

COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE PLACE OF KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY AT THE INSTITUTES AND DEPARTMENTS OF SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION IN ALGERIA

Bitar Hichem^a, Atallah Ahmed^b

^a *Institutes of Sport and Physical Education, Mostaganem (IEPSMOSTA)*

^b *University Abdelhamid Ibn Badiss. Mostaganem (UMHB)*

BitarHichem : bitareps@gmail.com

Abstract

This research attempt to find out the requirement of the knowledge economy needed in the institutions of physical education in Algeria. In order to achieve this aim, we developed a questionnaire in order to determine these requirements as well as to find out the administrative roles in this process. Analysis of the questionnaires revealed that there is a significant difference in regard to the criterion of the knowledge economy but about the Institute Destinations department we found that there is no distinction between them. One cannot say that one is better than the other because the results of this modest research confirms that what can go best in school is not the same as what is in another. It was concluded that the general hypothesis of this experiment has been confirmed, however that other secondary hypotheses were not confirmed.

Key words: Sports Training Institutes, Department of Sports and Physical Education, the knowledge of economy.

1. INTRODUCTION:

The world today is experiencing a constant changes and revolution, especially in the domain of teaching methods at the university level; among these changes is the notion of the knowledge-based-economy. The term “knowledge-based economy” is the result of acknowledgment to knowledge and technology roles in the growth and development of any economy. By definition, there is no clear cut definition to this notion since it embraces several visions, and implied differently depending on the requirement of each society (Abdul wahed, 2000).

Yet the common assumption is that success of any institution or company, as(Kantar 1995), can be realized to only those that meet universal standards and tap into global networks. Along the same thought, (Hobday 1995) believes that the knowledge and technology plays a key role in the development of any country. It is believed that in the light of 21ST century the most successful countries will be granted to those that establish a strong link between their local businesses and the global one. The knowledge based economy is seen as the new base for the development (McInerney, 2002)

Therefore, this new challenge requires institutions and universities to consider their training methods by encouraging scientific research and creativity. It also insists for adopting and adapting the methods of training that are followed in our institution, either in the roles of administrators or teachers or even students (GERARD, 2000).

Problematic

Based on the aforementioned, we carried an investigation in order to know the place of the knowledge economy at the institution of physical education and sport (ENS) in Algeria.

Therefore the research problem that guides our research is:

Is there a difference between the institutes and Department of Physical Education and Sport in training regarding the criteria of the knowledge economy?

Research Questions

- What Institute and Department is best suited for training that is based on the Knowledge of economy from the view of the teachers and administrators?
- Are there differences for the effectiveness of training between the Institute and the Department in the nature of training that are based on the requirement of Knowledge of economy from the view of the teachers and administrators?

Research hypotheses: based on the aforementioned research questions, we assume the following hypotheses:

General hypothesis

- There are significant differences between the institutes and Department of Sports and Physical Training (EPS) regarding the criteria of the knowledge economy from the teachers and administrators view.
- The age of the Institute plays a considerable role in adapting an appropriate training that is based on the knowledge economy requirement.
- There are no significant differences between the Institute and Department of Sports and Physical Training (EPS) regarding the criteria of the knowledge economy from the teachers and administrators view.

Research Objectives

Based on the aforementioned researches questions and hypotheses, our analytical research is carried out in order to find out, on the one hand, whether or not the current training that is adopted in some Selected Institutes and Departments of Sport and Physical Training in Algeria are appropriate for those that are based on the Knowledge of economy requirement.

On the other hand, this study explores the role of the age and experience of these Institutes and Departments in the nature of this Kind of Training.

The Methods of Research:

The Descriptive Approach

The Sampling: a questionnaire was designed and distributed to 69 teachers and administrators staff, including heads of departments, heads of scientific advice, the heads of laboratories, and heads of area manager).

In addition, a questionnaire was developed for faculty directors, composed of five (05) open ended questions that seek to find the following: (SCUETZE, 2000),(O.C.D.E, 2000), (KEARSLEY, 2000), (Vincent, 2000),

- 1- Objectives of the training.
- 2- Quality of training.
- 3- Vocational training.
4. Funding and infrastructure and scientific research.
- 5- Evaluation.

Psychometric questionnaire transactions :

Table (01): the values of transactions psychometric questionnaire

coefficients Axes	Split. h	Alpha. c	validity	fidélité	Sign . level	R.value	N
Setting objectives of the training.	0,90	0.76	0.79	0.94	0.05	0.44	20
Quality Training	0.93	0.75	0.82	0.89			

Vocational training.	0.83	0.74	0.90	0.90			
Funding and infrastructure and scientific research	0.87	0.73	0.87	0.88			
The evaluation	0.92	0.75	0.80	0.89			

Discussion of the Results

Analysis of variance test results

Table (02): the analysis of variance test results between the Institutes and Departments

Anova one way		Sum of Squares	Degree of freedom	Mean Square	F	Critic Val. F	Sig. lev
Questionnaire	Between Groups	7496,418	9	832,935	6,060	3,04	0,05
	Within Groups	7972,640	58	137,459			
	Total	15469,059	67				

Table (02) shows that the result of the administrators questionnaire. As can be seen from the table, 'f' which values (6,060) is bigger than 'f', which Critical values of 'f' (3,04) at the significance level (0,05) and the degree of freedom (9-58), and this confirms the existence of significant differences between the Institutes and Departments of sport and Physical Education in the light of the knowledge of economy requirements.

Table 3: View test results (LSD) of the questionnaire oriented professor's administrators

lowe significant difference (LSD)									
Institute of Chlef		Institute of Constantine		Institute of Alger (03)		Institute of Oran		Institute of Mostaganem	
LSD	Institute	LSD	Institute	LSD	Institute	LSD	Institute	LSD	Institute
14,458	Bejaia	-8,291	Chlef	19,29*	Constantine	-21,72*	Alger (03)	30,76*	Oran
0,410	Bouira	6,166	Bejaia	11,00	Chlef	-2,433	Constantine	9,01	Alger (03)
6,839	Msila	-7,880	Bouira	25,45*	Bejaia	-10,72	Chlef	28,33*	Constantine
-2,041	Biskra	-1,452	Msila	11,410	Bouira	3,733	Bejaia	20,04*	Chlef
1,291	Khemis	-10,33	Biskra	17,83*	Msila	-10,31	Bouira	34,50*	Bejaia
Department of Bejaia		-7,000	Khemis	8,958	Biskra	-3,885	Msila	20,45*	Bouira
-14,04	Bouira	Institute of Bouira		12,291	Khemis	-12,76	Biskra	26,88*	Msila
-7,619	Msila	6,428	Msila	Institute of Msila		-9,433	Khemis	18,00*	Biskra
-16,50	Biskra	-2,452	Biskra	-8,88	Biskra	Institute of Biskra		21,33*	Khemis
-13,16	Khemis	0,880	Khemis	-5,547	Khemis	-3,333	Khemis		

(*) ⇒ The difference significant

For the role of the knowledge of economy in the quality of training in the Algerians Institutes and Departments, the results obtained from the questionnaire that was distributed to both the teachers and administrators revealed from table 3 that the differences were significantly in favor of the Institutes compared with the Departments and Sections.

This in return proves our hypothesis that assumed that would be significant differences between the Institutions and Departments for the role of the knowledge of economy in the quality of training from the view of the teachers administrators staff. Yet as the results revealed that the differences were not statistically significant between the old institutes and the new ones, it goes opposite to our hypothesis that assumed that the age and experience of whether the institute or departments is important for the adoption of training based on the knowledge of economy requirements (Fred, 2001).

2. CONCLUSION

By way of conclusion, it can be said that the development of knowledge economy is important in the light of today global market for the development of any society. Thus higher education and the universities play a key role in the development of knowledge economy to help their society to emerge and be adapted with the new requirements of the universal market. Both teachers and administrators staff are responsible for its endorsements.

Therefore, we would like to raise the following notes that seen crucial:

- 1- Encouraging scientific competition within the Institutions of Sports and Physical Education.
- 2- Establishing a committee at the Ministry that should be responsible for defining appropriate criteria and consider them the key to the success of any training.
- 3- Creating procedures that would allow the exchange of experience between different institutions.
4. Review the standards assessments into a major element in training.
- 5- Providing a considerable budget for the tools of the new educational medium and research labs.

REFERENCES

- 1- Abdul wahed, M. (2000). Critical role of ICT in knowledge transfermm the examplar case of SMEs in Divplosing Countries. *knowledge Management in recherche and technology organization: policies and practices to make your RTO competitive in the 21 st Centry* (pp. 11-13). The Netherlands: The Hague.
- 2- GERARD, V. (2000). *Towards a KNOWLEDGE soCIETY*. Universite infose : foundation travail .
- 3- HOUGHTON, J. W. (2002). *The Global Knowledge Economy*. Molbourne: Victoria university,.
- 4- KEARSLEY, C. (2000). *learning and teaching in cyberspace*. Canada: Nelson Thomsor Learning.
- 5- MAGGI, B. (2000). *manière de penser,manière d'agir en éducation et en formation*. paris: ed: PUF.
- 6- McInerney, C. (2002). *Knowledge Mnagment and the dynamic nature of knowledge*. 53: JASIST.
- 7- O.C.D.E. (2000). *perspectives des technologies de l'information de l'O.C.D.E: TIC, commerc électronique et économie de l'nformation* . paris : O.C.D.E.
- 8- Papagiannis, F. R. (6-9 March 2002). *Education, Globalization and Sustainable Futures,S truggles over Education Aims and Purposes in Period of Environnement and Ecological Challenge*. Orlando: Annual Meeting of the comparative and international Education Society.
- 9- R, D. F. (2001). *strategic management ,Concepts & Cases* . New Jersey : Prentice Hall.
- 10- SCUETZE, K. R. (2000). *Transiton veres la société du savoir: politique et stratigies pour promouvoir la participation et l'apprentissage chez l'individu* . ED:I.E.S : Vancouver .
- 11- Vincent, M. T. (2000). *The Knowledge web, Learning and Collaborating on The Net*. LONDON: Biddles LTD.