　　(

(2)

.(1.2)

(7)

	1.04	1.6	.	1
	1.2	1.5	.	2
	1.2	1.7	.	3
	1.4	2.5	.	4
	1.38	2.4	.(　　　　　　　)	5
	1.1	1.7	.	6
	1.30	2.1	.	7
	1.21	2.5	.	8
	1.3	1.6	.	9
	1.2	2.1	.	10
	1.1	1.7	.	11
	1.2	2	.	12
	1.03	1.9	.	13
	1.01	1.8	.	14
	1.2	1.4	.	15
	1.3	1.5	.	16
	1.12	2.1	.	17
	1.12	3.1	.	18
	1.27	1.6	.	19
	1.2	2.4	.	20
	1.21	2.3	.	21
	1.26	1.4	.	22

(3)　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(6)

.

.(1.2)　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(6)

(7)

(11)　　　(3)　(1.1)

.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(2)

(7)

(13)　　　(3.1)　(1.4)

(2)

(3.1)

:

.(1.4)

(8)

	1.25	3.1	.	1
	1.3	2.9	.	2
	1.2	1.8	.	3
	1.3	3.5	.	4
	1.25	3.1	.	5
	1.36	2.7	.	6
	1.23	2.9	.	7
	1.23	2.9	.	8
	1.3	3.4	.	9
	1.31	3.1	.	10
	1.24	3.6	.	11
	1.32	3.4	.	12
	1.29	1.4	.	13
	1.31	3.3	.	14
	1.2	2.7	.	15
	1.1	2.3	.	16
	1.29	3.1	.	17
	1.36	3.4	.	18

(9) (8)

.

(9)

(1.4)

(3.7) (1.7) (3.6)

(3.7)

(3.5) (3.6)

.(1.7)

.(1.4)

(9)

	1.25	1.7	.	1
	1.3	2.7	.	2
	1.2	1.8	.	3
	1.3	3.4	.	4
	1.25	3.3	.	5
	1.36	3.1	.	6
	1.23	2.7	.	7
	1.23	2.9	.	8
	1.3	3.4	.	9
	1.31	3.5	.	10
	1.24	2.7	.	11
	1.30	3.7	.	12
	1.29	2.3	.	13
	1.31	3.4	.	14
	1.2	2.7	.	15
	1.1	2.3	.	16
	1.29	3.2	.	17
	1.36	3.4	.	18

: (10)

. .
(10)

(3.5) (1.4)

(3.4)

(309)

(15) .(1.4)

(10)

. (%69)

.

(%50)   (%60)   (286)
                              (%92)   (218)   (284)
                                                              (%60) (%80)
                                          (9)   (9)   (309)
                                                                    (%45)
                                        (%50)   (10)
                                        (%40)
                                        (%90)
          .   %25

          (%100   %33)   (2003   )
        (%44)   (%33)   (2007   ) (2004   )
          (%48)
                  (%54)   (%51)   .
(61)   (%60)

          .

(10)

	1.25	2.6	.	1
	1.3	1.4	.	2
	1.2	1.8	.	3
	1.3	3.4	.	4
	1.25	2.7	.	5
	1.36	2.7	.	6
	1.23	2.9	.	7
	1.23	2.9	.	8
	1.3	3.4	.	9
	1.31	3.5	.	10
	1.24	3.2	.	11
	1.32	3.5	.	12
	1.29	1.9	.	13
	1.31	3.4	.	14
	1.2	2.7	.	15
	1.1	2.3	.	16
	1.29	3.1	.	17
	1.36	2.3	.	18

(2.4)　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　－

(3)

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　－

(Edward, 2005) (2006　　　　) (2007　　　　)　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(100%)

.(Rodrigo, 2003)

.

(　　　　　　　)

:

) (2)

(3.1)　(3) (2.3)　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(

(excel)

.

(word)　　　　　　　　　　　(power point)

(1.4)　(1.7)　(1.5)　　　　(ITAC-GL)

.

(2004　　　)

(excel)

.

.

(2.9)

(3.4)

(309)

(15)   (20)

data)

2002   )   (show)

.(2002   (284)   (286)

%50

(3.5) (3.7) (3.4)

(%33)

-20)

(24

.

)   (2004   )   (2003   )

(2007

.(2007   ) (2005   )

(2002   )

.

.

(%25) (   )   (5951)

(42-37)

(309)

(2005   )

.(1:10)

%15

.

)

.(2005   ) (2003

–

.

–

(2.3)   (3.4)

.

–

.

.   –

.(292-281)

:(4) 43   2005

.17-13   2003

2001   .

(2001/10/(18-17)   2002

.   2006   .

.   ICDL   2004

.

2005

.

2004

.71-67   (4)43   "

2006   .117-85   (1)

.   2004

2000   ICDL

.   .

.   2006

(1)   2007

.   (4)12

ducational Technology*, 33, U.S.A, Englewood cliffs.

Bevacqua, J. 2001. *Utilization of a new computer Lap at Lincoln Elementary School.* (California) MAI, 39/06 P 1463.

Edwards, S. 2005. Identifying the factors that influence computer use in the early childhood classroom. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 21(2): 192-210.

Forgasz, H. 2003. Teachers and computer use for secondary mathmatics teaching: ecoureging and inhibiting factors Monash university, www.aare.edu.au/oupup/for04866.pdf FOR04866 (17/5/2010)

Harris, J. 2000. Utilization of computer Technology by teacher at Carl Schurz High school, *A Chicago public school (ullinios) DAI-A 61/06*, (.2263).

Harrison, Holly. 2004. *The Effectiveness of Using Technology in the Classroom*, San Jose Stste University.

Rodny, S. 2002. The integration of instructional technology into public education: promises and challenges. *Education Technology,* 8 (1): (5-11).

Rodrigo, T. and Maria, M. 2003. *Information Technology Usage in Metro Manila Public and Private Schools*. Nova Southern University,www.dissertation.com/library/1121806a.htm (7/4/2011)

2007

2003

2004
(1)
2005

2001

2002

رش   نل بن سد م بن خ   2006   س د
سو   شـ   وهـ   د   ذرنت .تد يس
ريض   ف   وسط   مـ ظ طـنف.

Binder, C. 1993. *Behavioral Fluency a new paradigm in*

The Reality of the Use of Computers in Teaching from the Perspective of Principals, Teachers and Students in Al-Balqa Governorate Secondary Schools

Khitam Abed-Alhaleem Al-Awamleh*

ABSTRACT

This study aims to know the reality of computer usage in teaching in AI- Balqa Governorate secondary schools. To know the efficiency of computer devices. To limit what obstacles teachers face in using and employing computer in teaching. To achieve this questionnaire of (57) paragraphs formed the options of arbitration committee has been prepared. Pearson coefficient was calculated to insure its stability. The study sample consisted of (400) principals, teachers and students who were chosen randomly from study society. To analyze and process data statistically percentages, averages and standard deviations were used.

The results of the first question concerning the status of the devices and the expiry date showed that the computers are old and slow. Some devices are broken and need maintenance. The results of the second question indicated shortage of using computers in teaching. Computer usage is limited to some applications that curriculum requires such as Excel in mathematics and PowerPoint projects by students. The result of the third question concerning the obstacles for using computers in teaching indicated shortage of computers, devices and educational programs in comparison with students' number in high schools. Result also showed shortage of frequent maintenance, slow old devices, deficiency of updating computers and shortage of educational software needed for improving curriculum. Moreover, results also showed increase in the educational and administrative burdens related to the teacher, shortage of teachers who gained advanced courses for applying computer in teaching. Added to this computer laps are most of the time being involved with computer lessons.

As a result, the researcher has recommended to do other studies to know the real use of computer in teaching to provide classes with computers and multimedia devices to update and maintain devices frequently. To reduce teachers, teaching burdens. The Researcher also recommended to make the headmasters and the supervisor roles more efficient in pursuing using computer in teaching by teachers. And also consecrated on the cooperation with the private sector to produce software related to educational subjects curriculum. That is by the encouragement the ministry and coordinating with it to be applied scientifically.

Keywords: Use of computers, Principals, Teachers, Al-Balqa Governorate.