

*

Abstract

The aim of the study was to explore the role of electronic administration in activating the administrative communication in perspective of the Al-Quds Open University working staff – Gaza, also to recognize the challenges of application of electronic communication; regarding of the following variables (age, sex, qualification, years of experience and job classification). The researcher used the descriptive analytical design using simple random sample (64.36%) of working staff. Data collection was obtained by using a questionnaire. The study revealed groups of results, the most important results were: the higher administrative levels believed and

*

2013

convinced that the application of electronic administration help to overcome the geographical distance, decrease the cost of traditional communication, the university not facilitating for activating the non-formal communication between working staff, not utilizing the electronic communication to communicate with staff and solve their problems inside and outside the university, unclear rules and regulations regarding coordination & communication between working staff, and finally the staff having decreased skills when dealing with electronic communication means and devices.

:

" "

:

....

:

)

(-

:

-1

-2

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

-3

)

(

:

:

.1

.2

.3

)

(

:

:

-

-

2013

.2012-2011

(56 :2004) .

. (128 :2002)

.....

:

(2011)

-1

(50)

(2011)

-2

(250)

(394)
(%63.4)

:

(0.05)

-

- -)

(-)

(

(0.05)

-

.()

()

(2010)

-3

(180)

2013

.

:

-

-

(2010)

-4

:

(413)

-

-

35-26

(2008)

-5

(2005/2004)

1426/1425

....

.()

(215) (73) / (18) (306)

:

-

:

:

-

-

-

(2005)

-6

%5

2013

.

-

-

(2004) Russell

-7

:

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

(2003) Shiels and Others

-8

(24)

.....

:

-
-
-
-

:

:
:
:
-1

(2 :2004)

2013

(7 :2003)

(2003:)

(8 :2008)

(263 :2003)

: -2

: (4 :2004)

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

: (37 :2006)

....

:

-3

(26 :2008)

(2003)

(7-6 :2004)

:

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

:

:

-1

(24 :2006)

2013

(128 :2002)

(272 :2007)

" " () (73 :2008)

: -2

(32 :2005)

(20 :2008)

-:

-1

-2

-3

.....

-4

-5

:

-3

(15-13 :) (59 :2009)

:

-

-

-

-

-

-

()

:

:

:

)

(

2013

:

:

-

(87) .(2013-2012)

:

:

(87) (2013-2012) -

(56)

(%64.36)

:(1)

50.00	28	40	25
50.00	28	65	-41
91.07	51		
8.93	5		
10.71	6		
25.00	14		
28.57	16		
17.86	10		
17.86	10		
7.14	4		
32.14	18	10-2	
60.71	34	10	
42.86	24		
57.14	32		
100	56		

....

() :

:

: -1

: -2

. (SPSS)

:(2)

()

0.01	0.483	1
0.01	0.500	2
0.01	0.627	3
0.01	0.661	4
0.01	0.645	5
0.01	0.697	6

2013

0.01	0.615	7
0.01	0.648	8
0.01	0.684	9
0.01	0.602	10
0.01	0.587	11
0.01	0.566	12
0.01	0.693	13
0.01	0.419	14
0.01	0.543	15
0.01	0.600	16

0.325 = (0.01) (54)

0.250 = (0.05) (54)

:(3)

(

)

0.01	0.545	1
0.01	0.650	2
0.01	0.632	3
0.01	0.536	4
0.01	0.643	5
0.01	0.591	6
0.01	0.607	7
0.01	0.784	8
0.01	0.608	9
0.01	0.656	10
0.01	0.733	11
0.01	0.716	12
0.01	0.590	13
0.01	0.700	14
0.01	0.649	15

0.325 = (0.01) (54)

0.250 = (0.05) (54)

....

(2,3)

(0.01)

(4)

:(4)

0.623	:
0.800	:

0.325 = (0.01) (54)

0.250 = (0.05) (54)

(0.01)

:Reliability

: Split-Half Coefficient

-1

: (5) (Spearman-Brown Coefficient)

:(5)

0.808	0.678	16	:
0.822	0.820	*15	:

2013

(0.822 -0.808)

: -2

: (6)

:(6)

0.877	16	:
0.854	15	:

(0.877-0.854)

:

:

:

":

:

"

:

: (7)

:

....

:(7)

(56=)

4	85.00	0.580	4.250	238	.	1
11	79.29	0.934	3.964	222	.	2
1	86.43	0.716	4.321	242	.	3
10	79.64	0.842	3.982	223	.	4
5	85.00	0.667	4.250	238	.	5
7	84.29	0.756	4.214	236	.	6
8	83.93	0.773	4.196	235	.	7
15	76.43	0.974	3.821	214	.	8
3	85.36	0.700	4.268	239	.	9
2	86.07	0.685	4.304	241	.	10
12	79.29	0.894	3.964	222	.	11
14	77.14	0.923	3.857	216	.	12
6	84.64	0.539	4.232	237	.	13
16	74.64	0.820	3.732	209	.	14
9	81.43	0.657	4.071	228	.	15
13	78.57	0.735	3.929	220	.	16
	81.70	7.270	65.357	3660		

(%81.70)

2013

": " (3) -
.(%86.43)

(2008)
(2004) Russell

" " (10) -
.(%86.07)

-)

(
(2004)Russell

": " (8) -
.(%76.43)

(2008)

....

" (14) -
" (%74.64) "

(2010)

" :

: (8)

:

:(8)

(56=)

6	71.79	0.930	3.589	201	.	1
13	68.21	0.890	3.411	191	.	2
4	72.86	1.167	3.643	204	(...).	3
14	64.64	1.027	3.232	181	.	4
10	68.93	1.008	3.446	193	.	5
11	68.57	1.024	3.429	192	.	6
2	75.00	1.031	3.750	210	.	7
15	62.86	0.862	3.143	176	.	8

2013

8	71.07	0.971	3.554	199		9
5	72.86	1.034	3.643	204		10
1	75.71	0.780	3.786	212		11
7	71.43	0.951	3.571	200		12
3	74.29	1.140	3.714	208	()	13
9	70.00	1.009	3.500	196		14
12	68.57	1.006	3.429	192		15
	70.45	9.483	52.839	2959		

(%70.45)

(%75.71)

(2008)

....

.(%75.00)

" (7) -

"

(2005)

:

"

"

(4) -

.(%64.64)

(2010)

"

(8) -

"

.(%62.86)

:

:

($0.05 \geq \alpha$)

)

(

:

($0.05 \geq \alpha$)

"

"

2013

: (9) "T. test"

" "

:(9)

		" "						
	0.382	-0.880	7.604	64.500	28	40	25	:
			6.951	66.214	28	65	-41	
	0.246	1.174	8.594	54.321	28	40	25	:
			10.235	51.357	28	65	-41	
	0.703	0.383	12.154	118.821	28	40	25	
			12.267	117.571	28	65	-41	

2.00 = (0.05)

(54)

" "

2.66 = (0.01)

(54)

" "

" "

" "

($0.05 \geq \alpha$)

":

"

: (10) "T. test"

....

" "

:(10)

		" "					
	0.475	0.720	7.208	65.137	51		:
			8.385	67.600	5		
	0.930	0.088	9.712	52.804	51		:
			7.563	53.200	5		
	0.619	0.500	12.209	117.941	51		
			12.071	120.800	5		

2.00 = (0.05) (54) " "

2.66 = (0.01) (54) " "

" "

" "

(2008)

($0.05 \geq \alpha$)

:"

"

One Way

: (11) . ANOVA

2013

" "

:(11)

		" "					
0.374	1.085	57.007	4	228.029		:	
		52.526	51	2678.829			
			55	2906.857			
0.666	0.598	55.364	4	221.454		:	
		92.629	51	4724.099			
			55	4945.554			
0.981	0.104	16.264	4	65.054			
		157.015	51	8007.785			
			55	8072.839			

3.65 = (0.01) (55 4)

2.53 = (0.05) (55 4)

" "

" "

(0.05)

(0.05 ≥ α)

" :

."

One Way

∴ (12)

ANOVA

....

" "

:(12)

		" "					
0.265	1.361	71.013	2	142.025		:	
		52.167	53	2764.832			
			55	2906.857			
0.413	0.898	81.079	2	162.158		:	
		90.253	53	4783.395			
			55	4945.554			
0.149	1.975	280.015	2	560.030			
		141.751	53	7512.809			
			55	8072.839			

4.98 = (0.01) (55 2)

3.15 = (0.05) (55 2)

" "

" "

(0.05)

(0.05 ≥ α)

" :

."

: (13)

"T. test"

" "

:(13)

2013

		" "					
	0.178	1.364	8.115	66.875	24		:
			6.464	64.219	32		
	0.497	0.684	9.536	51.833	24		:
			9.524	53.594	32		
	0.787	0.272	13.936	118.708	24		
			10.769	117.813	32		

2.00 = (0.05)

(54)

" "

2.66 = (0.01)

(54)

" "

" "

" "

(2008)

:

:

-

-

-

-

-

-

.....

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

:

:

:

:(2008)

-1

1 VOL 35

:

.....		
	:(2008)	-12
	:(2002)	-13
:(272 :2007)		-14
	:(2004)	-15
:(2006)		-16
:(2004)		-17
		46
:(2011)		-18
	2011/09	
	:(2008)	-19
	:(2005)	-20
21-	Shiels, Helen & others,(2003) " Understanding the Implications of ICT Adoption: Insights from SMEs ", MCB UP Limited, Logistics Information management, Volume 16 (Number 5.	
22-	Russell, A.S.(2004): How school counselors could benefit from E-Government solutions , The case of paperwork, U.S. department of education office of education research and improvement educational resources information center, ERIC number : ET 478218.	