

2013 283-249

()
ISSN 2070 - 3147

(2005)

* .
* .
* .



(2005)

(54)

(18)

(1%) (1212)

- - *

....

Abstract

The study is aimed at identifying the evaluating degree of community members to the performance of elected municipal members in Jenin governorate in the election cycle that took place in (2005) according to the variables: sex qualification age group and profession.

To achieve the objectives of the study a descriptive approach was used in which a designed questionnaire was adopted. It consists of (54) statements distributed amongst sample of local citizen's residents of municipalities over the age of (18) years and they have the right to campaign as candidates and vote, the sample size (1212) citizen approximately (1%) of the represented population.

The study showed that the total degree of evaluation from the community members to the elected municipal members performance was negative, it was indifferent in regarding the areas of: the environment public health and infrastructure, while in economic, Political awareness and social was negative, the study also showed that the females evaluated municipal council members performance was better than males evaluation, it also states the degree of evaluation for younger ages was better than the evaluation of mature ages, finally it showed that for citizen's with higher academic qualifications had a stronger degree evaluation, and those who were self-employed are less satisfied than the other demographics.

The study recommended that the municipal councils must review the causes of low performance level and adjust their performance, in order to develop it. In this way it meets the real needs of their citizens and will address more issue than currently it does.

Key words: Appraisal, Evaluation, Municipalities, Local community, Performance, Local councils.

:

-

-

(1:1998)

2013

"

(181: 2004).

.(175 :2004)

(1994)

"

.(24 :2004)

....

(2005)

)

.(25 :2009

:

:

(2005)

(12)

:

2013

2005

:

(

2005

(

2005

:

: ()

($0.05 \geq \alpha$)

:

:

:

-

-

-1

....

-2

-3

:

:

-1

-2

-3

:

-:

:

-*

. (22/2/2012-1/5/2012)

:

-*

(18)

:

-*

:

(56:2009)

: . :

:

2013

: .) :

.(500

:

"

.(2009) "

.(15:2004)

.(58:2009)

.(158:1995)

:

:

....

(Robert & Jackson 1998 : 229) .

(Byars and Rue 2006: 226)

DeNisi)

.

(&Griffin 2001:232

.

(101 :2006) .

.(217 :2000)

(23 :2009)

:

:

:

2013

(2003 :295)

":

"

()
(95 :1995).
(عباس، 2006):-

()

:

(

:

(

:

(

:

-(2006)

:

:

....

:

:

:

:

(2005)

:

:

(

:

(

(

)

:

(

()

:

(1994)

(37:2006)

2013

(26) (1994)
(87) (4)
: (13) (74)
(45: 2003) .
(1994) (1967)
(485):
(11) (121):
(42: 2006) (127) (251)
(1995)
(10 :1995) .
(1994) (2005)

....

:

:

(27 :2006)

(96 :1995) .

:

:

:

(2008)

:

(2008)

:

2013

(47.5) : (120)

(%33.3)

:

(2008)

(314)

(%52)

(%8.1)

(%54)

(%42)

(2008)

(257)

:

(%47.3)

(%1.8)

(%48.4)

(2006)

....

(78)

(78)

:

(2006)

(2002_2006)

(1000)

(55000)

:

:

:

(Kilic 2012)

):

(1000)

(

:

(

)

2013

(Vasset, Marnburg, Furunes :)

2011

(600)

(Akther. Islam & Hasan 2009)

: ()

:

....

:

:

(18)

(122275)

(12)

(2011)

:-

(1)

		/	
2059	41864		1
8322	20497		2
2704	6070		3
7077	17493		4
3790	10060		5
7106	14564		6

2013

5075	10908		7
3745	7863		8
4078	9562		9
6150	6914		10
2059	3913		11
2790	6186		12
122275	155895		

-*

(2011) / :

(1212) :

(18) (%1)

(12)

:

(2)

71.3	864		
28.7	348		
45.6	553		
18.6	225		
35.8	434		
45.8	555	30	
39.5	479	45-30	
14.7	178	45	
19.4	235		
14.2	172		
19.5	236		
34.4	417		
12.5	152		

....

()

:

(61)

." " "

:

-

(57)

(33)

-

(3)

(-)

(0.930)

(0.2)

:

(54)

.

:

.

:

=

:

=

:

:

(spss)

2013

()

(LSD)

" - "

-:

5	4	3	2	1	

:

" :
"

-:

:

5-4.20	4.19-3.4	3.39-2.6	2.59-1.8	1.79-1	

:

-

(2.59) ()

(0.67821)

(2006)

....

(%50)

(2008)

:

-

:

(3)

سلبية	%50.02	0.7156	2.501		3	-1
سلبية	%48.16	0.7615	2.408		5	-2
محايدة	%50.06	0.7665	2.803		1	-3
محايدة	%50.04	0.8245	2.802		2	-4
سلبية	%40.36	0.8428	2.468		4	-5

(2.803)

(2.802)

(2.408 2.468 2.501)

2013

(2006) : (2008)
(50%)

(52%)
(62%)

Akther Islam &)

(Hasan 2009

" :

$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$

-:

() ."

()

-:

....

() (4)

	" "					
*0.000	-4.824	1210	2.4389	864		
			2.6561	348		
*0.001	-3.318	1210	2.4029	864		
			2.5626	348		
*0.000	-5.719	1210	2.7247	864		
			2.9995	348		
*0.006	-2.748	1210	2.7610	864		
			2.9045	348		
*0.000	-4.038	1210	2.4164	864		
			2.6311	348		
*0.000	-4.732	1210	2.5488	864		
			2.7508	348		

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

= α)

(0.05

2013

(0.05)

(0.00)

(2.5488)

(2.7508)

":

$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$

:-

.() "

(Oneway-Anova)

:-

....

(5)

	" "					
*.000	12.000	6.037	2	12.073		
		.503	1209	608.168		
*.000	7.992	4.582	2	9.165		
		.573	1209	693.163		
.121	2.119	1.242	2	2.485		
		.586	1209	709.011		
*.004	5.496	3.709	2	7.419		
		.675	1209	815.971		
* .000	7.821	5.495	2	10.990		
		.703	1209	849.379		
*.000	8.499	3.861	2	7.723		
		.454	1209	549.298		

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

(0.05 ≥ α)

(0.00)

(0.05)

2013

(LSD)

(LSD)

-:

(6)

(2.6126)	(2.6072)	(2.4610)	
*-0.15482	*-0.16975	-----	: (2.4610)
0.01493	-----		: (2.6072)
-----			: (2.6126)

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

....

(Vasset et al, 2011)

(Akther Islam & Hasan 2009)

" :

-:

$$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$$

.(45 45-30 30) ."

(Oneway-Anova)

-:

(7)

	" "					
*.031	3.483	1.777	2	3.553		
		.510	1209	616.688		
.416	.877	.509	2	1.018		
		.580	1209	701.310		
.725	.321	.189	2	.378		
		.588	1209	711.118		

2013

.949	.052	.035	2	.071		
		.681	1209	823.319		
*.049	3.006	2.128	2	4.257		
		.708	1209	856.111		
.274	1.298	.597	2	1.193		
		.460	1209	555.828		

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

(0.05 ≥ α)

(0.049 0.031)

(0.05)

(LSD)

-:

(LSD)

(8)

(45) (2.4185)	(45-30) (2.4668)	(30) (2.5577)		
0.13912*	0.09089*	-----	(2.5577)	(30)
0.04823	-----		(2.4668)	(45-30)
-----			(2.4185)	(45)

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

....

(45)

(45-30)
(30)

(30)

Akther)

(Islam & Hasan 2009

-:

-

2013

(LSD)

(9)

(45) (2.3883)	(45-30) (2.4397)	(30) (2.5399)	
0.15152*	0.10015	-----	(30) (2.5399)
0.05138	-----		(45-30) (2.4397)
-----			(45) (2.3883)

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

(45)

(30)

(30)

(45)

(30)

Akther)

(Islam & Hasan 2009

" :

(0.05 ≥ α)

-:

.():"

....

(Oneway-Anova)

:-

(10)

	" "					
*.003	4.030	2.044	4	8.175		
		.507	1207	612.066		
.260	1.320	.765	4	3.059		
		.579	1207	699.269		
*.003	3.959	2.303	4	9.213		
		.582	1207	702.282		
.060	2.273	1.539	4	6.155		
		.677	1207	817.235		
*.003	4.052	2.850	4	11.400		
		.703	1207	848.968		
*.020	2.937	1.342	4	5.369		
		.457	1207	551.652		

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

≥ α)

(0.05

2013

(0.003 0.003 0.003 0.020)
(0.05)

-: (LSD) (LSD) (11)

:	:	:	:	:	:
(2.6057)	(2.5385)	(2.4009)	(2.5142)	(2.5691)	:
-.04752	.05591	.16803*	.03576	-----	(2.5691)
-.08328	.02015	.13227	-----		(2.5142)
-.21556*	-.11213*	-----			(2.4009)
-.10343	-----				(2.5385)
-----					(2.6057)

(0.05 ≥ α)

*

....

....

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

:

-1

2013

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

.....

:

1

:2000

-1

:2004

-2

1995-2000:

:2004

-3

:2009

-4

:2009

-5

:1996

-6

:2006

-7

....

	:2009	-8
	. 45_79 :	
	:2006	-9
	2002-2006:	
	:2006	-10
	:	
:2010	.	-11
/		
	:2003	-12
	:2003	-13
2 -	:2006	-14
2 :	:2006	-15
:	:1995	-16
:	:2004	-17
-	:2008	-18
.2011:		-19
	:2005	-20

2013

: -2008 -21

: -2008 -22

:1998 -23

:2006 -24

:

- 1- Akther M. Islam I. and Hasan MD. 2009: Evaluation of municipal services in selected wards of Dhaka city corporation: citizen's perspectives. Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management vol. 4, pages: 133-145.
- 2- Byars L. & Rue W. 2006: Human Resource Management, 8th edition, McGraw-Hill, 222.
- 3- DeNisi S. & Griffin W. 2001: Human Resource Management, Houghton Mifflin Company, USA.
- 4- Kilic H. 2012: The performance evaluation of municipalities with VICOR: an application among municipalities in Istanbul, international journal of business and management studies, Vol 4, No 2.
- 5- Robert L. and Jackson H. 1988: Personnel/ Resource Management StPaul: West publishing company.
- 6- Vasset, F. Marnburg E, Furunes T. 2011: The effects of performance appraisal in the Norwegian municipal health services: a case study, Human Resources for Health, Volume: 9 Issue:22, p34