

*

(679)

)

(

:

)

(2003

) "

"

(D011)

(2007

"

(2004

)

(2005

Goudas, 2006)

.www. almarefah. com

"

(2007

)

.2009/12/23

2009/6/22

*

/

(Woodhouse, 2005)

(Navartnam and

()

Oconnor, 1993)

()
(%21

(28)

(132)

()

(2002)

(2007)

(3) -
(2007) -
(130) -
(2006) -
(215) -
(2006) () -
(514) :
: .
.2009 -1-7 2008-10-12 :
(1998)
(2009)
(184)
(%69)
(150)
(6)
(1998)

	:				
	.)	-	(156)	
	.(:
	.		-		.
	:				(71)
	:				
2009)		-		
	.(Alssker,1985 1996	2006			(%92-%70.4)
2009)		-)
	.(Alssker,1985				
)		-	()
	.(2007	2006	1998		(
					(1996)
	.(1998)			
	:				
(1998	Alssker, 1985)		-	(398)	
)	
(2009)				(
	.				.
					(Alssker, 1985)
	:		-		(200)
	:				

(1)

832	406	396		
856	447	409		
1080	700	480		
632	280	352		
3470	1833	1637		

:

(2)

(679)

(%20)

(2)

%23	185	100	85		
%19	166	92	74		
%17	181	104	77		
%20	147	81	66		
%20	679	377	302		

(3)

%27	185		
%24	166		
%26	181		
%22	147		
%28	192		
%27	185		
%27	182		
%18	120		
%22	150		
%44	302		
%23	156		
%10	71		
%47	320		
%53	359		
%16	107		
%84	572		

(5)

0.79	0.88	3.88	0.82	3.17	
0.76	0.68	3.84	0.60	3.55	
0.73	0.84	3.56	0.48	3.21	
0.82	0.76	4.51	0.81	4.25	
0.84	0.81	4.41	0.75	4.14	

.0443=(0.05> α) *

: (SPSS)
 :
 : ()
 -

(6)

3	%82	0.88	4.10		1
1	%91	0.75	4.55		2
1	%91	0.66	4.55		3
4	%80	0.81	4.02		4
6	%73	0.91	3.67		5
5	%80	0.78	4.01		6
2	%88	0.87	4.42		7
%85		0.81	4.23		

(%85)

(6)

(%91-%73)

(7)

1	%92	0.99	4.60		1
2	%91	0.91	4.55	.	2
4	%80	0.83	4.01	.	3
3	%82	0.81	4.11	.	4
5	%73	0.94	3.63		5
6	%68	0.82	3.41	.	6
4	%80	0.81	4.00	.	7
6	%68	0.71	3.40		8
%79		0.85	3.96		

(%92-%80) (7)
 -%68) (6 5)
 (%73
 (%79) (4 3 2 1)
 (8)

4	%78	0.86	3.88		1
5	%71	1.88	3.55		2
3	%80	0.83	4.01		3
6	%60	0.89	3.01		4
7	%60	0.91	3.01		5
1	%84	1.02	4.20		6
3	%82	0.95	4.10		7
2	%83	0.77	4.15		8
3	%80	0.75	3.98		9
%75		0.95	%3.43		

(7 6 5 4) (8)
 (%78-%60)
 (%75) (3 2 1) (%84-%80)
 (9)

4	%80	0.77	4.01		1
5	%62	0.63	3.10		2
1	%91	0.82	4.55		3
3	%82	0.81	4.10		4
1	%91	0.95	4.55		5
2	%84	0.87	4.20		7
	%82	0.88	4.08		

(%82) (9)
 - (4 3 2 1) (%91-%80)
 (%62) (5)
 (10)

*0.455	*0.285	*0.211	*0.755	0.166	0.1.20	
*0.387	*0.298	*0.241	*0.647	0.167	0.155	
*0.253	*0.267	*0.247	*0.569	0.189	0.160	
0.177	0.151	0.189	*0.421	0.128	0.141	

.0194=(0.05> α) *

(0.285) (0.211) (10)
 (0.455)
 : 0.194 =(0.05> α)
 -
 (0.647) (0.755)
 (0.298) (0.241) (0.647)
 (0.387) (0.421) (0.569)
 -
 (0.755)

(0.421) (0.569)
 - (0.267) (0.247)
) (0.253)
 ()

(11)

()

				(298)	
				(381)	
	0.20	0.88	4.29		
		0.71	4.35		
	0.18	0.98	4.01		
		0.95	4.10		
	0.47	0.92	3.88		
		0.82	3.74		
	0.48	1.11	3.55		
		1.21	3.64		

.196=(0.05> α) () *

() () (11)

(12)

()

				(107)	
				(572)	
	0.45	0.98	4.20		
		1.20	3.55		
	0.11	1.51	4.11		
		1.81	3.88		
	0.64	1.82	4.11		
		1.79	3.52		
	0.52	0.95	4.55		
		1.06	3.17		

.196 =(0.05> α) () *

() () (12)

(13)

16.99	100.96	3	302.89		
	5.94	675	4012.69		
		678	4315.58		
17.73	73.77	3	221.31		
	4.16	675	2814.15		
		678	3035.45		
10.04	66.40	3	199.21		
	6.61	675	2315.34		
		678	2514.55		
12.99	40.41	3	121.25		
	3.11	675	2101.10		
		678	2222.35		

.2.6=(0.05>a)

*

(13)

(14)

0.59	0.35	0.50	-	4.60	
0.09	0.15	-	-	4.10	
0.24	-	-	-	4.25	
-	-	-	-	4.01	
0.78	0.49	0.50	-	4.40	
0.02	0.29	-	-	3.60	
0.29	-	-	-	3.91	
-	-	-	-	3.62	
0.26	0.32	0.61	-	4.21	
0.35	0.29	-	-	3.60	
0.06	-	-	-	3.89	
-	-	-	-	3.95	
0.29	0.21	0.54	-	4.20	
0.25	0.33-	-	-	3.66	
0.18	-	-	-	3.99	

...

-	-	-	-	3.81		
---	---	---	---	------	--	--

(14)

(0.49) (0.50)
.(0.78)

-

(0.32) (0.61)
.(0.26)

:

-

(0.21) (0.54)
.(0.29)

(0.39)

(0.50)
.(0.59)

(15)

1.55	1.07	3	3.10		
	0.69	675	470.04		
		678	480.14		
1.72	1.00	3	3.00		
	0.58	675	339.73		
		678	342.73		
1.71	0.84	3	2.54		
	0.49	675	334.52		
		678	337.06		
1.78	1.02	3	3.06		
	0.57	675	390.20		
		678	40.26		

.2.6= (0.05>α) *

) () (15)
.(

(16)

13.72	79.2	3	237.85		
	5.77	675	3897.91		

		678	27682.91		
14.16	96.19	3	288.58		
	6.79	675	4583.51		
		678	4872.09		
10.66	70.48	3	211.44		
	6.61	675	5943.72		
		678	6155.16		
2.19	26.40	3	79.22		
	12.03	675	8123.10		
		678	8202.32		

.2.6= (0.05> α) *

) () (16)
 .((17)

1.49	0.99	0.47	-	3.21	
1.02	0.52	-	-	3.68	
0.50	-	-	-	4.20	
-	-	-	-	4.70	
1.04	0.66	0.58	-	3.36	
0.78	0.08	-	-	3.94	
0.38	-	-	-	4.02	
-	-	-	-	4.40	
1.04	0.78	0.06	-	3.16	
1.02	0.72	-	-	3.22	
0.26	-	-	-	3.94	
-	-	-	-	4.20	
0.75	0.72	0.03	-	3.19	
0.72	0.69	-	-	3.22	
0.13	-	-	-	3.81	
-	-	-	-	3.94	

: (17)

-

				...	
			(0.78)		(0.38)
				(1.49)	
	(7)				-
(1)		(%79)	(1.02)		(0.50)
				(1.04)	
		(2)			-
	(%91)		(0.26)		
				(1.02)	
					(1.04)
					-
			(0.72)		(0.13)
				(0.75)	
	(6)				
		(%68)			-
(%75)	(8)			(6)	
(1)			(%85)		
			2)		
(%83)	(2)	(%84)			(3)
			(%91)		
			(1)		
(7 6)					
	(%60)			(1)	

(9)

(%82)

(1)

(%91)

(5)

(%62)

(2009)

(2006)

)

(2009

)

(2006

-

1996)

(Alssker,1985

(10)

()

()

)
(
(11)

)

(

.(2009

2006

)

(16)

(12)

()

()

.(17)

()

.(2009

)

(13)

()

()

(2009

)

.(14)

:

-

-

(2006

)

-

(1996

)

(15)

2007

.(4)

2006

2007

.(4) (8)

2002

2000

2009

.(56) (14)

1998

2007

2006

.(4)

Woodhouse, David. 2005. Introduction to Australian Universities Quality Agency and Quality Audit, Lecture, Accreditation Council, Jordan. .3

Goudas, M. Dermizaki, I. Leondari, A. and Danish, S. 2006. The Effectiveness of Teaching a Life Skills Program in a Physical Education Context, *European Journal of Physical of Education*, XXI. 4. 429-438. . 2007

Navartnam, K. and Oconnor, R. 1993. Quality assurance in vocational of education, education- meeting the needs of the minute's vocational aspect, *Journal of Education*, 45 (2):59-60. . 1996

Alasker, W. 1985. Differences in perception of values toward sport participation between Jordanian and American College students Siu University, master thesis published, Siu University. . 2003

2000

.(56) (14)

2004

2004 www.almarefah.com .

2005

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Curriculums Areas for Team Game In Relation to the Social Values in Light of the Total Quality Programs

*Abdelsalam Jaber Hussein**

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluating the effectiveness of curriculums areas for team games in relation to the social values in light of the total quality programs. The descriptive approach was used. The study sample consisted of the 679 student from the faculty of physical education of the University of Jordan.

Data analysis shower that the effectiveness of team games in light of the total quality programs Became in a high and very high levels and that there was a significant relationship between the curriculum areas social values domains. It was revealed that there were no significant difference in the study variables according to sex, practice, and specialization, rather significant differences reveled according to the university variable in favor of faculty of physical education of the University of Jordan in addition to significant differences reveled according to devilmnt level in favor of the excellent category compared to the other categories.

Keywords: Curriculums, Team Games, Value.

* Faculty of Physical Education, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Received on 22/6/2009 and Accepted for Publication on 23/12/2009.