

*

82

-1

(Gardner, 1990)

(Kotter, 1990:103)

(Living (1982)
 وتزدهر System)
 -2 -1 :
 -3
 (Scott, 1981)

*)
) .2005/1/27 2004/9/4
 .(2004/2003

...

84 (9)
 %85.7 72 (Social Constructionists)
 %14.3 12
 - 20 (Calder, 1977; Meindle,
 2004 (Meindle, 1990) 1990)
 295
 34
 265
 30
 102 122 13
 20 %84
 %16 ()
 16
 %6.25 % 93.75 .(32)
)
 .(2004
 (Lumpkin, 1984)
 . (7 :1998)
 (Dolan, 1997)
 1966
 (Representation Theory) (Kalifeh, 1986)
 1992
 . (Conner, 2001) 252
 12 26
 240

()

-6

-1

= α

-2

0.05

(1998)

()

= α

-3

0.05

-4

0.05= α

:

-1

-5

0.05= α

()

-2

-6

0.05= α

-3

-4

:

-5

-1

-2

-2

(Blinde, 1989:37)

(Gendered Sport Culture)

(Everhart

-3

and Pemperton, 2001)

(Lumpkin, 1984; Glenn and Weiss, 1992;

-4

Revail, 1998)

(Megaree, 1969; Theberge, 1987, 1990; Fasting, 1995; Kathlene, 1995; Rosenthal, 1997, 1998; Bloor (1998) and Brown, 1994)

(Lumpkin, 1984; Aburden and Naisbitt, 1992)

-5

-6

(Hoferek, 1986)

-7

-8

Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for

1971 Women (AIAW)

(Festle, 1996)

(Title 9 " : 1972 IX)

(Fasting, 1995) 1994 ."

9

(Brighton Declaration on Women in .Sport) (Hill, 1993:49)

:(Leadership in Sport) - -2 -1 :

-3

1987

)

(1980

(Education, Training and :Development) - -1

-2

(International Olympic Committee, 1997) (IOC) 1996 (Council of Europe, 1996:9)

- 105 .

1989

31 .(Ibid, 1996:11)

2000 (Fasting, 1995)

%10 %28

. 2005 %20 %9 %12

%8

%3

...

1996

-

2001

1996

)

.(2001 2000 1999 1996 1995

:

)

(

2004

5

:

.(2004)

% 80

%20

(20)

%33

%

1966

"

"

.(Kalifeh, 1986)

-3

1995

1996

1999

2000

(AIAW)

:

" :

.

25

(Bernay and Cantor, 1992)

(Theberge, 1987, 1990)

49

:

(Blout and Browne,

1994)

. 1972

5

70

%7

(Aburdene and Naisbitt, 1992)

. 1991

(Kathlene, 1995; Rosenthal, 1995, 1998)

(Goktepe and Schneier, 1989;

Wentworth and Anderson, 1984; Carbonell, 1984,

Theborg, 1977)

(Blout and Browne, 1994)

(Kent and Moss, 1994)

(Megargee, 1969)

(Burns, 1987;

(Burns, 1987)

Theberge, 1987, 1990)

%69

%88

:

%25

(Megargee, 1969)

:

(Carbonell, 1984; Fleischer and Cherkoff, 1986; Nyquist and Spence, 1986) (Wentworth and Anderson, 1984)

)

. (2002

-4

20

166)

186

(Fleischer and Cherkoff, 1986)

.(20

(Dobbins, Long, Dedrick and Clemons, 1990)

%44.1 (15 67) 82

:

:(Brenner et al., 1989; Chusmir and Koberg, 1991)

28

.(4 24)

:

.(Karabik, 1990)

.(11 43) 54

(1)

% 34.1	28	-
% 65.9	54	-
% 100	82	
% 81.7	67	-
% 18.3	15	-
% 100	82	
%9.8	08	-
%12.2	10	-
%50	41	-
%19.5	16	-
%8.5	07	-
%100	82	
%45.1	37	5 -
%34.1	28	10 - 5 -
%20.8	17	10 -
%100	82	
%78	64	-
%22	18	-
%100	82	

(Wienberg and Gould, 1999), (Pierce and Newstorm, . (1)

.2003)

: -2

- / -

- - :

-1

-3

12 : 55) (1998)

15 : 17 (Parks, Zanger (2004) (2002

. 11 and Quarterman, 1998) (Newstorm and Davis, 1997)

(2)

18 =

**0.797	0.63	0.68	3.73	3.81	/
**0.856	0.63	0.68	3.61	3.66	
**0.839	0.65	0.67	3.78	3.81	
**0.703	0.62	0.63	3.65	3.80	
**0.859	0.61	0.64	3.69	3.77	

.01 = α

**

2004/7/25 -7/1

82

104

.(30 - 13)

-4

- 31)

15 :

-3

7

10

.(45

3

13 :

-4

.(58 - 46)

:

(4)

(5)

(2)

(3)

(10)

(1)

-5

1996

)

7

.(2003

1996

% 80

)

9

% 80

- % 70

)

(

% 70

- % 60

(

% 60

- % 50

% 50

58

Content

:

55

Validity

12 :

/

-1

.(12 - 01)

18 :

-2

(3)

/ :

	2	%81.4	0.83	4.07		1
	4	%80.2	0.78	4.01		2
	8	%77.4	0.87	3.87		3
	5	%79.4	0.83	3.87		4
	11	%73.4	0.94	3.67		5
	10	%75.0	0.92	3.75		6
	1	%82.0	0.76	4.10		7
	3	%80.6	0.84	4.03		8
	9	%76.8	0.90	3.84		9
	12	%71.8	0.87	3.59		10
	6	%77.8	0.75	3.89		11
	7	%77.8	0.79	3.89		12
		%77.8	0.63	3.89		

:

	4	%77.2	0.98	3.86		13
	5	%77.0	0.98	3.85		14
	15	%72.6	1.02	3.63		15
	17	%70.8	1.06	3.54		16
	8	%76.0	0.95	3.80		17
	1	%79.4	0.98	3.97		18
	13	%73.8	1.06	3.69		19
	10	%74.6	0.88	3.73		20
	18	%69.6	1.01	3.48		21
	12	%74.2	1.03	3.71		22
	14	%73.0	10.1	3.65		23
	7	%76.2	1.00	3.81		24
	16	%71.4	1.12	3.57		25
	2	%79.2	0.88	3.96		26
	6	%76.4	0.89	3.82		27
	3	%77.8	0.94	3.89		28
	11	%74.2	0.93	3.71		29
	9	%75.0	0.94	3.75		30
		%74.4	0.81	3.72		

...

:

	1	%80.3	0.88	4.01		31
	2	%79.6	0.82	3.98		32
	8	%77.2	0.87	3.86		33
	11	%76.4	0.91	3.82		34
	7	%77.2	0.97	3.86		35
	10	%76.4	0.86	3.82		36
	5	%78.2	0.83	3.90		37
	4	%78.2	0.96	3.91		38
	12	%75.8	0.95	3.79		39
	3	%79.2	0.90	3.96		40
	13	%75.2	0.92	3.76		41
	9	%77.0	0.92	3.85		42
	15	%72.6	1.09	3.63		43
	6	%77.4	1.07	3.87		44
	14	%74.0	0.97	3.70		45
		%77.0	0.73	3.85		

:

	1	%79.0	0.90	3.95	/	46
	3	%76.4	0.86	3.82		47
	4	%76.2	0.97	3.81		48
	8	%74.2	0.96	3.71		49
	6	%76.0	0.92	3.80		50
	5	%76.2	0.90	3.81		51
	12	%71.8	1.00	3.59		52
	13	%71.6	1.01	3.58		53
	10	%73.0	1.00	3.65		54
	9	%74.0	0.90	3.70		55
	2	%77.8	0.93	3.89		56
	11	%72.8	1.07	3.64		57
	7	%74.8	0.91	3.74		58
		%75.0	0.80	3.75		
	---	%76.0	0.70	3.80		

(Tukey) - (Test - Retest) 18

9) 9

-5 (

2004/6/21 - 6/1

(Pearson Correlation)

0.703 0.839 0.856 0.797

0.859

0.01 = α

(2)

(3)

(3) :

-1

%82 .(/) -

%69.6 .() : -

" (7)) : -

" (1) (%82) .(-

" (8) (%81.4) " - 5 5) : -

- (%80.6) " .(10 10 -

" (31) .() : -

- (%80.3) " -

" (2) -2

- (%80.2) " -

% 80

" (21)

(%69.6) "

(SPSS)

:

-

%71.8 - %82

1) (Independent T - () -

(8 7 2) Test) -

%77.8 (One - way Anova) -

(31)

. %77 - %69.6 - % 79.4
 - %79 - %71.6 %74.4 (21)
 . %75 - %72.6 - % 80.3

(4)

82 = (" ")

	" "		28 = :		54 = :		
0.78	0.28	0.04	0.66	0.92	0.62	3.88	
0.13	1.5	0.28	0.70	3.91	0.84	3.66	
0.18	1.33	0.23	0.68	4.00	0.74	3.77	
0.02	*2.31	0.42	0.63	4.03	0.84	3.61	
0.13	1.5	0.24	0.63	3.96	0.71	3.72	

.1.99 = 0.05 = α " "

%77.8
 %74.4
 %77.8 " "
 %77 " "
 " " "
 " " %76

(Theborg, 1977; Carbonell, 1984; Hoferek,
 .1986; Powell, 1993)
 (1998)

.%74.4

" :
 0.05 = α

" ()

1996

" "

(Wentworth and Anderson, 1984)

.(4)

(Fleischer and Cherkoff, 1986)

(4)

0.05 = α

"

"

" :

0.05 = α

2.31

" "

0.05 = α

"

" "

.(5)

(5)

0.05 = α

" "

" "

"

" "

" "

"

2.95 2.33 2.82 3.15 2.68

" "

0.05 = α

(Representation Theory)

(5)

" "

82 =

	" "		15 = :		67 = :		
0.009	*2.68	0.47	0.67	4.27	0.59	3.80	
0.002	*3.15	0.69	0.75	4.29	0.76	3.60	
0.006	*2.82	0.86	0.67	4.31	0.70	3.75	
0.022	*2.33	0.52	0.78	4.18	0.78	3.66	
0.004	*2.95	0.56	0.69	4.26	0.65	3.70	

.1.99 = 0.05 = α

" "

(6)

82 =

0.57	4.00	7		
0.59	4.012	16		
0.66	3.94	41		
0.49	3.57	10		
0.69	3.62	8		
0.57	3.76	7		
0.66	3.97	16		
0.76	3.88	41		
0.87	3.32	10		
1.07	3.27	8		
0.73	3.95	7		
0.54	4.05	16		
0.70	3.96	41		
0.84	3.24	10		
0.80	3.66	8		
0.93	4.03	7		
0.65	4.33	16		
0.78	4.17	41		
0.97	3.23	10		
1.07	3.95	8		
0.63	3.93	7		
0.58	4.12	16		
0.70	3.99	41		
0.71	3.34	10		
0.80	3.63	8		

.2.49 = 0.05 = α

" "

(7)

82=

	" "					
0.169	1.65	0.65	4	2.63		
		0.39	78	31.02		
			82	33.66		
0.085	2.12	1.29	4	5.18		
		0.61	78	47.54		
			82	52.73		
0.040	*2.64	1.32	4	5.30		
		0.50	78	39.13		
			82	44.43		
0.018	*3.16	2.16	4	8.66		
		0.68	78	53.47		
			82	62.13		
0.045	*2.56	1.12	4	4.86		
		0.47	78	37.01		
			82	41.87		

.249 = 0.05 = α

" "

(8)

	0.81	-	
	0.72	-	
	1.10	-	
	0.94	-	
	0.77	-	

" :

0.05 = α

"

(Dobbins, Long, Dereick and Clemans,

1990)

(7) (6)

(9)

82 =

0.62	3.76	37	5	
0.66	3.99	28	10 - 5	
0.56	4.02	17	10	
0.81	3.60	37	5	
0.87	3.88	28	10 - 5	
0.66	3.72	17	10	
0.70	3.75	37	5	
0.85	3.90	28	10 - 5	
0.56	3.98	17	10	
0.77	3.066	37	5	
0.90	3.77	28	10 - 5	
0.68	3.92	17	10	
0.69	3.69	37	5	
0.78	3.88	28	10 - 5	
0.53	3.91	17	10	

(10)

82 =

	" "					
032	1.04	0.46	2	0.93		
		0.40	80	32.72		
			82	33.66		
0.40	0.78	0.50	2	1.01		
		0.54	80	1.72		
			82	52.73		
0.60	0.50	0.27	2	0.55		
		0.54	80	43.88		
			82	44.43		
0.65	0.41	0.32	2	0.64		
		0.76	80	61.49		
			82	62.13		
0.54	0.60	0.31	2	0.62		
		0.51	80	41.24		
			82	41.87		

.3.11 = 0.05 = α " "

(11)

" "

82 =

	" "		18 = :		64 = :		/
0.25	1.14	0.19	0.56	3.74	0.64	3.93	
0.33	0.97	0.21	0.82	3.56	0.80	3.77	
0.21	1.25	0.24	0.59	3.66	0.75	3.90	
0.03	*2.14	0.45	0.80	3.40	0.78	3.85	
0.14	1.48	0.27	0.64	3.59	0.70	3.86	

.199 = 0.05 = α

" "

(6)

.005 = α

(7)

0.05 = α

" :

0.05 = α

" "

" "

" "

2.56 3.16 2.64

(Tukey)

(8)

(8)

0.05 = α

(10) (9)

(9)

(10)

0.05 = α

-6

" "

0.60 0.41 0.50 0.78 1.04
0.05= α

:

-1

" ;
0.05 = α

-2

" "

-3

((11))
(11)
0.05= α

-4

2.14 " "
0.05= α

-5

:

" "

" "

.1.99

:

-

-

- Hill, L.K. 1993. Nov/Dec. Women in Sport: Backlash or Megatrend? *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 64.9: 49-52.
- Hoferek, M. J. 1986. *Going Forth*, Pennington, NJ; Princeton.
- International Olympic Council. 1997. Women and The Olympic Movement. International Olympic Committee, <http://www.Olympic.org/lefwomen.html>.
- IOC World Conference on Women in Sport (in press) ICSSPE Bulletin. Ladies Professional Golf Association. Daytana Beach. Fla.
- Kalifeh, Suha. M. 1986. The History of Organized Sports in Jordan. Unpublished Doctoral Disseertation, Miami University, Coral Gables, Fla.
- Karabik, K. 1990. Androgyny and Leadership Style. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9: 283-292.
- Kathelene, Lyn. 1995. Alternative Views of Crime: Legislative Policy Mating in Gender Terms, *Journal of Politics*, 57: 696-723.
- Kent, R. L., and Moss, Sherry, E. 1994. Effect of Sex and Gender Role on Leader Emergency, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (5) 1335-1346.
- Kotter, J. P. 1990. What Leaders Really Do. *Harvard Business Review*, 68 (3): 103-111.
- Lumpkin, A. 1984. Historical Perspectives of Female Participation in Youth Sport. Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Educaion, Recreation, and Dance, Anaheim, CA. ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. EO. 243 878.
- Megargee, E. I. 1969. The Effect of Selfmonitoring, Sex, and Gender Role on Leader Emergence, Working Paper, Florida International University, Main, Fla.
- Meindle, J. R. 1990. On Leadership: An Alternative to the Conventional Wisdom, *Research on Organizational Behavior*, 12: 159-203.
- Newstorm, John. W. and Davis, Keith. 1997. Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work. 10th (ed), McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Nyquist, L. V., and Spence, J. T. 1986. Effect of Dispositional Dominance and Sex Role Expectation on Leadership Behavior, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50: 87-93.
- O'Conner, Karen. 2001. Women and Congress: Running, Winning and Ruling, *Women and Politics*, 23 (1/2): In Stow, B. H. and Salanick, G. R. (EDS). New Directions in Organizational Behavior, Chicago, St. Clair, 179-204.
- Carbonell, J. L. 1984. Sex Role and Leadership Revisited, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 44-49.
- Chusmir, L. H. and Koberg, C. S. 1991. Relationship between Self-Confidence and Sex-Role Identity Among Managerial Women and Men, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 161: 781-790.
- Coasta, D. Margaret and Gathrie, Sharon, R. 1994. Women in Sport Interdisciplinary Perspectives, *Human Kinetics*, Champaign, IL: 370-371.
- Council of Europe. 1996. Sport Information Bulletin, 8 (4.2), Brussels, Belgium, Sport for All, Clearing House 9.
- Dobbins, G. H., long, W. S., Dedrick, E. J., and Clemons, T. C. 1990. The Role of Self-Monitoring and Gender on Leader Emergence: A Laboratory and Field Study, *Journal of Management*, 16: 607-618.
- Dolan, Julie. 1997. Support for Women Interest in the 103rd Congress: The Distinct Impact of Congressional Women, *Women and Politics*, 18 (4): 81-94.
- Everhart, Robert and Pemberton, Cynthia Lee, Winter. 2001. The Institutionalization of a Gender Blazed Sport Value System, *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*, 1-10.
- Fasting, K. 1995. European Women in Sport: Monitoring The Implementation of the Recommendations Adopted by the 1991 ESC in Oslo. Farsta, Sweden, Sweden Sport Confederation, II.
- Festle, M. J. 1996. *Playing Nice*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Fleischer, P. A. and Cherkoff, J. M. 1986. Effects of Dominance and Sex on Leader Selection In Dyadic Work Group, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50: 94-99.
- Gardner, John, W. 1990. *On Leadership*, New York, N. N., Harper Draw.
- Glenn, S. D. and Weiss, M. R. 1992. Aug. Psychological Development and Females Sport Participation: An Interactional Perspective, *Quest*, 44 (22): 138-157.
- Goktepe, J. R., and Schneier, C. E. 1989. Role of Sex, Gender Roles, and Attraction in Predicting Emergent Leaders, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 165-167.

- Integrative Leadership in State Legislatures, New York, Oxford University Press .
- Scott, Wiliam. 1981. Organization Theory: A Structural and Behavioral Analysis, Illinois, Richard Irwin.
- Theberge, N. 1987. Nov. Feminist Change and the Mobility of Women to Leadership Positionin Sport: The Case of Coaching, *The Sociology of Sport*, Edmonton, AB.
- Theberge, N. Coaching, *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 15: 59-75.
- Theborg, J. R. 1977. Women in Management: A Research Review, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62: 647-664.
- Weinberg, Robert, and Gould, Daniel. Foundation of Sport and Exercise Psychology. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL., 179-201.
- Wentworth, D. K., and Anderson, L. R. 1984. Emergent Leadership as a Function of Sex and Task Type. *Sex Role*, 11: 513-523.
- 167-179.
- Parks, Janet. B., Zanger, Beverly, R. K., and Quarterman, Jerome. 1998. Contemporary Sport Management, Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL.
- Pierce, Jon. L., and Newstorm, John. W. 2003. Leadership and the Leadership Process, McGraw-Hill Companies Inc, New York.
- Powel, G. N. 1993. Women and Men in Management (2nd. ed), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Revaill, G., and Zimmerman, J. 1998. Raising our Athletic Daughters: How Sport can Build Self-esteem and Save Girls Lives. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Rosenthal, Cindy, Simon. 1995. Alternative Views of Crime: Legislative Policy Making in Gender Terms, *Journal of Politics*, 57: 696-723.
- Rosenthal, Cindy, Simon. 1997. A View of Their Own: Women's Committee Leadership Styles and State Legislative, *Policy Studies Journal*, 25: 585-600.
- Rosenthal, Cindy. Simon. 1998. When Women Lead:

Attitudes of Sport Leaders in Executive Boards of Jordanian Sport Federations Towards Women Leadership Position in the Sport Organizations

*Suha A. Issa**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify attitudes of sport leaders in the executive boards of Jordanian sport federations towards appointing women in leadership positions in the sport organizations, based on the degree of their agreement that women possess leadership traits and skills. Also, it aimed to identify the difference in their attitudes according to the study variables, sport type, sex, qualifications, experience and sport participation.

The "attitudinal questionnaire towards appointing women in leadership position in sport organizations" developed by the researcher was applied to a purposive sample of 82 sport leaders. Means, standard deviations, percentages, T-test, and analysis of variance were used to answer the questions of the study. Results showed that the attitudes of leaders were high towards women's leadership skills, significant differences in their attitudes were found in relation to sport type, in favor of game sport's federations, sex type in favor of female leaders and, in qualification, in favor of leaders holding master and bachelor degrees. No significant differences were found in relation to work and sport experience.

Recommendations were presented to the Jordanian Olympic Committee and other sport organizations to develop their structural measures and policies to support the participation of Jordanian women in leadership position in sport organizations.

* Faculty of Physical Education , University of Jordan. Received on 4/9/2004 and Accepted for Publication on 27/1/2005.