

*

		(14892)	2006/2005
		(%5)	(751)
(ANOVA)	(1999)	:	.
	" "		
	:		-
			-
(5)			-
)			-
	.(-
		(400)	-
.()		()	-
	.(-
			-
			:
			.1

(1) *

(2)

.(1992) .2007/1/10 2006/7/27

) .(1983) " " .(1981

(Shavelson and Hubner, 1976)

1935

(Rogers and

Alexander, 1990)

.(2000)

(2001)

(2002)

(Hamachek, 1987)

.(1990)

(Shavelson etal, 1976)

.()

.2

-1

(1990)

.(2002)

.(1994)
-2

.(2001)
-3

.(1992)

.(1994)
-4

.(2001) (Shavelson and Bolus, 1982)

-5

.(2002)

)

.(2001

.(1989)

(1981)

:

-

(1992)

1987

1983

)

(1987

(1992)

(1989)

(Shavelson)

(Byrne1996)

(Polus)

(Biehler, 1974)

(Thurston)

(Spearman)

(Winne

and Marx)

(1994)

(1992)

(600)

(16 14 12)
(-)

(16 14)

(1994)

(864)

(488) (376)

(1990

:

(2001)

.3

(Byrneand Gavin, 1996)

(Hertel, 1992)

: (877)

(150)

(1996)

(Marsh, 1992)

(507)

:

(Ziller and Henderson)

(133)

(269)

(136)

(0.70-0.45)

(0.57)

(1999)

(500)

)

(

(

)

.2006–2005

:

-

:

-

:

-

-1

.4

-2

(751) 2006/2005
(14892)

(%5)

(1)

(1)

%			
%44	330		
%56	421		
%35	263	15	
%50	375	8-5	
%15	113		
%42	315		
%58	436		
%26	195	200	
%38	285	400-200	
%36	271	400	
%53	398		
%47	353		
%60	451		
%40	300		
%46	345		
%34	255		
%20	151		

-6 -1 :
 -7 -2 .() :
 -8 -3 8-5 5) : -1
 -9 -4 .(8
 -5 .() : -2
 200 200) : -3
 .(400 400 -
 .() : -4
 (Fitts) .() : -5
 (1999) .() : -6

: (100)

: (100)

" "

(ANOVA)

X

.5

(2)

(2)

10.18	78.67	102.28	
11.45	78.26	109.57	
8.85	68.57	96.0	
6.32	62.68	56.42	
6.20	62.37	56.14	
5.75	62.36	56.13	
5.88	61.14	30.57	
5.65	60.95	54.86	
5.84	60.78	54.71	

(6.20)

(2)

(5.75)

(62.36)

(61.14)

:

(5.88)

(60.95)

(10.18)

(78.67)

(5.65)

(78.26)

(5.84)

(60.78)

(11.45)

(2)

(8.85)

(68.57)

(62.86)

(6.32)

(62.37)

(3)

(t-test)

*						
0.31	-0.97	5.92	55.15	5.86	54.18	
0.75	1.09	5.94	57.16	5.88	58.25	
*0.04	-0.18	5.97	52.50	6.24	51.69	
*0.003	-0.25	5.67	58.15	6.35	57.90	
*0.02	0.32	6.31	55.21	6.29	55.57	
*0.02	1.23	5.83	31.42	5.46	32.65	
0.49	0.20	7.90	95.10	8.70	95.20	
0.13	1.43	10.03	106.73	10.06	108.16	
0.27	-2.25	7.26	105.92	8.65	103.67	

.(0.05 = α)

*

(3)

:

:()

()

(3)

(t-test)

(On way ANOVA)

(4)
 " " (4)
 (0.02) (3.64) " "
 " " (0.05 = α)
 (0.01) (1.18) " "
 .(0.05 = α) " "
 : ()
 (5)

(4)

		8	8 - 5	5	
0.18	1.12	56.75	56.96	57.21	
0.42	0.31	51.87	51.91	52.33	
0.26	0.66	58.31	57.66	57.67	
0.46	1.38	53.45	53.10	53.46	
*0.02	3.64	54.55	54.57	54.58	
*0.01	1.18	30.12	30.13	30.14	
0.51	0.86	95.95	95.40	96.25	
0.35	0.96	110.81	109.96	111.36	
0.24	0.78	101.53	101.27	103.75	

.(0.05 = α) *

(5)

8	8-5	5			
*			53.46	5	
			53.10	8-5	
			53.45	8	
*	*		30.14	5	
			30.13	8-5	
			30.12	8	

.(0.05 = α) *

(6)

(t-test)

*						
0.96	0.25	5.86	58.02	5.68	58.27	
*0.01	0.60	5.83	56.85	5.77	57.45	
*0.02	0.61	5.29	55.55	5.16	55.16	
*0.02	0.50	5.91	58.20	6.32	58.70	
*0.03	1.15	5.96	58.20	5.88	59.80	
* 0.01	1.44	5.65	28.96	5.36	30.40	
0.13	1.97	8.88	92.31	8.79	94.28	
0.12	3.05	9.91	103.15	10.30	106.20	
*0.04	1.08	10.61	100.57	9.65	101.65	

.(0.05 = α)

*

(t-test)

(5)

(6))

(6)

(

(5)

)

(8-5)

(

(8)

)

(5)

(

(5)

:()

:()

(7)

(On way ANOVA)

(7)

		400	400 - 200	200	
0.14	0.75	59.60	59.31	58.14	
0.38	0.91	57.01	56.41	56.30	
0.24	0.84	57.70	57.16	57.67	
*0.011	2.18	53.14	52.36	52.31	
*0.03	2.75	59.91	59.20	59.37	
0.19	1.03	33.14	32.77	32.18	
0.51	1.38	98.10	98.12	97.40	
0.65	1.45	111.76	110.87	111.51	
0.44	1.12	101.40	101.06	100.30	

.(0.05 = α) *

(8)

400	400 -200	200			
			52.31	200	
			52.36	400-200	
	*	*	53.14	400	
			59.37	200	
			59.20	400-200	
	*	*	59.91	400	

.(0.05 = α) *

" " (7)

(400)

.(0.05 = α)

. 400

(8)

(8)

)

(

400

. 400

(t-test)

(9)

:()

(9)

(t-test)

*0.001	-0.32	5.88	58.28	5.03	57.93	
0.18	0.02	5.73	59.58	5.63	59.60	
*0.02	0.40	6.24	58.82	6.51	59.22	
*0.02	0.17	5.48	58.01	5.11	58.18	
0.29	-1.98	5.78	54.38	6.15	52.40	
*0.03	0.48	5.96	29.11	5.88	29.59	
0.52	0.58	8.08	96.88	8.18	97.46	
0.38	3.55	11.32	107.71	11.02	111.25	
*0.03	1.49	11.03	104.76	10.17	106.21	

.(0.05 = α)

*

.()

(9)

)

.(

(

)

(1999)

(1996)

(9)

(t-test)

:()

(10)

(10)

(t-test)

*						
*0.01	0.42	6.01	59.28	5.84	59.70	
0.92	0.30	5.61	58.30	5.97	58.60	
0.4	0.34	5.71	57.23	5.14	57.57	
*0.02	1.53	5.53	50.17	6.38	51.70	
0.71	-0.36	5.89	55.96	6.31	55.61	
*0.01	0.53	5.87	30.81	5.14	31.34	
*0.03	1.56	7.91	96.18	8.78	97.74	
*0.03	1.66	10.01	109.06	9.45	110.72	
0.44	1.73	9.21	101.84	8.66	103.57	

.(0.05 = α)

*

(10)

.)
.(

(1999)

(Marsh, 1992)

)
(

:()

(11)

(On way ANOVA)

(11)

		()			
		()		()	
0.20	0.86	52.01	51.40	50.19	
0.56	0.77	54.01	52.76	53.20	
*0.023	3.96	59.60	59.20	58.16	
0.36	0.98	54.99	53.30	54.91	
*0.031	4.16	59.96	59.80	59.41	
0.16	2.34	31.39	31.01	30.40	
0.74	0.69	98.05	97.25	96.40	
0.42	1.75	108.41	111.34	110.81	
0.25	1.39	101.47	100.86	100.16	

.(0.05 = α) *

(12)

()		()			
			58.16	()	
			59.20		
	*	*	59.60	()	
			59.41	()	
			59.80		
	*	*	59.96	()	

.(0.05 = α) *

()

" " (11)
 (0.023) (3.96)
 .() " " (0.05 = α)
 (4.16)
 (0.05= α) (0.031)

(12)

(12)

()

()

-2

-3

.6

-4 :

-1

1996

2000

2001

1989

1992

117- 77

2002

1990

1983

1989

1993

35 -19

.250- 226

1994

1987

281-253

.251-211

1994

1987

1983

Testing for the Structure of Academic Self -concept Across Pre
 -early, and Life a Adolescents, *Journal of Educational
 Psychology*, 88 (2):215-228. 1981 1992 1

Hertel, Joseph B. 1992. *An Investigation of the Self-concept of
 College Preparatory Students*, M.D Thesis. For Eric Hays
 State University, Kansas, U.S.A. 1994

Hamachek, D. 1987. *Encounters with the Self*, New York: Holt
 Rinehart and Winston Inc. 0 49-24 2 14 1999

Marsh, Herbert, W. 1992. *The Concept Specificity of Relations
 between Academic self-concept and Achievement: an
 Extension of Marsh/ Shavelson Model*, The Annual Meeting
 of the American Educational Research Association, San
 Francisco, Eric. 1990

Regers, James R. and Alexander, Ralph A. 1990. *The Effects of
 Running on Self Concept and Self Efficacy*, Research.
 Report Ohio. U.S. Eric. 1992

Shavelson, R. J. and Hubner, J. J. and Stanton, G.C. 1976. Self
 Concept Validation of Construct Interpretations, Review of
 Educational Research, 46 (3): 407 441. 76-45

Shavelson, R. J. and Bolus. 1982. Self- Concept: the Interplay
 of Theory and Methods, *Journal of Educational
 Psychology*, 74 (1). Biehler, R. 1974. *Psychology Applied to Teaching*, 2nd ed.
 Boston, Houghton Muffin.
 The Shavelson Model Revised. 1996. Byrne Barbara M. and
 Gavin.

The Impact of Socio-economic and Academic Factors on Self-Concept Formation at the Hashemite University Students

*Sameh Mahafza and Zuhair Al-zoapi**

ABSTRACT

This study aims at investigating the factors that affect the formation of self-concept at the Hashemite University Students. It also aims to know if there were statistical significant differences in forming self-concept due to sex, family size, residence, family income, college, students' academic level, and students' accumulative average.

The population consisted of (14892) student enrolled at Hashemite University in the academic year 2005/2006. The sample consisted (751) students.

To investigate the impact of the above factors on shaping self-concept, a questionnaire was developed from AL-Wahabi scale (1999). In analyzing the data obtained, the researchers utilized means, standard deviation as well as t- test and ANOVA.

The findings of the study revealed that:

- The ranking of self-concept dimensions of the Hashemite University students is respectively as follows: behavior, self-acceptance, identity, self-personality, ethical self, critical self, physical self and family self.
- There were statistical significant differences among males and females on the dimensions of social and critical self in favor of males.
- There were statistical significant differences among rural and urban students on the dimensions of: ethical self, personality self, family self, and social self, in favor of rural students.
- There were statistical significant differences among students with regard to family income variable on the dimensions of family self and social self, in favor of families with high income.
- There were statistical significant differences among students of scientific and humanistic colleges on the dimensions of personality self, family self, self criticism and behavior, in favor of students of scientific colleges, and in favor of humanistic colleges on the dimension of physical self.
- There were statistical significant differences among first year and fourth year students in favor of students of first year on the dimensions of physical self, family self, self criticism, identity and self acceptance.
- Finally, there were statistical significant differences with regard to student accumulative average on the personality self and social self dimensions in favor of students with high accumulative average.

Keywords: Self concept, The Hashemite University, Socio-Economic and Academic Factors.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan; Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan. Received on 27/7/2006 and Accepted for Publication on 9/1/2007.