

*

.1

.2

(115)

(2004/12/15-11/15)

.1

.2

.1

(2002)

)

(2003

*

2005/10/27

2005/2/22

/

2006 ©

-315-

:

)

(2004

()

.(Northouse, 2004)

:(Lukes, 1998)

.2

.(Public Issues Education Task Force, 2002)

:(2000)

(Singletary, L., Smith, M.,

(Ricards S. Morse, Poul (Hill, G. and Corcoran, R., 2004

(1999) W. Brown, Jeannic E. Warning, 2006)

(35)

(53)

(12)

.3

1.3

22	59	0.37		
10	28	0.35		.1
9	16	0.56		
12	13	0.92		
35	20	1.75	-2	
12	9	1.33		-3
100	145			

(116)

(13 16 28 59) (

)

(20)

)

(1 2 3 4)

5

5=) :
 (1= 2= 3= 4= (9)

3 4) ((100) (1 2

3

4

1

2

)

(Face Validity)

(Content Validity)

(1985)

)

(10)

(Pre – test)

2.3

2004

(16)

3.3

.(1)

(16)

(1981)

)

(15)

(Subject

Matter Specialists)

2004/11/15

.2004/12/15

(16) (12.99) (9) (35) (9) () . (12) .(2001) (T-test) 5.3

.4

(3) (%69.56) **1.4**
 (%13.92)

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \cdot(2) \\
 () \qquad \qquad \qquad (73) \\
 (3 \ 2 \ 1) \qquad \qquad \cdot(53.38) \qquad \qquad (36) \\
 (4) \\
 (2.05) \\
 (1.86)
 \end{array}$$

2.4

$$(48) \quad (33.68) \quad (22)$$

(53)

3.4

()

4.4

(22)

(14.72)

(9)

(4)

(10)

(7)

(6.87)

(%44.34)

(%20.86)

(4)

(9)

(58.337)

(12)

(4)

(5.86)

(50.114)

(6.72)

(3)

(0.420)

(Spearman-Brown)

(5)

(4.07)

(t)

(0.01)

(%64.34)

(%13.06)

(%80.80)

(%66.95)

(%6.95)

(%60.86)

(%13.92)

(%55.65)

(8)

(7-1)

(%8.70)

(6)

(21-15)

(2.17)

(1.88)

			(58.100)	(22)
			(51.886)	
			(7)	
	:		(0.270)	
		(0.01)		
(%35.65)	(10)		(2.46)	(t)
(%64.35)				
	(58.137)			
(44.714)				
		(0.756)		
(t)	(0.01)		(12)	:
		(10.15)	(6.82)	
				(3)
		(%54.78)		(9)
	(2000))		(%19.12)
			(56.67)	
				(50.857)
	:	()		
	()		(0.625)	
(11)			(7.029)	(t) (0.01)
	(%58.26)			
	(% 41.74)			
	(57.022)			
	(45.667)			

(40)
(14.27) (4)

(15)
(%63.48)

(61.765)
(43.667)

(0.750)
(t) (0.01)
(9.955)

)
(1984)

:(1)

0.918	0.844	
0.847	0.719	
0.884	0.781	

:(2)

%			
18.26	21	1-	
64.34	74	1+ 1-	
17.40	20	1+	

$\bar{x} = 53.38$

S.d. = 8.54

n = 115

: (3)

%		%		%			
18.26	21	17.39	20	16.52	19	1-	
65.22	75	59.13	68	69.56	80	1+ 1-	
16.52	19	23.48	27	13.92	16	1+	

$$\bar{x} = 6.63$$

$$S.d. = 1.41$$

$$n=115$$

$$\bar{x} = 12.99$$

$$S.d. = 1.28$$

$$n=115$$

$$\bar{x} = 33.68$$

$$S.d. = 5.93$$

$$n = 115$$

: (4)

1		2.05					
2		1.98					
3		1.86					

: (5)

%		%		%		%			
25.22	29	6.95	8	11.30	13	22.60	26	1-	
60.86	70	66.95	77	80.80	93	64.34	74	1+ 1-	
13.92	16	26.10	30	7.90	9	13.06	15	1+	

$$\bar{x} = 6.27$$

$$S.d. = 2.11$$

$$\bar{x} = 5.86$$

$$S.d. = 1.06$$

$$\bar{x} = 6.87$$

$$S.d. = 2.59$$

$$n= 115$$

$$S.d. = 24.1$$

: (6)

1		2.17					
2		1.93					
3		1.89					
4		1.88					

10 of 10

:(7)

	%		
50.114	44.34	51	
52.176	20.86	24	
58.337	34.80	40	

$r = 0.420$ $t = 4.07$ $x = 53.4$ S.d. = 6.36 n = 115

: (8)

	%		
15.886	55.65	64	7-1
53.444	21.74	25	14-8
55.857	08.70	10	21-15
58.100	13.91	16	22

$t = 2.46^{**}$ $\bar{x} = 33.39$ S.d. = 8.04 n = 115

.(0.01) (**)

: (9)

	%			
50.857	26.10	30	1 -	
54.698	54.78	63	1 + 1-	
56.067	19.12	22	1 +	

$$r = 0.625 \quad \bar{x} = 53.9 \quad \text{S.d.} = 2.75 \quad n = 115$$

:(10)

	%		
44.714	35.65	41	
58.137	64.35	74	

$$r = 0.756 \quad \bar{x} = 53.35 \quad \text{S.d.} = 0.48 \quad t = 10.14$$

: (11)

	%		
57.022	58.26	67	
49.364	27.82	32	
46.800	7.82	9	
45.667	6.10	7	

$$r = 0.476 \quad \bar{x} = 53.39 \quad S.d. = 0.50 \quad t = 4.749$$

: (12)

	%			
46.37	36.52	42	1-	
54.51	36.52	42	1+ 1-	
61.47	26.96	31	1+	

$$r = 0.706 \quad \bar{x} = 53.4 \quad S.d. = 3.23 \quad t = 8.752$$

: (13)

	%			
42.5	6.00	7	1-	
55.017	76.00	87	1+ 1-	
64.2	18.00	21	1+	

$$r = 0.759 \quad \bar{x} = 33.95 \quad S.d. = 3.32 \quad t = 10.245$$

: (14)

	%			
43.22	14.78	17	1-	
53.75	67.00	77	1+ 1-	
62.714	18.22	21	1+	

$$r = 0.765 \quad \bar{x} = 53.83 \quad S.d. = 6.02 \quad t = 10.442$$

:(15)

	%			
43.667	14.78	17	1-	
52.860	63.48	73	1+ 1-	
61.765	21.74	25	1+	

$$r = 0.750 \quad \bar{x} = 53.43 \quad t = 9.955$$

.86-85

- Luke, J.S. 1998. *Catalytic Leadership: Strategies for an Interconnected World*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 21 .2001 .
- Northouse, P.G. 2004. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 3rd .371 94-93 .
- Ed: Thousand Oaks, CA: Stage, 3. 2003 .
- Public Issues Education Task Force. 2002. *Public Issues Education: Increasing Competencies, Enabling Communities*. Reno, NV: USDA Innovations Fund, Farm Foundation and Regional Rural Development Centers. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.publicissueseducation.net> .2-1 .
- Ricards S .Morse, Poul W. Brown, Jeannc E. Warning. 2006. Catalytic Leadership: Reconsidering the Nature of Extension's Leadership Role, *Journal of Extension*, 44 (2): 2FEA9. .80-74 1981 .
- <http://www.joe.org/joe/2006april/a9.shtml> 1999 .
- Singletary, L., Smith, M., Hill, G. and Corcoran, R. 2004. Survey of Extension Professionals' Skills Level Needed to Practice Public Issues, Education, *Journal of Extension*, 42 (6). .117 .
- <http://www.joe.org/joe/2004december/rb2.shtml>. 2004 .
- http://www.joe.org/joe/2004december/rb2.shtml. 2000 .

An Analytical Study of the Level of Leadership Skills of the Extension Agents Working in the Governmental Agricultural Extension in Jordan and Its Relationships with Some Personal Characteristics

Ahmad N. Al-Shadaydeh*

ABSTRACT

The study has been carried out to achieve the following objectives:

- 1- Determining the level of leadership skills of the extension agents working in the Governmental Agricultural Extension in Jordan through specifying the level of their:
a- Technical skills. b- Humanistic skills c-Agricultural political skills.
- 2- Determining the relationship between the degree of the leadership skills of the extension agent and selected personal characteristics.

The population of the study included 115 agents who work in the agricultural extension, and they were considered as a representative sample for agricultural extension who will work in the extension in the future.

The data of this study was collected through a questionnaire form prepared by the researcher. The questionnaire is composed of two parts: one for the personal information and the second included a measure to test the level of leadership skills of the extension agents. The questionnaire has been given to a number of experts and arbitrators to assure usefulness and efficiency, then a critical limit was used, the examined items were differentiated, then the coefficients of validity constancy were obtained for some variables in the study. After that, information was collected from the study during the period from November to December 2004. Then, the true compliance of the study was detected to the standards used, and the level of leadership skills was determined through specifying the level of the agents' technical skills, humanistic skills and agricultural political skills.

The results of the study revealed that the level of leadership skills of the extension agents was generally medium with a slight tendency to lower level.

The technical and agricultural political skills were found medium with a slight tendency to lower level. The humanistic skills were recorded to be medium with a slight tendency to higher level.

Some recommendations have been made:

- 1- The Directorate of Agricultural Extension in Jordan should prepare a scientific and practical plan handling the results in detail and in an accurate way for this study according to the level of leadership skills and the sides connected to it.
- 2- The Directorate should conduct periodic surveys to study the personal and work changes for the agricultural extension agents before being involved in planning the training programs specific to it, and we should clarify the reality of information and knowledge in order to modify it through these programs.

KEYWORDS: Agricultural Extension, Agricultural Extension Agent, Leadership Skills, Professional Leaders, Jordan.

* Faculty of Agriculture, Mu'tah University, Al-Karak, Jordan. Received on 22/2/2005 and Accepted for Publication on 27/10/2005.