*

.

(302)   (551)   (819)   2007/2006
      .   (574)   .

.

(0.05=∝)
.(   )
.   :

.

.

.

.

:

.

                                                                                *
.(1999   )   .2008/7/20   2007/10/2

(2003)

:

(2001   ) .

(1994)

.

(2004)

.

(1997)

.

.

(1999)

.

.

:

.

.(Cohen, 2002   2004   ) .

(2004)   (2004)

)

.   (2002.

.(2004)

.

.

(2001)

.

.

.(1998)
(1999)

.

(Burgess,

(57)   2003)

WebCT

.

.

WebCT   (%94)

(%41)

(%52)

.

.

:

.   .

:

.

:   .

.

(2003)

Jones,   Weer, 2003   Baskin, 2003)

.(Jager, 1999   Houvinen, 2001   2002

(2001)

.

(638)

304   (2003/2002)

(121)   (183):

(148)   (186) :334   .

.

.

(%6 46)

.

.

.

.

:

.

(2003)   .

(2001)

(341)   .

(265)

.   (162)

.   (72)

.

.

.   .

(Diane, 2000)

)

(

.   .

.   (550)   (117)

(   )

.

.

(%85)

.

:   .   (%15)

.1   (   )

.2   (%82)

(%40)   (%45)

(%30)

.3   )   (%27)

)   (%21)   (

.(%20)   (

.4

(   )   .

.5   :   (24)

(   )

.

.

.

.(2001 Pilgrim, 2001 2003

•

.

2007/2006
(819) (551)
(302) . .

•
2007/2006 (5)
(574) (13)
(425) (149)
(312) (258)
(425) (70%) (19)
(25) .

.
:
(
50% 75%-50%
75%).
(34) . .

: ( )
: (
. 50% 75%-50%
: 75%).
( ) . •
: : .
: ( ) •
: (20)
:
( ) : ( )
• .(
:
• (90%)
.
:

(2005 2004 /)

.(   ) (   )   -1

             .(   ) (   )   -2   .

                                                                              .

(Test–retest)

            :   Pearson Correlation

•   (   )

                                                (0.93)

•   .

)   :

(   )

                .(:

(t-test) ( )   •   (574)   •

                                                                                              •

                                              .

            :   :   .   •

                                                                                              •

                                                                            (   )

2007 /2006

                                                                              .

                                                                                              •

(1)

                                                              .

                    .   •

(1)   .   (574)

)   •

                                                                                    (SPSS

.

(2003)

Data Show   2003   2001   2001 2003 (Diane, 2000).

22.8 %– 68.1 %   (2)

. (1.5%)

(9.2%)   (8.5%)

(9.9%)

5.4 %   .   (12.2%)

(12.4%).

(2)   ( )

.

( )   (2)   .( )

(93.7 %   92.2 %   91.6 %   84.5 %   81.0 %   .

(64.8%

.

.

(1)

			%
1		391	68.1
2	Data Show	344	59.9
3		277	48.3
4	CD – ROM (Multimedia)	247	43.0
5		131	22.8
6		94	16.4
7		88	15.3
8		88	15.3
9	(DVD, CD, CD-R)	76	13.2
10		59	10.3
11	Scanner	49	8.5
12		31	5.4

(2)

%			
93.7	538		1
92.2	529	Power Point	2
91.6	526		3
84.5	485		4
81.0	465		5
64.8	372		6
48.3	277		7
31.5	181		8
24.2	141		9
17.4	100		10
15.7	90		11
15.5	89		12
13.4	77		13
12.4	71		14
12.2	70		15
9.9	57		16
9.2	53		17
8.5	49		18
1.5	29		19

:   :

.

.

10   .   .   (3)

23   (3)

24   .%76.9 - %52.4

25   (9   1   )

Blackboard   .%93.6 - %80.4

WebCT .

:   Information and

Communication Technology (ICT)

(4):

(3)

%				
			:	
93.6	0. 48	3. 74	Word Processing	1
91.3	0. 51	3. 65	Windows	2
90.4	0. 59	3. 61	Excel	3
85.8	0. 75	3. 43	Power Point	4
83.8	0. 73	3. 35	.	5
83.1	0. 80	3. 32		6
82.1	0. 81	3. 28		7
81.6	0. 82	3. 26		8
80.4	0. 90	3. 21		9
76.9	0. 86	3. 07		10
74.9	0. 91	2. 99		11
69.3	0. 97	2. 77	(CDs)	12
68.3	1. 03	2. 73	( )	13
67.2	0. 92	2. 68		14
66.5	0. 90	2. 66	.	15
60.4	0. 96	2. 41		16
60.3	10. 8	2. 40	((Online Courses	17
59.9	1. 07	2. 37		18
57.6	0. 92	2. 30		19
57.4	0. 97	2. 29		20
55.9	0. 89	2. 23		21
52.7	0. 99	2. 10	( )	22
52.4	1. 02	2. 09		23
40.9	0. 74	1. 63	((WebCT	24
40.9	0. 74	1. 63	((Blackboard	25

(4)

%			
		.1 :	
75.7	331		1
71.1	408		2
63.1	362		3
62.5	359		4
55.1	316	( )	5
48.4	278		6
47.0	270		7
46.9	269		8
46.2	265	(Data Show)	9
42.2	242		10
38.7	222		11
36.9	212		12
19.7	113		13
19.2	110		14
18.6	107		15
8.9	51		16
		.2 :	
51.9	298		17
40.6	233		18
26.3	151		19
24.7	142		20
		.3 :	
55.4	318	.	21
54.7	314		22
30.0	171		23
26.1	150		24
		.4 " "	
48.4	279		25
42.2	242		26
38.3	220	.	27
22.0	126		28
15.5	89		29
13.6	194		30
11.8	68		31
5.7	33	" "	32

1.   :   (   )

(4)   (1)   )   (26.3%).

((20)   )

(

(24.7%)   (75.7%)

.   .

(2)   )   (2001   2001).

(**3.**   :

(71.1%)   (3)   (4)   (21)

)   (   )

(63.1%).   (

(   )

(62.5%).   (55.4 %)

)   (   )

.   (55.1%).

6   16

(8.1% – 48.4%

(54.7 %).

(23)   )

(.

(30.0%).

)

(30.0%).   (

(24)   )

(

(26.1%).

.   :

)   2004   2001   Lia & Pratt, 2001

. (Reynold, Treharne & Tripp, 2000

2.   :

(4)   (17)

)   (

.

(51.9%)   )   2002   Goodison, 2001

. (Lia & Pratt, 2001

4.   :   .

(25)   (4)   )

)   (

((40.7%).

.   (5)   (%48.4)

(5)

.

(0.05 = α)   )   (26)

0.448   ( )   (

(0.05 = α)   .(%42.2)

)

.   32   .(%38.3)   (

%22.0 – %5.7   28

(   )

(%22.0)

.

.

) :

.   2001   2004   2002

:   Lia   Goodison, 2001   Simpson & Conlon, 2001   2002

.(Reynolds, Trehame & Tripp, 2000   & Pratt, 2002

:

(   )

(   )   (t-test)   (   )

.   (t- ( )

.   (6)   test)

(5)

	( )				( )
0.654	0.448	16.86	64.58	315	
		17.38	63.94	258	

(6)

	( )				( )
0.239	0.179	16.74	64.79	424	
		18.02	62.87	149	

0.179   ( )   (6)

(0.05 = α)   (0.05 = α)

.

:
●

.   .

●

.
●   .(   )

.   (   )
●

.   .

)   :

.   11-1   (
2005

1997
.491-473 (3)27
.   :   2002
2004
.   :   .(2)   .
.(1)   .   2004   2001
.   :   (3)1
2001   .164-191
.(1999
.   ,   .
2001   -107 (4)2   .
.120
.   /   2002
2003
.   :
.
2001   .
.(1)   .   2004

London, Melbourne, Singapore.

Diane M. 2000. Faculty Computer Use and Training: Identifying Distinct Needs for Different Populations. *Journal of computers and Education*, 27(4), 149-168.

Goodison, T. 2001. Integrating ICT in the Classroom: A Case Study of Two Contrasting Lessons. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(5), 549-566.

Huovinen, L. 2001. Developing Virtual Learning Environments: Finnish Information Strategy for Education and Research 2000 – 2004. World Conference on Educational Multimedia , *Hypermedia and Telecommunications*, (1) 798 – 802.

Jager A. 1999. *Impacts of ICT in Education: The Role of The Teacher and Teacher Training (Stoas Research, Wageningen*, The Netherlands). Paper Presented at The European Conference on Education Research, Lahit, Finland, 22–25. Retrieved From, June/15/2007: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001201.html.

Jones, C. 2002. *The Dichotomy of The Conquering*: Looking for Pedagogy in ICT. Society for Information Technology Teacher Education International Conference. 2002 (1), 52 – 58.

Lia, K., & Pratt., K. 2002. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in secondary schools: the role of the computer coordinator. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(4), 461-465.

Pilgrim, M. 2001.*An Investigation into Instructional Commuincation Technology and the ISSUE of WebCt Faculty Support*. Retrieved June/15/2007, from http://www.Trentu.ca/mpilgrim/webCT–Spupport.

Reynolds, D., Trehame, D., & Tripp, H. 2000. ICT – the Hopes and the Reality. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(2), 151-167.

Simpson, M. & Conlon, T. 2001. Silicon Valley Versus Silicon Glen: The impact of computers upon teaching and learning: a comparative study, *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 34(2), 137-150.

Weer, T. 2003. Task-Based Team Learning With ICT, Design and Development of New Learning. *Journal of Education and Information Technologies*, 8(2) : 195 – 214.

2004

)

(

.   (20-18)
2001
.
:(1)28

.100-85
1 .   1994
.(148)
2003

.

2001

"
)   "
(
.153-133   25 -24
1999
:
:   1   –
.
2003
.
.111-89 (1)6
(   ) .   1999
1 .
.   :   185-161
1998
)
.   5-2   (

Baskin, C. 2003. Toward a Smart Community: Rethinking The Strategic Use of ICT,s in Teaching and Learning. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*. 19(2), 192 – 210.

Burgess, L.2003. WebCT as an E-Learning Tool: A Study of Technology Students' Perceptions. *Journal of Technology Education*, 15(1), 6- 15.

Cohen, E. 2002. *Challenges of Information Technology Education in the 21st Contury*. IDEA Group Publishing,

The Status of Utilizing Information and Communication Technologies by Students of Graduate Studies at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the University of Jordan

*Khalid I. Ajlouni ***

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at shedding light on the status-quo of ICT at the Faculty of Educational Sciences of the University of Jordan in terms of examining availability of adequate infrastructure needed for ICT, the rate of its usage by graduate students, and obstacles that would impede its proper use by students. The population of this study comprised all male and female students pursuing studies at the Faculty of Educational Studies who were registered for the Second/Spring semester of the academic year 2006/2007. For that semester, there were (819) male and female students registered at the Faculty, of whom (551) students were at the Master's level and the remaining (302) students were at the Doctoral level. Some 574 male and female students duly filled in the questionnaires and returned them to the researcher. The researcher analyzed the responses he received and he came up with the following conclusions/remarks: The number of equipment, PCs, peripherals, etc. available to students at the Faculty's Computer Labs were adequate and the ratio of the number of these equipment to students was rated as suitable also; The Faculty's Computer Lab has in its possession the most updated softwares that enable students of graduate studies to make beneficial use of the various application software of Microsoft Office, as well as to have easy access to the Internet; The study showed that the most obvious obstacle that hindered the use of ICT in the Faculty was the insufficient number of PCs available at the Faculty's Computer Lab, and the relatively slow operation of these PCs when it comes to data processing. At the same time, the number of students registered in the same course was high and the available educational stoftwares were not enough. This was aggravated by the fact that faculty members are not well trained on the use of these technologies or even the browsing of the Internet for educational/research purposes; No substantial differences or significant statistical results were revealed in the rate of using ICT amongst students that can be attributed to gender (male, female) or to their educational level (Master or Doctoral).

Keywords: Status, Utilization, ICT,Graduate Studies, Educational Sciences.