

*

26 (398) (120)

(a 0.05)

:

(2004)

*

(2007) .2010/8/30 2010/1/12

) .

.(2006

)

.(2006

.(2000)

(Work Bank

.Group, 2002)

.(2008)

.(2003)

"

.(2004)

.(2007) "

• "

•
(2008)

)
(2002

)
(2005

(2002)

(ERFKE)

-

ERFKE

(2001)

(38)

:

•

2009 ()

.2009-2008

($0.05 > \alpha$)

: (Larue, 1999)

(12)

:

: (Yunus, 2001)

(2020)

: (2005)

: (Malhotra, 2003)

:

(2008)

(213)

(ANOVA)

: (2004)

(0.05 > a)

(0.05 > a)

(4.28)

(2009)

(786)
(499)

(0.05 > a)

(1)

%41.7	50		
%58,3	70		
%90.8	109		
%9.2	11		
%40	48	5	
%32.5	39	10	-5
%27.5	33		10
%100	120		

2009-2008

398

120

()

%30

(1)

:

:

	1.5
	2.49 -2
	2.5

:

26

:

3

(2)

	0.51	2.73	.1
	0.62	2.70	.2
	0.65	2.63	.3
	0.62	2.62	.4
	0.65	2.62	.5
	0.64	2.59	.6
	0.65	2.54	.7
	0.65	2.50	.8
	0.64	2.48	.9
	0.70	2.48	.10
	0.73	2.45	.11
	0.73	2.43	.12
	0.61	2.56	

:

.(2)

(2)

26

30

(2.73)

%80

"

"

"

(2.43)

"

(Crombach
(0.91)

Alpha)

:

:

:

*

:

*

5

:

*

10 10

-5

:

:

(SPSS)

" "

" "

(2008)

(3)

	0.52	2.81	.1
	0.42	2.77	.2
	0.49	2.76	.3
	0.53	2.76	.4
	0.64	2.72	.5
	0.59	2.68	.6
	0.58	2.68	.7
	0.56	2.67	.8
	0.59	2.63	.9
	0.68	2.59	.10
	0.69	2.57	.11
	0.73	2.55	.12
	0.71	2.50	.13
	0.67	2.48	.14
	0.49	2.66	

:

(3)

(3)

"

(2.84)

(2.48)

"

"

"

(4)
" "

0.92	119	1.69	0.32	2.61	
			0.28	2.65	

:

(0.05> α)

: -1

(ICDL) : " " (0.05 \geq α) (4)
 (INTEL) (4) (0.05 \geq α)

(2008)

- 2

" " :
 (5)

(5)

(5)

$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$
 .(6)

0.47	7 2.5	
0.34	2.49	
0.31	2.53	

(6)

" "

	()				
0.374	1.08	0.544	15	4.323	
		0.682	104	74.802	
			119	79.125	

(6)

$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$

"

"

" "

(7)

(7)

(7)

$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$
 .(8)

0.33	2.54	5
0.31	2.53	10-5
0.29	2.64	10
0.31	2.56	

(8)

..

	()				
0.279	1.359	0.720	15	0.713	
		0.662	104	9.879	
			119	10.592	

.(2008)

(8)

$(0.05 \geq \alpha)$

•

•

•

•

•

(42)

WWW.ULUM NL

2006

web www.4arab.net.com -24 539 2003

2007 .30

2008 2005

.641-615 (2) 22) 2006

2002 (9001

-15) . (

Harrison, R. and Kessels, J. 2004. Human Resource Development in Knowledge Economy, Palegrave Macmillan, UK. (4) 44

2004

Krogh, A. Von, Nonaka , I. and Aben, M. 2001. Making The Most of Your Company's Knowledge: A Strategic Framework, Long Rang Planning. DAIA. 50/08. P.2315. 21 19

2004

LaRue, Bruce MallorY. 1999. Toward A unified View of Working, Living, and Learning in The Knowledge Economy: Implications of The New Learning Imperative for Higher Education, Distributed Organizations, and Knowledge Workers. Academy of educational Leadership Journal, 8(2): 153-168. .58-51 546

2001

2005

Malhotra, Yogish. 2003. Measuring Knowledge Assets of a Nation: Knowledge Systems For Development, New York City, U S A. 1 (1) 32

2000

2009

Pan, S. and Scarbrough. 1999. Knowledge Management in Practice: An Exploratory Case Study", Technology Analysis and Strategic Management, Journal of College Student Development, 11 (3): 269-280. WWW.ULUM NL (40)

2004

"

World Bank. 2002. The Knowledge Assessment Methodology and Scorecards, Available at: www.worldbank.org .21-12 (1) 43

2000

Yunus, Aida Suraya Muhammad, 2001. Education Reforms in Malaysia, College student Journal, 24, 1-17. .84-70 (63) 8

2009

**The Concept of Knowledge Economy and the Roles of Teachers Renewable
from the Viewpoint of Secondary Teachers in Jordan and
its Relationship with some Variables**

*Natheer Sihan Abu-Nair, Khaled Ali Al Sarhan and Mohammad Saleem Al-Zboon**

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at revealing the concept of knowledge economy from the point of view of the Jordan high school teachers and their renewed roles and its relationship to gender variable and their Scientific qualification and teaching experiences. Where as the educational community has been formed from high school teachers at the Ministry of Education of Al-salt municipality, their total sum reached (398) teachers of both genders, while the study specimen has been formed of (120) teachers, who were chosen randomly, a questionnaire has been developed out of 26 paragraphs, and suitable statistical methods were used to analyze information.

The study results revealed that the concept of knowledge economy and their renewed roles had gained a high understanding through it, and it also showed that there are no statistical differences at the level of (a 0.05), of the level of high school teachers' understanding of the concept of knowledge economy and their renewed roles through it, due to gender variables, scientific qualification and education experiences. On the light of the study outcomes, the researchers have presented several recommendations to help those who set the educational policy in Jordan and the teachers in order to improve the working fields in the educational occupation and raising their capacity.

Keywords: Knowledge Economy, Teachers Roles.

* Department of Human Sciences, Al-Balqa Applied University; Princess Rahma College, King Abdullah II School for Information Technology; Department of Educational Administration and Foundations, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Jordan, Jordan. Received on 12/1/2010 and Accepted for Publication on 30/8/2010.