

:

. 2004/2/10

.....	()	-1
.....	()	-2
.....	()	-3
.....	()	-4

الملخص

(429)

"()"

(68)

:

(Kronbakh Alpha)

.(%0.95)

:

-

(%78.8)

(%82)

:

(%70)

(%77.4)

(%78.2)

.(%67.4)

()

(0.05= α)

-

.

.

(0.05= α)

-

.(25)

.

(0.05= α)

-

.

(0.05= α)

-

.

(0.05= α)

-

.

(0.05= α) -

()

. ()

(0.05= α) -

) :

. () (

(0.05= α) -

()

.(1500)

.

**" "Motives of Pursuing High Studies by the Students of the Palestinian
Universities**

By

Shawqi Fayyad Darweesh Sbaihah

Advisor

Dr. Ghassan Al-Holow& Dr. Abdul Naser Al-Qaddumi

Abstract

This study aimed to realize the motives of pursuing high studies' programs by the Palestinian universities' students. For that, the researcher developed an instrument by the help of a similar instrument, and added some points to it. The researcher benefited from the instrument in collecting information that may help his study. The instrument was composed of (68) points, divided into six scales in the field of motives. The scales are: scientific motive, proffessional motive, psychological motive, social motive, financial motive, and unemployment motive.

To be sure of the validity of the instrument, he introduced it to six arbitrators. They paid their effort to make it suitable. And to be sure about its reliability. The researcher used (Cronbach Alpha) equation to calculate the validity of the coefficients of the scales and to the total degree. The rate was (0.95).

After analyzing the study, it resulted the following:

1-The motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities were respectively due to their strength:

The professional motive (82%), the scientific motive (78.8%), the psychological motive (78.2%), the financial motive (77.4%), the unemployment motive (70%) and the social motive (67.4%).

The total degree was very big at the field of professional motive, big at the fields of (scientific, psychological, financial, and unemployment) motives. and mean at the field of social motive.

2-There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to gender, at the field of (psychological motive), in behalf of female, while there are no statistical difference, nor between the other fields, neither at the total degree. So, the first hypothesis was accepted.

3- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian

universities due to age, in behalf of (less than 25 years old) level, while there were no statistical differences between the other fields, and the total degree. So, the second hypothesis was accepted.

4- There are no statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the specialization in the high studies, at all the fields and at the total degree also. So, the third hypothesis was accepted .

5- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the university that you study in at all the fields and at the total degree also. So, the forth hypothesis was rejected.

6- There are no statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the place of living at all the fields, and at the total degree also. . So, the fifth hypothesis was accepted.

7- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the current job at the field of (psychological motive), in behalf of the (governmental office) level, at the field of (unemployment motive), in behalf of (unemployed), but there are no significant differences, nor between the other fields, neither at the total degree. . So, the sixth hypothesis was accepted .

8- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the social status at the fields of (professional, social, financial, and unemployment) motives, and all are in behalf of the (single) level, and the differences at the total degree also. So, the seventh hypothesis was rejected.

9- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the income level at the fields of (social, financial, and unemployment) motives, and the total degree, and all are in behalf of the level of (less than NIS 1500). But there were no statistical differences between the other levels. So, the eighth hypothesis was rejected.

In the light of these results, the researcher recommends the higher studies' faculty to pay more attention to its students, and direct them to the common affairs and to make contacts with the other universities to exchange knowledge with them, in order to benefit from the new sciences.

An-Najah National University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

**“Motives of Pursuing High Studies by the Students of the Palestinian
Universities**

By

Shawqi Fayyad Darweesh Sbaihah

Advisor

Dr. Ghassan Al-Holow & Dr. Abdul Naser Al-Qaddumi

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Educational Administration, at An-Najah National
University, Nablus, Palestine.**

2003

.	•
.	•
.	•
.	•
.	•
.	•
.	•
.	•

：

“

。

“

”

”

。

。

—

—

。(1997)

。

。

)

。(1999

。

。

) (2000.

) (1999.

) (1995.

" وفي ذلك فليتنافس المتنافسون " . (26

) (1998.

(2000).

(1996)

() () :
()

.

.

.

.

:

.(1996)

.

.

()

() .

()

: .

: : .

.

:

.

:

.

.

.(1996)

:

.

:

.

.

.

—

—

.

.

.

.

.(1996)

.(Science Parks)

(1996)

:

.1

.

.2

.

.3

.

.

.

.4

.

.5

.

.6

.

.

:

.1

.

.2

.

.3

.

.4

.

.5

.

.6

.

.7

.(1998)

.

)

.(1983

:

.

:

:

:

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

.8

.9

:

:

(0.05= α)

.1

.

(0.05= α)

.2

.

(0.05= α)

.3

(0.05= α) .4

(0.05= α) .5

(0.05= α) .6

(0.05= α) .7

(0.05= α) .8

:

:

-1

-2

.1995

-3

-4

-5

:

:

-1

-2

:

:

-1

-2

.
 :
 -
 .(1984)
 -
 .(1979)
 .
 -
 :
)
 -
 .(1986
 :
 -
 .(1983)

الفصل الثاني

الإطار النظري والدراسات السابقة

أولاً: الإطار النظري.

- أهمية الدوافع.
- نظريات الدوافع.
- أنواع الدوافع.
- العوامل التي تؤثر بالدوافع.
- هرم ماسلو للحاجات.
- أثر الدوافع على الشخصية.
- آراء العلماء والمدارس في الدافعية.
- التعليم العالي في الوطن العربي.
- التعليم العالي في فلسطين.
- نبذة عن الجامعات الفلسطينية.

ثانياً: الدراسات السابقة

- الدراسات العربية.
- الدراسات الأجنبية .
- تعقيب على الدراسات السابقة.

:

:

.

.

.

.

.

.

.(1997)

(1997)

.

.

.

.

.

(1998)

(1985)

)

.(2000

:

(1982)

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

-7

(1997)

"

"

(1999)

(2000)

.(1987)

(1938)

نظرية ماكدوجل في الغرائز:

)

.(1987

. نظرية الاتزان وإنقاص الدافع:

(Homeostasis)

.(1987)

(incentives)

.(1987)

. النظرية التحليلية:

:

(Libido)

.(1987)

:

(vicarious learning)

(models)

()

.(1987)

: .

:

.

.

.

.(1999)

:

.

:

.1

.

.2

.

.3

.

:

.

.(1999)

.(1979)

:

.(1999)

(2000)

(1985)

"

"

"

:

.

.

.(1992)

:

.

.

—

—

.(1998)

(1990)

" " (1984)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

.(1982)

(1987)

:)" "

" .(148

.(52 :) "

)

.(

) (

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.(1987)

:

.

.(1997)

(1997)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

:

)

.(1988

:

(1)

20		-1
6		-2
2		-3
5		-4
8		-5
8		-6
9		-7
4		-8
1		-9
15		-10
1		-11
9		-12
2		-13
1		-14
8		-15
11		-16
18		-17
13		-18
1		-19
7		-20

:

.

.(1988)

.

— —

.

.

:

98-97

الجدول (2)

*

السنة الدراسية	جامعة بير زيت*			جامعة النجاح*			جامعة القدس (أبو ديس)*		
	ذكر	أنثى	مجموع	ذكر	أنثى	مجموع	ذكر	أنثى	مجموع
98-97	177	85	262	505	100	605	-	-	-
99-98	118	101	219	203	79	282	115	72	187
00-99	278	185	463	383	97	480	369	180	549
01-00	358	261	619	356	160	516	263	130	393
02-01	310	262	572	295	163	458	210	130	340
03-02	423	344	767	439	282	721	161	72	233

*تم الاكتفاء بالجامعات في الضفة الغربية لصعوبة الاتصال مع قطاع غزة .

(1998-2003)

والجدول التالي يبين عدد خريجي الدراسات العليا في فلسطين منذ سنة 1997-1998

الجدول (3)

عدد خريجي الدراسات العليا في الجامعات الفلسطينية في الضفة الغربية حسب السنة والجامعة

والجنس

السنة الدراسية	جامعة بير زيت			جامعة النجاح			جامعة القدس (أبو ديس)		
	ذكر	أنثى	مجموع	ذكر	أنثى	مجموع	ذكر	أنثى	مجموع
98-97	4	3	7	28	15	43	-	-	-
99-98	50	18	68	80	31	111	-	-	-
00-99	39	24	63	107	22	129	-	-	-
01-00	59	58	117	128	47	175	119	39	158
02-01	58	57	115	111	72	183	100	55	155
03-02	20	6	26	51	27	78	68	30	*98

2002-2003

*

(1998-2003)

:

.

.

:

:

•

1924

"

1942

."

"

1932

1953

."

.1961

1972

.

.

.

."

"

1976/1975

1976

.

.

1977

.

.1979/1978

.1978/1977

.1980/1979

.

1995/1994

.

:

2000/1999

—

.

;

•

"

"

1918

1965

1941

1977

.

1982

1983

.

1978

.

1979

.

1981

.

:

1985

.

1991/8 1988

1992 1991

1993

1994

1995

1996

1997

1998

1999

()

2000 /

. 26

: •

73

()

.

79

.

: •

. 80

94

85

91

.

.

.

: •

1991

2001/2000

44

.

.

4700

.

278

39

35 . 9872 . 2000-99

.

.

.

.

:

•

81/80 .

1971

1986

1985

1990

1987 .

1994

1999

1998

.()

2900

:()

•

.

—

1931

—

.1967

.

.1978

()

1982

.1979

1994

.

.

.

.

(5250)

.

.

:

:

.

:

.

: :

:(2001)

"

."

.(/)

(250)

.

): (44)

.

.(

):

(

.

(

)

.

)

.(

.

()

.()

)

(

.

()

.

.

.

:(2001)

"

"

(125)

.

.

:

.

(2001)

"

"

(44)

(61)

:

(2000)

"

"

(217)

(13)

(6)

(10)

:(1999)

"

"

:(1999)

"

"

.

:

.

.

:(1997)

"

:

"

:

.

.

.

:(1997)

"

"

.

.(1996)

(65)

.

.

.

:(1995)

"

"

:

.(1992-1977)

.

()

:

:(1995)

"

"

(357)

%12

(2694)

. 94-93

:

:(1994)

:

"

"
.

(236)

.

.(1992-1991)

:

.

:(1992)

"

"

"
.

:

.

.

.

:

.

.

.

.

:

.

.

:

:

:(Dubios .2002)

"

"

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

(Plants .2000)

"

"

.

/

:

.

.()

()

(98)

(182)

.(PRIOR) (MAI) (ITE)

:

:(Nevgi. 2000)

(371)

:(Mores. 2000)

"

"

(58-35)

()

:(Williams. 1996)

.() "

(1763)

(335)

:

(Cookson .1986)

:(Scheifele. 1995) ,

"
.
(12)

"
(51)

:(Harrell. 1995)

"

"

:(Benge. 1994)

"

"

(90)

(Colorado)

(26)

:(Stoker. 1994)

"

."()

(201)

(California)

: (Gordon.1994)

"

." HBCUs ()

(1600)

(327) (397)

:(Rodriguez. 1993)

"

"

(417)

:(Fickner. 1992)

888

:

:(Gordon. 1992)

"

." (OFF -CAMPUS)

(319) .(West Verginia) (Marshal)

(68)

:

(%90)

:(Smith. 1992)

(38)

"

"

(%74)

(%95)

(%56)

(%90)

:

.

:

.

:(Gordon. 1992)

"

"

(270)

(357)

.

.

(Gordon. 1990)

"

"

.

:

—

—

.

(235)

:

83-82

.

.

.

"

"

"

"

"

"

.

.

:(Dorn.1987)

(110)

:(Psacharopoulos & sanyal. 1982)

·
:
·
:
·

·

:(Patchner. 1982)

"
:
78 70 (262)
73 28
:
%65
·

·

·

:

:
 •
 1990) (Plants 2000) (2001) (2001)
 .(Gordon
 •
 .(Gordon 1990) (Scheifele 1995) (1995)
 •
 .(Gordon 1994) (1995) (2001) (2001)
 (2001) •
 .(1995)
 •
 (2001)
 (Fickner ,1992) (Scheifele 1995) (1997) (2001)
 .(Dorn 1987)
 (Scheifele 1995) •
 .
 (2001) •
 .(1995) (1997) (1999) (1999)
 •
 (1995) (1997) (2001)
 (Harrell 1995) (Williams 1996) ,(Plants ,2000)
 (Smith 1992)

.(Benge 1994) (1997) (2001)
 2002) (1995) (1997)
 .(Stoker 1994) (Mores 2000) (Dubois
 (1999) (2000)
 (Gordon 1994) (1999)
 (1995) (1995)
 (Rodriguez 1993) (Williams 1996) (1992)
 . (Gordon 1994)
 .(Benge 1994) (1992) (1995)
 (1995) •

•

-
-
-
-
-
-
-

.

:

.

:

()

.

:

.(2003 -2002)

.

. (698)

(1023)

(1721)

(4)

:() (2003 -2002)

767	344	423	
721	282	439	
233	72	161	()
1721	698	1023	

:

(429)

(429) .(455) (513)

(285) (26)

(%24.92) (%33.6) (144) (%66.4)

(12) (11) (10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) .

:

: .1

(5)

66.4	285	
36.6	144	
100	429	

: .2

(6)

28.2	121	25
53.4	229	35-25
18.4	79	35
100	429	

: .3

(7)

51	219	
49	210	
100	429	

: .4

(8)

34.7	149	
41	176	
24.2	104	()
100	429	

: .5

(9)

44.5	191	
43.1	185	
12.4	53	
100	429	

: .6

(10)

53.3	229	
25.2	108	
21.4	92	
100	429	

: .7

(11)

52.4	225	
40.8	175	
6.8	29	
100	429	

: .7

(12)

39.6	170	1500
38.9	167	2500-1500
12.1	52	3500-2501
9.3	40	3500
100	429	

:

:

.1

(1995)

(2001)

.(1995)

.2

.

(likert Scale)

.3

:

(5)

(4)

(3)

(2)

(1)

:

.4

： (68)

。

：

：

。： .1

。 35 35-25 25 ： .2

。： .3

： .4

。()

。： .5

。： .6

2500 -1500 1500 ： .7

。 3500 3500-2501

：

： (68)

(13)

14	
8	
14	
13	
11	
8	
68	

.

:

3 4 5)

.(1 2

.(40 55 65 70 40 70) :

14 8 14)

.(340)

.(68) (8 11 13

(11)

:

	:	
.		-
		-
	.()
	:	
.		-
	:	
.		-
		-
		-
		-
	:	
.		-
		-
	:	
.		-
		-
	:	

.

:

(kronbakh Alpha)

. (14)

(14)

0.88	
0.81	
0.88	
0.86	
0.90	
0.81	
0.95	

)

(14)

(0.81 0.90 0.86 0.88 0.81 0.88) (

(0.95)

.

:

:

.

.1

	.2
.(2003-2002)	
.	.3
.	.4
.	.5
.	.6
:	
(SPSS)	
:	
.	.1
. (Independent T-test) ()	.2
.(ANOVA)	.3
(Repeated MANOVA)	.4
.(Wilks Lambda)	
. (Sidak)	.5
. (Scheffe)	.6

.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:

:

:

:

(20) (19) (18) (17) (16) (15)

(21) .

.

:

. (%80) -1

. (%79.99-%70) -2

. (%69.99-%60) -3

. (%59.99-%50) -4

. %50 -5

(15)

	%		*		
	86.8	0.86	4.34		1
	86.0	0.82	4.30		2
	75.6	1.08	3.78		3
	65.6	1.27	3.28		4
	79.8	0.95	3.99		5
	83.2	0.96	4.16		6
	84.0	0.89	4.20		7
	77.2	0.97	3.36		8
	72.6	1.01	3.63		9
	72.6	1.08	3.63		10
	76.6	1.07	3.83		11
	78.6	0.99	3.93		12
	82.2	0.96	4.11		13
	82.6	0.91	4.13) (14
	78.8	0.6299	3.94		

(5) *

(15)

(14 13 7 6 2 1)

5 3) (%80)

(%79.8 -%72.6) (12 11 10 9 8

(% 65.6) (4)

.(%78.8)

: -2

(16)

	%		*		
	85.4	0.87	4.27		15
	85.0	0.90	4.25		16
	82.0	0.93	4.10		17
	82.2	0.98	4.11		18
	81.2	0.89	4.06		19
	82.4	0.94	4.12		20
	81.4	0.95	4.07		21
	77.8	1.11	3.89		22
	82.0	0.6218	4,10		

(5) *

(16)

- %82)

(21 20 19 18 17 16 15)

(22)

(%85.4

(%77.8)

.(%82)

:

-3

(17)

	%		*		
	79.8	0.97	3.99		23
	81.0	0.91	4.05		24
	80.6	0.92	4.03		25
	77.2	1.00	3.86		26
	76.2	1.07	3.81		27
	81.2	0.91	4.06		28
	81.0	0.97	4.05		29
	80.0	0.92	4.00		30
	83.6	0.97	4.18		31
	79.4	1.10	3.97		32
	77.0	1.11	3.85		33
	77.0	1.11	3.85		34
	73.8	1.16	3.69		35

	68.0	1.20	3.40		36
	78.2	0.6565	3.91		

(5) *

(17)

31 30 29 28 25 24)

(%83.6-% 80) (

(35 34 33 32 27 26 23)

(36) (%79.4-%73.8)

.(%68)

.(%78.2)

: -4

(18)

	%		*		
	77.2	1.04	3.86		37
	76.6	1.03	3.83		38
	73.2	1.15	3.66		39
	65.6	1.22	3.28		40
	61.0	1.29	3.05		41
	64.0	1.21	3.2		42
	74.6	1.11	3.73		43
	75.4	1.01	3.77		44

	76.6	1.01	3.88		45
	71.6	1.07	3.58		46
	77.8	0.95	3.89		47
	79.6	0.95	3.98		48
	78.8	1.01	3.94		49
	67.4	0.6168	3.37		

(5) *

(18)

44 43 39 38 37)

-% 71.6) (49 48 47 46 45

(42 41 40) (%79.6

(%65.6-% 61)

.(%67.4)

:

-5

(19)

	%		*		
	82.6	0.99	4.13		50
	80.6	0.98	4.03		51
	78.0	1.01	3.90		52
	75.2	1.07	3.76		53
	80.2	1.04	4.01		54
	80.8	1.01	4.04		55
	78.8	1.07	3.94		56
	69.4	1.32	3.47		57
	78.2	0.99	3.91		58
	74.8	1.06	3.74		59
	73.2	1.14	3.66		60
	77.4	0.7629	3.87		

(5)

*

(19)

(55 54 51 50)

(%82.6-% 80.2)

(60 59 58 56 53 52)

(57)

(%78.8-% 73.2)

.(%69.4)

.(%77.4)

: -6

(20)

	%		*		
	68.2	1.34	3.41		61
	64.2	1.31	3.21		62
	77.6	1.03	3.88		63
	75.4	1.08	3.77		64
	78.0	1.05	3.90		65
	75.8	1.07	3.79		66
	80.4	0.99	4.02		67
	81.0	1.09	4.05		68
	75	0.7480	3.75		

*(5)

(20)

(68 67)

(66 65 64 63)

(%81 %80.4)

81

(%78-%75.4)

(% 68.2- %64.2)

(62 61)

.(%75)

(21)

	%		*		
	82	0.6299	4.10		1
	78.8	0.6218	3.94		2
	78.2	0.6565	3.91		3
	77.4	0.6168	3.87		4
	75	0.7626	3.75		5
	67.4	0.7480	3.37		6
	76.4	0.4985	3.82		

(5)

*

(21)

)

(%82)

(%78.8-%70)

(

(%67.4)

.(%76.4)

)

(Welk's Lambda)

(Repeated MANOVA

(23)

(22)

*				
0.0001	424	5	134.98	0.386

.(0.05= α)

*

(22)

(0.05= α)

(Sidak)

(23)

(23)

(Sidak)

*0.18	0.07	*0.57	0.02	* -0.16		
*0.35	*0.23	*0.73	*0.19			
*0.15	0.04	*0.54				
* -0.38	* -0.50					
*0.11						

.(0.05= α)

*

: (23)

.1

. ()

) .2

. (

() . .3

.

() .4

.()

. .5

:

:

(0.05= α)

.

Independent T-)

()

. (24)

(test

(24)

()

*	()	(144=)		(285=)		
0.06	1.83	0.59	4.01	0.64	3.9	
0.30	0.92	0.59	4.14	0.63	4.08	
*0.01	2.40	0.66	4.01	0.64	3.85	
0.70	0.38	0.66	3.38	0.59	3.36	
0.70	0.34	0.73	3.85	0.77	3.87	
0.80	0.19	0.73	3.76	0.75	3.74	
0.20	1.14	0.51	3.86	0.49	3.80	

(427)

(1.96)

" "(0.05= α)

*

(24)

(0.05= α)

(2.40)

()

(1.96)

()

)

0.38 0.92 1.83)

()

.(

(1.96)

()

(0.19 0.34

(1.14)

()

(1.96)

()

:

::

$$(0.05=\alpha)$$

(One Way ANOVA)

(26)

(25)

(25)

(79=) 35	(229=) 35– 25	(121=) 25	
3.90	3.93	3.97	
4.02	4.15	4.07	
3.82	3.96	3.86	
3.28	4.40	3.36	
3.69	3.89	3.93	
3.57	3.75	3.86	
3.71	3.85	3.84	

(26)

*	()					
0.76	0.26	0.10 0.39	2 426 428	0.20 169.61 169.82		
0.19	1.62	0.62 0.38	2 426 428	1.24 164.24 165.49		
0.17	1.76	0.75 0.42	2 426 428	1.51 182.95 184.47		
0.32	1.13	0.43 0.38	2 426 428	0.86 161.98 162.84		
0.07	2.59	1.49 0.57	2 426 428	2.99 246.13 249.13		
*0.02	3.66	2.02 0.55	2 426 428	4.05 235.42 239.47		
0.10	2.26	0.55 0.24	2 426 428	1.11 105.25 106.37		

(426)

(2.99)

" " (0.05= α)

*

(26)

(0.05= α)

()

(2.99)

()

(3.66)

)

1.13 1.76 1.62 0.26) () (

(2.99) " " (2.59

" " (2.26) ()

. (2.99)

. (27) (Scheffe)

(27)

(Scheffe)

.

35	35– 25	25	
*0.29	0.11		25
0.17			35– 25
			35

.(0.05= α) *

(27)

(0.05= α)

) (35) (25)

(25

:

:

$$(0.05=\alpha)$$

Independent T-) ()

(28) .(test

(28)

()

*	()	(210=)		(219=)		
0.95	0.06	0.65	3.93	0.60	3.94	
0.68	0.40	0.63	4.09	0.61	4.12	
0.43	0.78	0.68	4.93	0.62	3.88	
0.58	0.55	0.59	3.35	0.63	3.38	
0.93	0.08	0.75	3.87	0.76	3.86	
0.27	1.10	0.74	3.71	0.74	3.79	
0.76	0.29	0.50	3.81	0.49	3.83	

(427)

(1.96)

" " (0.05= α)

*

(28)

(0.05= α)

)

.(

0.08 0.55 0.78 0.40 0.06)

()

(1.96)

()

(1.10

() (0.29) ()

.(1.96)

:

(0.05= α)

One Way)

(30)

(29)

(ANOVA

(29)

(104=)	(176=)	(149=)	
()			
3.66	4.08	3.96	
3.98	4.20	4.08	
3.75	4.04	3.86	
3.19	3.41	3.43	
3.60	3.99	3.91	
3.77	3.64	3.86	
3.66	3.89	3.85	

(30)

*	()					
*0.0001	15.3	5.67 0.37	2 426 428	11.34 158.47 169.82		
* 0.015	4.25	1.61 0.38	2 426 428	3.23 162.25 165.49		
* 0.001	6.72	2.82 0.42	2 426 428	5.64 178.82 184.47		
* 0.003	5.76	2.13 0.37	2 426 428	4.27 158.56 162.84		
*0.0001	9.04	5.07 0.56	2 426 428	10.14 238.98 249.13		
*0.03	3.36	1.86 0.55	2 426 428	3.72 235.75 239.47		
* 0.001	7.71	1.85 0.24	2 426 428	3.71 102.66 106.37		

(426)

(2.99)

" "(0.05= α)

*

(30)

(0.05= α)

)

() ((3.36 9.04 5.74 6.72 4.25 15.24)

() (2.99) ()
 .(2.99) " " (7.71)

37) (Scheffe)
 . (31 32 33 34 35 36

(31)

(Scheffe)

()			
*0.29	-0.12		
*0.41			
			()

.(0.05= α) *

(31)

(0.05= α)

()
 (()) () () (())
 .() () ()

(32)

(Scheffe)

.

()			
0.10	- 0.11		
*0.21			
			()

.(0.05= α)

*

(32)

(0.05= α)

() ()

.

()

(33)

(Scheffe)

.

()			
0.11	- 0.17		
*0.28			
			()

.(0.05= α)

*

(33)

(0.05= α)

() ()

()

(34)

(Scheffe)

()			
*0.24	0.02		
*0.22			
			()

.(0.05= α) *

(34)

(0.05= α)

()

() () () (())
.() () ()

(35)

(Scheffe)

()			
*0.30	- 0.08		
*0.38			
			()

.(0.05= α) *

(35)

(0.05= α)

()

(()) () () (())
.() () ()

(36)

(Scheffe)

.

()			
0.08	* 0.21		
-0.13			
			()

.(0.05= α) *

(36)

(0.05= α)

() ()

. ()

(37)

(Scheffe)

.

()			
*0.18	-0.04		
*0.23			
			()

.(0.05= α) *

(37)

(0.05= α)

()) ()

() (()) () () ()
.() ()

:

:

(0.05= α)

.

(One Way ANOVA)

(39)

(38)

.

(38)

(53=)	(185=)	(191=)	
3.95	3.95	3.92	
4.12	4.13	4.07	
3.85	3.90	3.93	
3.28	3.41	3.34	
3.83	3.92	3.82	
3.71	3.78	3.73	
3.79	3.85	3.80	

(39)

*	()					
0.90	0.10	0.04 0.39	2 426 428	0.08 169.74 169.82		
0.66	0.41	0.16 0.38	2 426 428	0.32 165.16 165.49		
0.73	0.30	0.13 0.43	2 426 428	0.26 184.21 184.47		
0.31	1.16	0.44 0.38	2 426 428	0.88 161.96 162.84		
0.45	0.79	0.46 0.58	2 426 428	0.92 248.20 249.13		
0.73	0.30	0.17 0.56	2 426 428	0.34 239.13 239.47		
0.60	0.50	0.12 0.24	2 426 428	0.25 106.12 106.37		

(426)

(2.99)

" " (0.05= α)

*

(39)

(0.05= α)

)

()

(

() (0.30 0.79 1.16 0.30 0.41 0.10)

() (2.99)

.(2.99) " " (0.50)

:

:

(0.05= α)

(One Way ANOVA)

(41)

(40)

(40)

(92=)	(108=)	(229=)	
3.95	3.83	3.98	
4.07	4.00	4.17	
3.87	3.75	4.00	
3.46	3.28	3.37	
3.98	3.86	3.86	
3.97	3.73	3.67	
3.88	3.73	3.84	

(41)

*	()					
0.14	1.94	0.76 0.39	2 426 428	1.53 168.28 169.82		
0.06	2.80	1.07 0.38	2 426 428	2.15 163.33 165.49		
0.005 *	5.35	2.26 0.42	2 426 428	4.52 179.94 184.47		
0.118	2.15	0.81 0.37	2 426 428	1.62 161.21 162.84		
0.16	1.82	1.06 0.58	2 426 428	2.11 247.01 249.13		
0.004 *	5.60	3.07 0.54	2 426 428	6.14 233.33 239.47		
0.06	2.78	0.68 0.24	2 426 428	1.37 105.00 106.37		

(426)

(2.99)

" " (0.05= α)

*

(41)

(0.05= α)

()

(

)

(2.99)

()

(5.35 5.60)

)
 1.94) () ()
 .(2.99) " " (1.82 2.15 2.80
 (2.78) ())
 . .(2.99) " "

)

(Scheffe) ()
 . (42 43)

(42)

(Scheffe)

0.12	*0.24		
-0.12			

.(0.05= α) *

(42)

(0.05= α)

) ()

. () ()

(43)

(Scheffe)

* -0.30	-0.05		
0 .24			

.(0.05= α)

*

(43)

(0.05= α)

() ()

()

:

:

(0.05= α)

(One Way ANOVA)

(45)

(44)

(44)

(29=)	(175=)	(225=)	
3.69	3.94	3.96	
3.83	4.10	4.14	
3.67	3.88	3.96	
3.12	3.33	3.42	
3.46	3.81	3.96	
3.75	3.62	3.85	
3.59	3.78	3.88	

(45)

*	()					
0.09	2.35	0.92 0.39	2 426 428	1.85 167.96 169.82		
* 0.04	3.21	1.23 0.38	2 426 428	2.40 163.03 165.49		
0.08	2.53	1.08 0.42	2 426 428	2.16 182.30 184.47		
* 0.02	3.64	1.36 0.37	2 426 428	2.73 160.11 162.84		

*0.002	6.45	3.66 0.56	2 426 428	7.32 241.80 249.13		
*0.01	4.44	2.42 0.55	2 426 428	4.85 234.62 239.47		
0.005 *	5.43	1.32 0.24	2 426 428	2.64 103.73 106.37		

(426)

(2.99)

" " (0.05= α)

*

(45)

(0.05= α)

)

3.21)

()

(

(2.99)

()

(4.40 6.45 3.64

()

(

)

.(2.99)

" "

(2.53 2.35)

(5.43)

()

.

.(2.99)

" "

)

(Scheffe)

(

.(46 47 48 49 50)

(46)

(Scheffe)

*0.30	0 .03		
0 .26			

.(0.05= α) *

(46)

(0.05= α)

() ()

()

(47)

(Scheffe)

*0.30	0.09		
0 .20			

.(0.05= α) *

(47)

(0.05= α)

() ()

()

(48)

(Scheffe)

*0.49	0.15		
0 .34			

.(0.05= α)

*

(48)

(0.05= α)

() ()

()

(49)

(Scheffe)

0.09	*0.22		
-0 .13			

.(0.05= α)

*

(49)

(51)

(40=)	(52=)	(167=)	(170=)	
3500	-2501) (3500	-1500) (2500	1500	
4.01	3.81	3.88	4.01	
4.05	3.92	4.13	4.15	
3.86	3.83	3.88	3.97	
3.15	3.28	3.36	3.45	
3.66	3.71	3.84	3.99	
3.68	3.44	3.72	3.89	
3.73	3.66	3.80	3.91	

(52)

*	()					
0.11	2.01	0.79 0.39	2 426 428	3.37 167.44 169.82		
0.10	2.04	0.78 0.38	2 426 428	2.36 163.13 165.49		
0.47	0.84	0.36 0.43	2 426 428	1.09 183.38 184.47		
* 0.02	3.03	1.13 0.37	2 426 428	3.41 159.43 162.84		

*0.01	3.46	1.98 0.57	2 426 428	5.94 243.18 249.13		
*0.001	5.29	2.87 0.54	2 426 428	8.63 230.84 239.47		
0.007 *	4.04	0.98 0.24	2 426 428	2.95 103.42 106.37		

(425)

(2.60)

" " (0.05= α)

*

(52)

(0.05= α)

)

(5.29 3.46 3.03)

()

(

(2.60)

()

()

.(2.60)

" "

(4.04)

(Scheffe)

(53 54 55 56)

(53)

(Scheffe)

.

3500	-2501) (3500	-1500) (2500	1500	
*0.29	0.16	0 .08		1500
0.21	0 .08			(2500-1500)
0.12				(3500-2501)
				3500

.(0.05= α)

*

(53)

(0.05= α)

)

(1500) (3500) (1500

.

(54)

(Scheffe)

3500	(3500-2501)	-1500) (2500	1500	
*0.33	0.28	0 .15		1500
0.17	0 .12			(2500-1500)
0.12				(3500-2501)
				3500

.(0.05= α)

*

(54)

(0.05= α)

)

(1500) (3500) (1500

(55)

(Scheffe)

3500	-2501) (3500	-1500) (2500	1500	
0.21	*0.44	0 .17		1500
0.03	0 .27			(2500-1500)
-0.23				(3500-2501)
				3500

.(0.05= α)

*

(55)

(0.05= α)

(1500)

(1500) (3500-2501)

(56)

(Scheffe)

3500	-2501) (3500	-1500) (2500	1500	
0.17	*0.24	0 .10		1500
0.06	0 .13			(2500-1500)
-0.06				(3500-2501)
				3500

.(0.05= α) *

(56)

(0.05= α)

(3500-2501) (1500)

(1500)

الفصل الخامس

.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:
.	:

الفصل الخامس

:

:

:

-

(15)

:

(4)

.

:
 (1995) (1995) (1997) (2001)
 1996) (Plants 2000) (1992) (1994)
 1992) (Fickner 1992) (Harrell 1995) (Williams
 .(Dorn 1987) (Gordon 1990) (Smith

(16)

:
 (1992) (1994) (1995) (1997) (2001)
 (Scheifele 1995) (Williams 1996) (Plants ,2000)
 (Fickner 1992) (Rodriguez 1993) (Benge 1994)
 (Gordon 1990) (Smith 1992) (Gordon 1992)
 .(Psacharopoulos 1982) (Dorn 1987)

:

-

(17)

.

.

.

:

.

:

(Dubois 2002)

(1994)

(1995)

(1997)

.(Stoker 1994)

(Scheifele 1995)

(Mores 2000)

:

-

(18)

.

-

-

.

.

.

:

(1997) (1997) (1999) (1999) (2000)
(Benge 1994) (1992) (1995) (1995)
(Gordon 1992) (Gordon ,1994) (Stoker ,1994)
. (Psacharopoulos ,1982) (Smith 1992)

:

-

(19)

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

:

(1992)	(1995)	(1995)	(2001)
(Scheifele ,1995)	(Willams ,1996)	(Moris ,2000)	
(Rodriguez ,1993)	(Benge ,1994)	(Harrell ,1995)	
(Smith ,1992)	(Gordon ,1992)	(Fickner ,1992)	
	(Dorn ,1987)	(Gordon 1990)	
			.(Psacharopoulos ,1982)

:

-

(20)

.(Benge ,1994) (1992) (1995)

—

(21)

)

(

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

$$\vdots$$

)

(22)

.(

: (23)

-

.

.

)

-

(

.

.

):

-

.

(

.

):

-

.

(

.

):

-

.(

):

(

.

-

.

:

:

(0.05= α)

.

(24)

) :

.

.(

.

.

.

.

(2001)

.

(2001)

.

(1995)

.

(1995)

.

(1992)

(Dubois ,2002)

(Plants ,2000)

(Nevgi ,2000)

(Williams ,1996)

(Gordon ,1992)

(Gordon ,1990)

:

:

(0.05= α)

(27 26)

) .(25)

.(

25

25

(1995)

,(Scheifele ,1995)

(Gordon ,1990)

(0.05= α)

(28)

(2001)

(2001)

(1995)

(Gordon ,1994)

(Gordon ,1990)

(Patchner ,1982)

:

:

(0.05= α)

(30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37)

)

.(

(31)

-

)) () .() (()) ()

.() ((

() ()

()

.()

(32)

-

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

.

.

$$(33) \quad -$$

$$.\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

.

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\left) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right)$$

$$(34) \quad -$$

$$.\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$.\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

.

$$(35) \quad -$$

$$.\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$.\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \quad \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$\left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right)$$

$$(36) \quad -$$

$$.(\quad) \quad (\quad) \quad (\quad)$$

$$(37) \quad -$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\quad) \quad .(\quad) \quad ((\quad) \quad) \quad (\quad) \\ .(\quad) \quad ((\quad) \quad) \\ (\quad) \end{aligned}$$

$$.(\quad)$$

$$: \quad ::$$

$$(0.05=\alpha)$$

$$(39)$$

$$)$$

$$.($$

• •

(41 42 43)

.(

.(

)

.(

•

) ()

(43)

-

.(() (

(2001)

(2001)

(1997)

(1994)

(Scheifele ,1995)

– (Rodriguez ,1993)

(Fickner ,1992)

(Smith ,1992)

(Dorn ,1987)

(Patchner ,1982)

.(73)

:(
(0.05= α)

(45 46 47 48 49 50)

.()

) ()

.(

(46)

-

()

.

() ()

.

(47)

-

()

()

.

(48)

-

()

-

-()

.

(49)

-

()

.

(50)

-

()

()

(Scheifle ,1995)

:

:

(0.05= α)

(52 53 54 55 56)

(0.05= α)

)

(1500) (

(53)

(1500)

(1500)

.(3500)

(54)

(1500)

(55)

(1500)

(56)

.(1500)

(1500)

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

المراجع

:

:

		:	:
		.	-
		.	-
		.(1992)	-
.61-29/18	-		
.		.(1985)	-
		.(1996)	-
		.	
)		.(1995)	-
		(
		.(1997)	-
		.	
		.(1986)	-
		.(161_55)	
		.(1987)	-
		.(14_7)	
		.(1998)	-
		.	
		.(1999)	-
		.(5_3)	
		.(1998)	-
		.(1998)	-

()	.(1997)	-
		.(2001)	-
:			
		.(79-48)	
		.(1997)	-
5/ 13-11			
			1997/
		.(1979)	-
		.(1984)	-
		.(1996)	-
	:	.(1988)	-
	.(283_234)	(2)	(2)
		.(1994)	-
	.(86-43)	(4)	(11)
		.(1992)	-
		.(1990)	-
		.(1983)	-
	.(19)		

.(1999) -

.(350_348)

.(1999) -

.(1999) -

.(34)

.(1997) -

.(2001) -

$$.(6-5) \quad (38)$$

.(2000) -

•

.(1995) -

_____ ()

.(2000) -

21

.(56-13) (75)

.(1999) -

-5

•

1999/12/6

.(2001) -

()

.(1982) -

.(1984) -

.(1985) -

.(1998) -

.(2000) -

.(2001) -

.(2003) -

- Benge, Daniel (1994). **An investigation of students' motivational factors related to persistence through college graduation :A qualitative study**, (unpublished Master's Thesis), University of Northern Colorado, US.
- Dorn, Dandre Keith (1987). **Continuing Professional Education Motivational Orientations of State Supervisors of Agritultural Education** University Ph. D.Thesis .U.S.A.
- Dubois. Susan Rae'. (2002). **Multilevel motivational personality structure. well being and coping style in graduate business students.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Chicago School of Professional Psychology.
- Gordon.-Howrd (1994). **Motivations for Enrollment in Graduate and Professional School among African American Students in HBCUs.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Clemson Univ.. SC. Houston Center for the Study of the Black Experience Affecting Higher Education, U.S.A..
- Gordon.-Howard-R.-D. (1992). **Comparison of the Motivational Orientations of Adult Education Graduates and Vocational Education Graduates in Off-Campus Credit Programs.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Reports-Research , U.S.; West-Virginia .
- Gordon.-Howard-R.-D.; and-others (1992). **Motivational Factors Related to Decision on Pursuing Graduate Study.** (unpublished Master's

Thesis), Reports-Research.

-Gordon.-Howard-R.-D.; and-others (1990). **Assessment of the Motivational Orientations of Vocational. Technical and Adult Education Graduates in Off-Campus Credit Programs.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Reports- Research, Marshal University, West Verginia U.S.A..

- Fickner, Rose Lagator (1992). **Motivational Orientations and Socio-Demographic Variables of Professional Nurses Enrolled in National League for Nursing Accredited Mastar s Programs in the U.S.A. ,** (Ph. D.Thesis), Temple University, U.S.A.

-Harrell. Pasty Martin (1995). **Successful strategies used by single working parents to motivate their children to remain in high school until graduation.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), University of Massachusetts.

-Mores. Maria Luisa . (2000). **Perceived experiences which facilitated and motivated* Mexican Americans from a migrant background to obtain a graduate degree.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), University of Northern Colorado.

- Nevgi, Anne –Marja Sinikka (2000). **From the entrance examination to graduation: The change in the study motivation of the students at the Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Helsingin Yliopisto, Finland.

-Patchner, Michael (1982). **Adecade of Social Work Doctoral**

Graduates: Their Characteristics and Educational Programs.

.No.2, pp.35-41 .Journal of Education for Social Work, vol.18.

-Plants ,Robert Thomas (2000). **The relationship of motivation . and metacognition to academic performance in graduate medical education.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), The University of Memphis.

- Psacharopoulos , George and Bikas Sanyal (1982). **The Reasons for Undertaking Higher Education and Employment, the HEP experience in 5 less developed countries.** U N E S C O: Paris, pp. 60-61.

-Rodriguez.-Stephen (1993). **Assessment of the Motivational Orientations of Vocational. Technical. and Adult Education Graduates in Off-Campus Credit Programs.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), College-Student-Affairs-Journal.

-Scheifele., Reni1 (1995). **The relationship between divorce and reentry to college for graduate education: A study of motivational factors (women students).** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Walden University.

-Smith.-Harry-A (1992). **Analysis of the Motivational Orientations of Adult Education Graduates in Off-Campus Credit Programs.** (unpublished Master's Thesis), Reports-Research, U.S.; West-Virginia.

-Stoker Jeannette P. .(1994). **The role of non-academic variables in measuring the perceptions of success of different ethnic groups of graduate students (African American. Hispanic . achievement**

motivation). (unpublished Master's Thesis), Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University.

-Williams. Victor Marvan. JR.. (1996). **Motivational orientation of reentry adult male graduate students to participate in higher education (motivational orientation).** (unpublished Master's Thesis), The Florida State University.

	.()	.1
		.2
.		.3
	.	
	()	.4
	.	.5
.		
()		.6
	.	
()		.7
.		

() :**(1)**

/ /

.

.

.

.

"

"

☐

☐

: _____ :

. 35

☐

35-25

25

☐

()

☐

☐

☐

:

☐

☐

☐

☐

(2500-1500)

1500

. 3500

☐

(3500 -2501)

☐

(x)

:

						-1
						-2
						-3
						-4
						-5
						-6
						-7
						-8
						-9
						-10
						-11
						-12
						-13
					()	-14

						-15
						-16
						-17
						-18
						-19
						-20
						-21
						-22

						-23
						-24
						-25
						-26
						-27
						-28
						-29
						-30
						-31
						-32
						-33
						-34
						-35
						-36

						-37
						-38
						-39
						-40
						-41
						-42
						-43
						-44
						-45
						-46
						-47
						-48
						-49

						-50
						-51
						-52
						-53
						-54
						-55
						-56
						-57
						-58
						-59
						-60

						-61
						-62
						-63
						-64
						-65
						-66
						-67
						-68

:(2)

:(3)

()

:(4)

•

:(5)

()

:(6)

.

()

:(7)

.

**" "Motives of Pursuing High Studies by the Students of the Palestinian
Universities**

By

Shawqi Fayyad Darweesh Sbaihah

Advisor

Dr. Ghassan Al-Holow& Dr. Abdul Naser Al-Qaddumi

Abstract

This study aimed to realize the motives of pursuing high studies' programs by the Palestinian universities' students. For that, the researcher developed an instrument by the help of a similar instrument, and added some points to it. The researcher benefited from the instrument in collecting information that may help his study. The instrument was composed of (68) points, divided into six scales in the field of motives. The scales are: scientific motive, proffessional motive, psychological motive, social motive, financial motive, and unemployment motive.

To be sure of the validity of the instrument, he introduced it to six

arbitrators. They paid their effort to make it suitable. And to be sure about its reliability. The researcher used (Kronbakh Alpha) equation to calculate the validity of the coefficients of the scales and to the total degree. The rate was (0.95).

After analyzing the study, it resulted the following:

1-The motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities were respectively due to their strength:

The professional motive (82%), the scientific motive (78.8%), the psychological motive (78.2%), the financial motive (77.4%), the unemployment motive (70%) and the social motive (67.4%).

The total degree was very big at the field of professional motive, big at the fields of (scientific, psychological, financial, and unemployment) motives. and mean at the field of social motive.

2-There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to gender, at the field of (psychological motive), in behalf of female, while there are no statistical difference, nor between the other fields, neither at the total degree. So, the first hypothesis was accepted.

3- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to age, in behalf of (less than 25 years old) level, while there were no statistical differences between the other fields, and the total

degree. So, the second hypothesis was accepted.

4- There are no statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the specialization in the high studies, at all the fields and at the total degree also. So, the third hypothesis was accepted .

5- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the university that you study in at all the fields and at the total degree also. So, the forth hypothesis was rejected.

6- There are no statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the place of living at all the fields, and at the total degree also. . So, the fifth hypothesis was accepted.

7- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the current job at the field of (psychological motive), in behalf of the (governmental office) level, at the field of (unemployment motive), in behalf of (unemployed), but there are no significant differences, nor between the other fields, neither at the total degree. . So, the sixth hypothesis was accepted .

8- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the social status at the fields of (professional, social,

financial, and unemployment) motives, and all are in behalf of the (single) level, and the differences at the total degree also. So, the seventh hypothesis was rejected.

9- There are statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha=0.05$) between the motives of pursuing high studies by the students of the Palestinian universities due to the income level at the fields of (social, financial, and unemployment) motives, and the total degree, and all are in behalf of the level of (less than NIS 1500). But there were no statistical differences between the other levels. So, the eighth hypothesis was rejected.

In the light of these results, the researcher recommends the higher studies' faculty to pay more attention to its students, and direct them to the common affairs and to make contacts with the other universities to exchange knowledge with them, in order to benefit from the new sciences.

An-Najah National University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

**“Motives of Pursuing High Studies by the Students of the Palestinian
Universities**

By

Shawqi Fayyad Darweesh Sbaihah

Advisor

Dr. Ghassan Al-Holow & Dr. Abdul Naser Al-Qaddumi

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Educational Administration, at An-Najah National
University, Nablus, Palestine.**

2003

