

*

(91)

()

(32)

(10)

:

(Bensimon, Ward, and

Sanders, 2000)

(McGonigle, Mastrain, Farcus, Eggers and

Shoop, 2000)

(Boice,

.1996)

(Lucas, 2000; Higgerson,

1996)

(Diamond and Adam,

.1993)

*

2010/3/16

(Bensimon,

.2010/8/2

/

Ward, and Sanders, 2000)

(1993)

(Mandell, 1989)

-

-

-

(1992)

-

.

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

()

() :

(2009/12/31-2005/1/1)

-

-

-

-2009) 1431-1430

.(2010

:

:

-

-2005/1/1)

(2009/12/31

:

:

-

-

:

-

1431-1430

.(2010-2009)

-

(Arnold,

:

1990)

-

):

) (

(55) (1990)

) (

(

(2002)

:

(Pang, 1993)

(1998)

/ 0,43)

(/

:

(2003)

:

(Di, 2000)

(Canberra)

(2005)

(2002/2001 - 1998/1997)

(2001)

:

(2005)

(1990)

:

(2006 2002)

(2006)

(1990)

:

(2008 1998)

(2001)

(2003)

(2005)

(2005)

(Arnold, 1990)

(Pang, 1993)

(Di, 2000)

/ 1,25)

(/

(2008)

:

(2010-2009) 1431-1430

(112)

:

(81)

(91)

2005

2002

)

(2006

)

.(1) (

(1)

	10	10-6	5-1				
91	37	23	31	75	8	8	
100	40,6	25,3	34,1	82,4	8,8	8,8	

.(

(Lucas, 2000; Higgerson,

()

(32)

1996; Bensimon, Ward, and Sanders, 2000)

)

(

(2007)

2002

)

.(2006

2005

(15)

)

(2005

1996

)

(80)

(2007

2006

):

(0,79 - 0,55)

) (

) (

) (

) (

(One-Way ANOVA) -

: :

(Scheffe) " " -

.(2)

(2)

	0,337	0,73		1
	0,332	0,63		2
	0,312	0,53		3
	0,272	0,44		4
	0,236	0,44		4
	1,205	2,77	/ /	

/ 0,63)

(2)

(/

(/ / 0,53)

:

(/ / 0,44)

-

.(/ / 2,77)

.(/ / 0,44)

-

: :

/ / 0,73)

: (

:

.1

(3)) (

(3)

1,847	2,98	8	
0,454	4,10	8	
1,096	2,61	75	

(4)

0,003	6,311	8,195	2	16,390	
		1,298	88	114,266	
			90	130,657	

(5)

" "

			2,98	
		1,12-	4,10	
	(*)1,49	0,36	2,61	

.(0,05) *

(4)

(3)

(Scheffe) " "

(One-Way ANOVA)

.(5)

.(4)

) (4,10) ((5)
 (2,61) (
 .())
)

(6)

0,98	1,95	31	5-1
0,82	2,62	23	10-6
1,09	3,56	37	10

(7)

		22,018	2	44,036	
0,000	22,369	0,984	88	86,621	
			90	130,657	

(8)

" "

10	10-6	5-1		
			1,95	5-1
		0,66-	2,62	10-6
	(*) 0,94-	(*) 1,60-	3,56	10

.(0,05)

*

.(6)
 (6)

:

.2

(One-Way ANOVA)

-1)

.(7)

(10

10-6

5

(9)

	0,63	4,42		16	1
	0,78	4,16		1	2
	0,88	4,13		13	3
	0,82	4,13		27	3
	0,77	4,12		18	5
	0,75	4,10		17	6
	0,85	4,08		4	7
	0,85	4,08		25	7
	0,77	4,03		5	9
	0,85	4,03		24	9
	0,92	4,03		12	9
	0,93	4,02		23	12
	0,74	4,01		7	13
	0,82	4,01		8	13
	0,88	3,99		14	15
	0,98	3,96		22	16
	0,93	3,96		29	16
	0,89	3,95		9	18
	0,81	3,95		19	18
	0,99	3,93		26	20
	0,95	3,93		28	20
	0,83	3,91		3	22
	0,82	3,89		15	23
	0,88	3,88		31	24
	0,86	3,86		32	25
	0,88	3,86		10	25
	0,92	3,84		20	27
	0,95	3,84		21	27
	1,00	3,80		6	29

	1,05	3,78		30	30
	1,01	3,74		11	31
	0,99	3,73		2	32
	0,57	3,97			

(10)

0,77	3,80	8	
0,55	3,59	8	
0,54	4,03	75	

(7)

(3,97)

.(0,57)

(14)

-

(18)

" "

.(8)

(Scheffe)

"

"

(16)

(8)

(4,42)

"

(1)

(0,63)

"

(4,16)

(3,56)

(10)

"

(13)

(0,78)

(5-1)

(10-6)

(1,95)

(4,13)

"

(2,62)

.(0,88)

.(10)

-

:

:

"

(2)

"

(0,99)

(3,73)

"

(11)

"

(30)

(1,01)

(3,74)

.(9)

: (9)

(3,78)

"

"

-

.(1,05)

(11)

0,079	2,613	0,830	2	1,661	
		0,318	88	27,961	
			90	29,622	

(12)

0,44	4,13	31		5-1
0,46	3,92	23		10-6
0,70	3,87	37		10

(13)

0,156	1,900	0,613	2	1,226	
		0,323	88	28,395	
			90	29,622	

: :

(One-Way

.(11)

ANOVA)

(11)

:

:

:

.1

:

.2

)

-1)

.(10)

(

(10

10-6

5

(10)

.(12)

(12)

(One-Way ANOVA)

.(13)

(13)

: :

)

(291 2007

(/ / 2,77)

.(0,44-0,73)

2007

)

.(289-288

(

)

(

)

)

(/ / 1,36)

.(2006

2005

2002

:

:

(/ / 0,73)

/ 0,63)

.(/

.()

)

()

(

)

(

(

)

)

(

)

()

(

()

2007 :)
(292-282

()

:

:

:

-

-

/

-

()

() ()
(Higgerson, 1996) .(2006)

.(10)

()
) ()
 .()
 .2)
 2005 2005 2002
 .(2006
 : :
 ()
 (()
 (10)
 .3
 .4
 1998)
 (2003
 1998)
 .(2008 2003
 .5
 : :
 .1

	2007		
1998		2002	
	.47-5 (33)		
	2007		.717-661 (36)
			1992
Arnold, V. 1990. Faculty Stress: Causes and Cures. Bulletin of the Association for Business communication. 35 (1), March.			.26-7 (27)
			1996
Bensimon, E. Ward, K. and Sanders, K. 2000. The department chair's Role in Developing new Faculty into Teachers and Scholars. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.			.53-24 (31)
			2005
Boice, R. 1996. First – order principles for college teachers: Ten basic ways to improve the teaching process. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.	25		.99-73 (1)
		2008	
Di, A. 2000. Views of Academic Work. Journal of Teacher Development. 4 (1), 65-77.			
Diamond, R. and Adam, B. 1993. Recognizing Faculty Work: Reword Systems for the Year 2000. New Directions in Higher Education, (81). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.			.225-203 (3) 5
			2003
Higgerson, M. 1996. Communication Skills for department Chairs. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.			.292-241 (42)
			2006
Lucas, A. 2000. Leading Academic Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.			.47-1 (242)
Mandell, B. 1989. Does Better Work file Boost productivity? Review of Business Research. 52 (2), summer.			1993
	(3) 9		.118-85
McGonigle, D., Mastrain, K., Farcus, N., Eggers, R., and shoop, L. 2000. Nurturing Faculty: An old concept. Journal of Academic Leadership, 2 (1), (on line).	2005		
Pang, T. 1993. Job Satisfaction of Women Faculty at Universities in Seoul, Republic of Korea. Dissertation Abstracts International. 54 (6), 2071-A.		1990	.84-45 (1) 24
Porter, S. and Umbach, P. 2001. Analyzing Faculty Workload data using multilevel modeling. Research in Higher Education. 42 (2), 171-193.			.72-37 (34) 10
			2001
			:
			.109-59 (4) 17

...

Analysis the Reality of Scholarly Work at the College of Education, King Abdul Aziz University (KAU), Identifying its Obstacles from the Faculty Members' Viewpoint and Improving Logical Thinking Among Tenth Grade Female Students

*Wae'l A. AL-Tal**

ABSTRACT

The present study aims at identifying the reality of faculty members' scholarly work in the College of Education at (KAU), and the obstacles of scholarly work in College. Additionally, the study aims at identifying the factors that influence this. This study had been prepared to measure five indicators of the amount of scholarly work, and (32) items which measure the obstacles of the scholarly work ,which are then applied to a sample of (91) members. The results of this study indicated that the amount of scholarly work as a whole at the intermediate level and the quantity of each indicator level were found to be very low; showing the presence of significant statistical differences between the mean values of scholarly work in favour of the groups labeled (Associate Professors) and (more than 10 years of experience). The obstacles to the scholarly work have been highly significant. It was also found that there were no statistical differences among the mean values of their assessments to these obstacles.

Keywords: The Problems of Higher Education, The Problems of Faculty Members, Scholarly Work, the Obstacles of Scholarly Work.

* Department of Education, Faculty of Education, Jazan University, Saudi Arabia. Received on 16/3/2010 and Accepted for Publication on 2/8/2010.