

*

(34) (90)

(124)
)

.(

(1999)

()

:

.()

:

"

.(2000)

"

"

*

2008/5/22

.2008/10/20

/

" (Rogers and Alexander, 1990)

.(2001) "

."

" (1990)

."

"

(Sherrill, 1998)

" (1990) ."

.(1983)

" (Sherrill, 1998)

."

(1990)

."

"

.(1992)

(Sherrill, 1998)

"

.(2002) "

" (1995)

(1983)

:

:

."

"

(1993)

."

(1995)

:

:

(1988)

:

•

•

)

.(

.(1983)

-

-

(1998)

.()

-

)

-

(

-

-

(2006)

(1996)

751

269

%5

(

)

(Byrne and Gavin, 1996)

(2001)

)

877

(

(733)

(535)

(Funk and Buchman, 1996)

-

(1999)

(500)

(sax, 1993)

(1400)

4

(191)

(180)

(34) (90)

(1)

2007

(1)

%73	90		
%27	34		
%35	43		
%65	81		
%37	45		
%30	36		
%20	26		
%13	17		
%39	48	3	
%35	43	6 3	
%26	33	6	
%18	22		
%12	15		
%12	15		
% 12	15		
%10	12		
%16	21		
%10	12		
%10	12		

) : -4

: -

.() : -5
 : -
 6-3 3) -3
 : .(6) -1
 .() -2

- . -1
- : -7 -2
- . -3
- : -8 -4
- . -5
- : -9 -6
- . -7
- : -8
- . -9

() : (1999)

(60)
.(0.92)
(100)

- :
- :
- :
- : -1
- : -2

(100)

X

$$77.10 = \frac{100 \times 107.927}{140}$$

(2)

- : -1
- : -2
- : -3
- : -4
- : -5
- : -6

(2)

11.267	77.10	107.927	
10.325	76.03	106.435	
7.868	75.19	97.741	
7.809	66.70	60.032	
8.270	62.35	56.112	
6.853	61.54	55.387	
5.433	61.30	55.145	
4.246	61.16	55.048	
3.331	60.76	30.379	

(2)

:

(11.267) (77.10)

(76.03)

(10.325)

(7.868)

(75.19)

(66.70)

(7.809)

(62.35)

(8.27)

(6.853)

(61.54)

(5.433)

(61.30)

(61.16)

(4.246)

(60.76)

(3.331)

(2)

()

(3)

(3)

()

	()					
0.06	1.92-	7.60	59.21	90		
0.06	1.87-	8.03	62.20	34		
0.43	0.78-	8.26	55.75	90		
0.44	0.77-	8.34	57.05	34		
0.26	1.11-	5.50	54.81	90		
0.25	1.14 -	5.20	56.02	34		
0.21	1.25 -	4.39	54.75	90		
0.18	1.34 -	3.76	55.82	34		
0.97	0.03	6.77	55.40	90		
0.97	0.03	7.15	55.35	34		
0.76	0.29	3.28	30.43	90		
0.77	0.28	3.49	30.23	34		
0.08	1.75-	9.99	105.44	90		
0.09	1.68-	10.86	109.05	34		
0.75	0.31-	11.14	107.73	90		
0.76	0.30-	11.72	108.44	34		
0.20	1.27-	7.75	97.18	90		
0.21	1.25-	8.10	99.20	34		

: (3)

(1999)

(2006)

:

()

(4)

(4)

()

	()					
0.52	0.64	7.87	60.65	43		
0.52	0.64	7.80	59.70	81		
0.25	1.14	8.41	57.27	43		
0.25	1.13	8.17	55.49	81		
0.09	1.67	4.74	56.25	43		
0.08	1.76	5.70	54.55	81		
0.42	0.79	4.43	55.46	43		
0.43	0.77	4.15	54.82	81		
0.88	0.14	7.50	55.51	43		
0.88	0.14	6.53	55.32	81		
0.17	1.38	3.00	29.81	43		
0.15	1.44	3.47	30.67	81		
0.58	0.55	9.77	107.13	43		
0.57	0.56	10.64	106.06	81		
0.36	0.90	11.51	109.18	43		
0.37	0.89	11.14	109.25	81		
0.35	0.93	8.84	98.65	43		
0.38	0.88	7.30	97.25	81		

(4)

(1999)

(2006)

$0.05 \geq \alpha$

(1996)

:

(5)

(5)

	()					
0.001*	3.8	203.8	7	1426.8		
		52.3	116	6075.0		
			123	7501.8		
0.036*	2.2	142.9	7	1000.5		
		63.8	116	7411.8		
			123	8412.4		
0.030*	2.3	63.94	7	445.5		
		27.4	116	3185.8		
			123	3631.3		
0.366	1.1	19.7	7	138.3		
		17.9	116	2079.4		
			123	2217.7		
0.063	1.9	88.2	7	617.7		
		44.4	116	5159.6		
			123	5777.4		
0.110	1.7	18.3	7	128.6		
		10.6	116	1236.5		
			123	1365.1		
0.061	2.6	257.6	7	1803.8		
		97.4	116	11308.6		
			123	13112.4		
0.35	2.7	317.2	7	2220.5		
		115.4	116	13393.8		
			123	15614.3		
0.20	3.1	172.0	7	1204.4		
		55.2	116	6411.3		
			123	7615.7		

.0.05 ≥ α *

(5)

(6)

)

.(

)

(

)

.(

(6)

*	*	*	*	*	*	*		58.14		
								56.23		
								57.65		
								56.90		
								57.40		
*	*		*	*	*	*	*	58.0		
								57.24		
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	58.11		
								56.87		
*	*	*	*	*	*		*	57.31		
								56.02		
								56.11		
								56.80		
								57.16		
*		*	*	*	*	*	*	57.60		
								55.14		
								57.76		
								5745		
								57.77		
								57.40		
								57.41		
*	*		*	*	*	*	*	58.55		
								56.86		
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	58.75		

.0.05 ≥ α

*

:

(7)

(7)

	()					
0.86	0.14	8.8	2	17.7		
		61.8	121	7484.1		
			123	7501.8		
0.39	0.93	64.1	2	128.3		
		68.4	121	8284.0		
			123	8412.4		
0.09	2.36	68.3	2	136.7		
		28.8	121	3494.6		
			123	3631.3		
0.57	0.55	10.1	2	20.2		
		18.1	121	2197.4		
			123	2217.7		
0.69	0.36	17.1	2	34.3		
		47.4	121	5743.1		
			123	5777.4		
0.06	2.84	30.6	2	61.3		
		10.7	121	1303.9		
			123	1365.1		
0.83	0.17	19.0	2	38.01		
		108.0	121	13074.4		
			123	13112.4		
0.56	0.58	74.4	2	148.9		
		127.8	121	15465.3		
			123	15614.3		
0.23	1.46	90.0	2	180.1		
		61.4	121	7435.6		
			123	7615.7		

)

(7)

(7)

.(

.0.05≥α

(8)

(8)

	()					
0.18	1.64	98.5	3	295.6		
		60.0	120	7206.2		
			123	7501.8		
0.13	1.86	125.0	3	375.0		
		66.9	120	8037.3		
			123	8412.4		
0.50	0.78	23.3	3	70.0		
		29.6	120	3561.3		
			123	3631.3		
0.45	0.88	15.9	3	47.7		
		18.0	120	2169.0		
			123	2217.7		
0.36	1.07	50.18	3	150.5		
		46.89	120	5626.8		
			123	5777.4		
0.93	0.14	1.63	3	4.8		
		11.33	120	1360.2		
			123	1365.1		
0.61	0.60	65.5	3	196.7		
		107.6	120	12915.7		
			123	13112.4		
0.32	1.16	147.0	3	441.14		
		126.4	120	15173.1		
			123	15614.3		
0.10	2.11	127.2	3	381.7		
		60.2	120	7234.0		
			123	7615.7		

$0.05 \geq \alpha$

(8)

$0.05 \geq \alpha$

(

-

-

.(8)

-

) :

-

-

.(

-

)

(

)

... ..

1995

22

.1086-1061 3

1995

1993

1996

2000

2001

2002

1990

1983

1 35

2001

1999

1992

Byrne, B. and Gavin, M. 1996. The shavilson model reversed, Testing for the structure of academic self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(2): 215-228.

2

1989

Funk, Jeanne B. and Buchman, D. 1996. Playing violent video and computer games and adolescent self-concept, *Journal of Communication*, 64 (2):19-32.

1988

Rogers, J. and Alexander, R. 1990. The effect of running on self-concept and self-efficacy. Research Report. Ohio. U.S.

(1) (15)

1983

Sax, Linda. 1993. The development of mathematical self-concept during college. The annual meeting of the association for study of high education. California. U.S.

Sherrill, Claudine. 1998. Adapted physical activity, recreation and sport (5 ed.).

2006

...

Self-concept among Students Who Participate in Sport Activities at the Hashemite University

*Ibraheem M. Harafsheh, Faleh Sultan Abu-Eid and Taghreed O. Betar**

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to identify self-concept of athlete students at the Hashemite University and its relation to some related variables such as: sex, type of college, level of studying, kind of sport and years of participation.

The sample of the study consisted of (90) males and (34) females. The researchers used Tennessee Self-concept Scale, translated and modified to suit the local environment by (Wehaby, 1999). The scale consisted of (100) statements to measure nine different dimensions related to the self. The data obtained were treated by utilizing means, standard deviations, t-test and ANOVA.

The results of the study revealed that the ranking of self-concept dimensions of the Hashemite University students are respectively as follows: self-acceptance, identity, behavior, physical self, ethical self, social self, personality self, family self and self criticism. Also, the study revealed no significant differences due to sex, level of studying, type of college and years of participation. The study revealed statistically significant differences in physical self due to kind of sport in favor of students who play (football, athletics and self defense).

Finally, the researchers suggest that the university authorities revise their educational policies and enhance and concentrate the self concept among the students through the lecturers and different activities presented to the students in order to enhance the self concept among them.

Keywords: Self-concept, Physical Activity.

* Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. Received on 22/5/2008 and Accepted for Publication on 20/10/2008.