

*

1426/1425 (2005/2004)
 .()
 (215) (73) / (18) (306)

.1

.(1980)

.2007/1/23

2006/2/15

*

(1988) (2001)

.(1988)

.(1988)
(Jennifer, 2000)

:

) .(Jennifer, 1999)
(1995 (1999)

(2001)

.(1980)

(1993)

.(1980)

(1995)

)

(2001

:

.(1994)

:

(Bureaupathology)

.(2001)

.(Dill and Soo, 2004)

(2000)

.2

(1994)

"

.1991 /1990

:

.1

.2

:

:

-1

-2

-3

" (1995)

"

.2005/2004

"
(1997)

" (1995)

"

(292)
(48)

:

) "

(1997

(64.4)

(1995)

"

"

) " :

(1999

(16)

:

" (1996)

"

"

(1999) "

(2004) "()

(- -) () :

() :

()

" (2000)

"

(550)

()

:

(-)

-

-

(Ali, 1990) "

(Hofsted, 1980)

)

" (2002)

"

(291)

(Mobasher, 1996)

(Hughes, 1999)

(Johns, 1997)

(317)

(LU, 2001)

(Lowenthal, 1998)

(2)

()

0.97	---	30	---	
---	0.87	5		
---	0.90	6		
---	0.90	5		
---	0.92	4		
---	0.92	5		
---	0.94	5		

.4

(6) : (30)
 :
 (5)
 :
 (5)
 :
 (4)
 (5)
 :
 (5)
 :

2005/2004

3.70
 3.69 -2.3
 .2.30

()
 (1 2 3 4 5)

:

:

(17)

(3)

:

(3)

(2)
 .(0.97 - 0.87)

3.68
 (4) (3) .067 " (3)
 -3.79) : (1) (3.62) 0.67 3.82
 " (2)
 0.88 3.79 (1) 0.73 3.74
 (4) 3.72 " "
 : 0.74
 " (4)
 3.65 " "
 .093 3.62 0.67 " (6)
 3.72 0.81 3.56 " (5)
 0.74 3.55 " (5)
 : 0.78
 (3)
 (5)
 " (5)
 (6) (3.52 -3.90) " "
 " "
 0.81 3.90 " (8)
 3.52 " "
 0.94
 0.73 3.74
 :
 :
 : (5)
 (5)
 (6) (4)

0.74	3.72		1
0.73	3.74		2
0.67	3.82		3
0.67	3.65		4
0.78	3.55		5
0.81	3.56		6
0.67	3.68		

(4)

0.88	3.79		1
0.85	3.77		2
0.89	3.74		3
0.87	3.67		5
0.93	3.62		4

(5)

"

"

0.81	3.90		6
0.86	3.87		7
0.92	3.75		9
0.88	3.72		10
0.84	3.65		11
0.94	3.52		8

(6)

		:	
0.90	3.88		15
0.77	3.86		16
0.77	3.85		14
0.77	3.77		12
0.82	3.75		13

" (20) (6) "

0.84 3.69 " 3.88) " (15) (3.75 -

" (19) "

.0.86 3.60 0.90 3.88 " (13)

3.65 .0.86 "

: (5) : 0.67 .0.82 3.75

3.82

(8)

(8) :

" (4)

-3.62) (23) (3.49) (7)

" 0.87 3.62

" (7)

(24)

" (7) (3.60-3.69)

:
 (5) 3.49 " .0.96
 :
 (9) 0.78 3.55

(7)

		:	
0.84	3.69		20
0.85	3.68		17
0.87	3.64		18
0.86	3.60		19

(8)

		:	
0.87	3.62		23
0.89	3.58		22
0.89	3.57		21
0.92	3.49		25
0.96	3.49		24

(9)

		:	
0.94	3.64		26
0.91	3.64		30
0.94	3.55		28
0.91	3.49		27
0.92	3.47		29

(9)

(10)

-3.64)

(10)

3.56

(3.47

0.81

(26)

3.64

(10)

"

0.94

(29)

"

(11)

"

.0.92

3.47

:

(10)

0.75	0.10	3.68	(280)	.1
		3.64	(26)	.2
0.04	8.39	3.56	(147)	.1
		3.78	(159)	.2
0.01	7.05	4.22	(18) /	.1
		3.70	(73)	.2
		3.62	(215)	.3
0.40	0.93	3.67	(249)	.1
		3.75	(45)	.2
		3.46	(12)	.3

(11)

		/		
(3)	(2)	(1)	/ .1	4.18
			.2	3.54
			.3	3.48

.05

" (1)

3.79
(2000)

"
(4)

" " "
(3.62-3.79)

3.62

"

" " 3.56

3.72

(3.47 - 3.64)

"

"

3.74

" (6)

"

3.90

" (8)

.3.68

.3.52

"

.(1987)

"

"

3.82

" (15)

"

" .(13)

3.88

"

.3.75

" :

"(20)

"

3.69

"

" (19)

"

3.60

"

"

3.55

(2002)

(3.49 - 3.62)

:

(1995)

-

:

:

-

.5

:

:

-

:

-

.202-171 (61) 17
1999

1997

1996

2000

.(1)

1993

:

1995

- (1) : 2001
 .(1) . 1988 : (1)
 : 1980
 1994 : .(1)
 1994
 .387 -359 (1) 21
 Ali, Abbas Hussein. 1990. The Impact of National Cultures and Interpersonal Factors on Managerial Communication, *DAI- A 50/09*, 2974. (11) .44 -17
 1995
 Dennis, John, Bhoendradatt, Tewarie and Quinton, White. 2003. Governance in the Twenty-First Century University, Approaches to Effective Leadership and Strategic Management, *ASE-ERIC HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT*, 30, 1. .155 -125 (2) 11 1999
 (4) 15
 Desna, L. Wallin. 2006. Short-Term Leadership Development: Meeting a Need for Emerging Community College Leaders, *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 30: 513-528. .(1) 2001 :
 2001 :
 (3) :
 Dill, David D. and Soo, Maarja. 2004. Transparency and Quality for Higher Education Markets. *Public Policy for Academic Quality*. Retrieved November 20, 2004, from: <http://www.unc.edu/ppoq/docs/Douro2.pdf>. 1980 :
 Heck, H. Ronald, Johnsrud, Linda and Rosser, Vicki. 2000. *Administrative Effectiveness in Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education*, 4 (6). 1987 : (1)
 Heck, H. Ronald, Johnsrud, Linda and Rosser, Vicki. 2000. *Administrative Effectiveness in Higher Education*, *Research in Higher Education*, 41 (6). (1) 2000 :
 1999 :
 Hughes, Ernest Lee. 1999. Developing Communication Skills for Leaders: A Theory - Research - Practice Approach to Curriculum Development, *DAI - A 59 / 07* 2325. .134 -113 (4) 15 1995
 Jennifer, Lindholm. 1999. *Preparing Department Chairs for Their Leadership Roles*, ERIC DIGEST (ED 433870), ERIC Clearing house for Community Colleges Los Angeles C Jennifer , Sumsion. : 1997
 Jennifer, Sumsion. 2000. Caring and Empowerment: A teacher Educators Reflection on an Ethical Dilemma. *Teaching in Higher Education*. 5 (2), 167-180. (96) () 2004
 Johns, Cheryl. 1997. Communication Competencies Necessary for Effective Education Leadership As Perceived by Public School Principals, *DAI - A 58 / 03*: 670. .199 -139 2002
 Lowenthal, Maria. 1998. The Internationalization of Higher Education: A Participatory Research Study 1988

Feedback and Exposure in The Interpersonal Managerial Communication Process in A Public Urban Community College (Bronx Community College), *DAI –A* 56/09, 3648.

(Communication Technology). *DAI-A* 59/06. 1938.
 LU, Xin – An. 2001. Public Secrets, as a Phenomenon in Organizational Communication, *DAI - A* 61/08, 2996.
 Mobasher, Maher Attla. 1996. A Study of the Level of

Effectiveness of Administrative Communication Among Academic Leaderships in Jordanian Public Universities

*Ahmad F. AbuKaream and Salameh Y. Tanash **

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at identifying the degree of effectiveness of academic leadership communication. Moreover, it aimed at examining the degree of effective academic leadership that can be attributed to the variables of gender, faculty, administrative level and the university from which they graduated. To meet the objectives of the study, a questionnaire were developed with the aim of identifying the degree of the effectiveness of administrative communication. Instrument were checked for validity and reliability, and then administered to the subjects of the study. The sample consisted of 306 participants who had the following positions: presidents/vice - presidents (18), faculty deans (73), and department heads (215). Data analysis involved frequencies, means, standard deviations, one-way analysis of variance and sheffee method for follow- up investigation.

The result of the study revealed that the degree of the of leadership communication effectiveness among academic leaderships at Jordanian Public Universities indicated a medium degree of effectiveness in areas: Timing of information communication; interest and participation; and feedback. Moreover, the result of the study indicates a high level of effective communication in areas: Clarity and openness of the communication system; incredibility and volume of information; and choose of appropriate communication tools. Finally the study revealed statistically significant differences in the degree of communication among academic leadership due to their colleges, and their administrative level. On the other hand the result showed no significant differences attributed to their gender, and to the university from which they graduated.

Keywords: Higher Education, Effectiveness, Educational Communication, Academic Leadership, Jordanian Universities.

* Department of Educational Administration and Foundation, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Jordan.
 Received on 15/2/2006 and Accepted for Publication on 23/1/2007.