REPRESENTATIONAL SYSTEMS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO SELF-EFFICIANCY OF PRACTITIONERS AND NON-PRACTITIONERS STUDENTS OF SPORTS IN KURDISTAN

Fattin Ali Al-Kaki

College of Physical Education/ Khanaqin University of Garmian

Email: sadps566@yahoo.com

Abstract

The representational systems can be defined as the ways that are favored by learners in receiving and processing information and interact with them as a technique or style to resolve the problem or situations that they face. While the self-efficiency is defined as knowing one's own expectations and ability to overcome the various tasks successfully, and self-contentment and ability to control and overcome the difficult problems that he is facing. In speaking about the researcher's experience as being an instructor in one of Kurdistan universities she found that there are differences in the self-efficiency between practitioners and non-practitioners of sports in the educational institution. Therefore, she decided to conduct a study on representational systems and their relationships with self-efficiency , Thus, the research aims to recognize the favorite representational systems and the self-efficiency of the research sample depending on the variables (gender, academic specialization). The research sample consisted of (336) students from both practitioners and non-practitioners of the students of sports from (scientific, humanitarian and Physical education) departments. The scale of representational system has been built and the scale of representational systems has been built and the psychometric features has been verified and took out its validity and reliability. Then the researcher applied the two scales on the basic sample of the research and copied the data and processed the results statically. The study results: The practitioner students of sports of Physical Education prefer the representational system (kinetic sense) on the rest of the systems, while the non-practitioners of the students of sports prefer the representational system (visual) on the rest of the other systems, besides, the practitioners of sports outperform the non-practitioners in the self-efficiency morally.

The research aims:

1.Recognize the favorite representational systems and the self-efficiency of the research sample depending on the variables (gender, academic specialization).

2. Recognize the significance of the statistical differences in representational systems and self-efficiency of the research sample depending on the variables (gender, academic specialization).

3.Recognize the relationship between representational systems connectivity depending on variables (gender, academic specialization) and its relationship with self-efficiency of the research sample.

The researcher used a descriptive survey method and the sample consisted of (336) students from both practitioners and non-practitioners of the students of sports from (scientific, humanitarian and Physical education) departments. To achieve the objectives of the study a scale of representational systems has been built and the researcher verified the psychometric features of the scale and took out its validity and reliability. Then the researcher applied the two scales on the basic sample of the research and copied the data and processed the results statically. The study results revealed a number of conclusions, including:

*Sport practitioners who are students of physical education prefer representational system (kinetic- sense) on the rest of the systems then visual, audio systems.

*Non-practitioners who are students of scientific and humanitarian departments preferred the visual representative system than the rest of other systems followed by the kinetic-sense system then audio sense.

*The practitioners of the sport Out-perform a non-practitioner in self-efficiency internally.

*There is a morale relationship with between the representational systems (visual and kinetic-sense) from one side and self-efficiency from the other side.

Key words: Representational systems, self-efficiency, relation, practitioners, non-practitioners of sports.

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of learning styles is an important field , it has a distinct and a direct connection related to the life of the individual and its compatibility with himself and his interaction with his environment and with others, these variables will help learners to manage learning positions more efficiently and effectively, since the different characteristics, attributes and abilities of students increases the need for diversity of educational means ,because there are those who learn best through audio means, and some of them prefer visual means, and some of them learns best by practicing and working. This diversity is needed and desirable to face the individual differences, for the reason that it is difficult for a single way to combine all the stimuli in teaching. Besides, there should be a key demand to take care of the students to help them to reach and get benefit from their maximum potentials, this in turn requires attention to the means of educational technology to face the individual differences among the students and make appropriate method of teaching accessible for each of them according to their educational preferences, being one of the important conditions for the success of the learning process where its helps in achieving the educational goals and the selection of the appropriate teaching means for them as well as creating a state of harmony and interaction between the teacher and the student (Alumran2008).

As for the concept of self-efficiency is reflected through the individual underlying confidence in his abilities through the new situations or the situations which have new and unusual demands that is an important factor in the formation of the behavior of individuals and activate his performance is one of the vectors of human behavior, the individual's belief in his self-effectiveness make him more aggressive and energetic in working and various activities, and do more achievements and have self-esteem and have a high ability to face and control the pressures and be more accurate in making decisions that affecting him and the others to move up in the path of: excellence, then perfection, then charity (Al-nifie ,2010).

From here begins the importance of this study, which is the major issue that concerns the researchers today which is the appropriateness of teaching techniques and methods that are used for the learning styles of the students, and adapt these methods as to make the education easier and more-preserved and have interest to the students, and leads to an appropriate mechanism that will enable us to choose the appropriate academic specialization to the student who goes to study at university for the first time in the light of his personality and learning style, or classify the students or admitting them to achieve psychological and healthy development for them. The importance of this study lies in the core of the subject itself, which is a response to contemporary global trends, where it is the first in-the limits of researcher's knowledge dealing with variables of the current research.

The problem:

The use of representational systems as a means of teaching often raises controversy about any of these systems that would be more effective among the students, especially at the university level where there is diversity in scientific, humanitarian and applied specializations, each of these types have their own ways and various methods , besides the variable gender (male and female) may play an important role in favoring a representational type to another or any of these systems is more favorable for students and the representative systems commonly are (audio, visual, and kinetic sense).Perhaps the difference in the need for representational systems or favoring one on the other is back to the self-efficiency of the students. All these questions represent the main problem of the research, which can be summarized as follows:

*Revealing of any representational systems suitable for students, according to their gender, scientific, humanitarian and applied specializations.

*Revealing of the relationship of each of these systems with self-efficiency of the students, according to their gender, scientific, humanitarian and applied specializations.

The research field:

1.5.1 The human field: (336) students of university from the practitioners and the non-practitioners of the sport in the departments of (scientific, humanitarian and Physical Education) in some universities in Kurdistan region of Iraq.

1.5.2 The temporal field: duration from 19/02/2014 up to 04/26/2015.

1.5.3 The spatial field: classrooms in the universities of Garmian, Sulaimaniya and Salahuddin.

Research methodology and field procedures:

Research methodology: a descriptive method was used so as to be appropriate with the nature of the research.

The research community and its sample: the original community of the research consists of students of three universities and the second, third and fourth stages in the scientific departments, namely, (Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics) and humanitarian (History, Geography, Arabic) and Physical Education from undergraduate level for the academic year (2014 -2015) from the morning studies, the total number were (336) students . As the research sample represented by (112) students of each university distributed into two parts according to the attitude from practicing sports for each of them and by (168) according to gender (males and females) have been distributed in Physical Education to the three universities equally (Garmian, Sulaimaniya and Salahuddin), the rate of (56) students for each university spread over the third and fourth stages and by (28) students for each

stage and distributed by gender to (14) male students and (14) female students. Besides (84) students in the scientific specialization and the same allocated to the humanitarian specialization and distributed to (42) students distributed by gender and stage. And table (1) shows the sample distribution by gender and stages and departments:

Table (1) shows the research sample

The attitude from practicing sports	The specialization	Third stage		Fourth stage		The percentage
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
Non-practitioners of sports (Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics)	Scientific	21	21	21	21	25%
Non-practitioners of sports(History, Geographic, Arabic)	Humanitarian	21	21	21	21	25%
Practitioners of sports (Physical education)	Applied	42	42	42	42	50%
The total number(336)		168		168		100%

Steps of building the representational systems scale:

The construction of any scale passes through several key stages:

- Planning for the scale by identifying axes (dimensions) that covers its items.

-The formulation of the items of each axis.

-The application of items on a representational sample of the research community.

-An analysis of the items of the scale.

Determining and formulating the items of the scale and answer them:

The researcher applied an opened questionnaire to a number of third and fourth stages from some of the scientific and humanitarian departments and Physical Education about the favored representational systems to them and which they feel through facing the practical and theoretical lessons since joining university. The students answered the questionnaire with several answers which the researcher get benefited in forming an idea about the most important representational systems used by students at this stage. Based on scientific analysis of the content of the scientific resources, the researcher determined the questions of the scale, and then applied a closed questionnaire to a number of specialties in sports, educational and psychological sciences, for the purpose of knowing their views on the validity of the items of the study. The researcher depended in formulating the items on the developed method of (Likert) which is similar in choosing from multiple choice, as it offers items for the respondent and asks him to identify his answer by choosing an alternative from several alternatives which have different weights according to the following bases:

- The items must not be long in their terms that lead to boredom in answer.

-The phrase must be in the first person.-

The statement would be subject to one interpretation. -

- Do not use phrases likely to be answered by everyone or by no one, so as not to lose the chance of comparison by the researcher.

-The item must be clear and understood in meaning and purpose.

-The item must not revealing itself.

The drafting of the items of the scale: the researcher prepared a preliminary version of the scale on the basis of previous scales and to suit every items by (28) items and she put three alternatives for answering of each item (visual, audio , kinetic sense).

Validity and suitability of the items : for the purpose of identification of the validity of the items; the scale has been showed in its initial form to the specialties who are experienced and competent in sports in educational and psychological sciences, to find

out their views on each item and its alternatives, and knowing the appropriateness of the items to measure them for the students and through putting the mark () in front of each item and under the suitable alternative (suitable, not suitable, suitable after modification) as well as identify the appropriate adjustment. After collecting the forms, the virtual validity of the scale the scale has been extracted through the value of (Chi square) of the agreement of the experts around the items of the scale, as it has been relying on the value of the (Chi square) after comparing it with tabular value for the purpose of keeping them in the scale, and under this statistical procedure no items of the scale were excluded because they gain the largest proportion of agreement , and the scale becomes as it stands by (28) items. (Table 2) shows that:

Table (2) the views of experts for the validity of items of scale of the representational systems and the value of Chi-square.

Number of the item	Number of the experts	The Approvers	The non-approvers	Percentage of agreement	Value of the calculated Chi	Significance
1,4,8,11,13,21,25,26,28))	**22**	**22**	**Zero**	**100%**	**22**	**Significant**
(3,5,9,12,15,19,23,27)	**22**	**21**	**1**	**95.45%**	**18.18**	**Significant**
(, 6,7,14,16,18,202)	**22**	**18**	**4**	**81.82%**	**8.90**	**Significant**
(17,22,2410)	**22**	**17**	**5**	**77.27%**	**6.45**	**Significant**

*** The value of tabular Chi-square at the degree of freedom at (1) and the percentage of error (0.05) = (3.84).**

The exploratory experiment

An exploratory experiment was conducted on a sample of (12) students from the third and fourth stages by (6) of each stage and (4) for each department in Garmian university to answer the items of the scale which consisting of (28) items. The purpose of conducting the exploratory experiment is to know how clear the items are, and diagnose of the obstacles that may encounter the researcher, as well as identify the time that the person under experiment takes to answer the questions of the scale.

Validity construction: statistical analysis is performed in two ways

The style of the two extreme groups:

The grades of the students has been arranged in descending order to the two of extremes groups, the percentage of (27 %) was selected from the higher grades and minimum grades of (52) students per group to represent the two extreme groups, as the size of each group of the two groups (upper and lower) depends on the appropriate number for the process of statistical analysis, also depends on the total number of answers. Confidence is growing in the item when the statistical analysis done on the (100) examined or more, and becomes less when the number is less than (100). The researcher conducted the (T) test on the two extreme groups in order to know the difference between them. Table (3) illustrates this:

Table (3) The discrimination power of the two style extreme groups for the scale of representational systems

Number of the item	**The Supreme group**		**The minimum group**		**The value of counted (T)**	**The level of significance**	**The discrimination ability of the item**
	Statistical mean	**Standard deviation**	**Arithmetical mean**	**Standard deviation**			
1	**2,477**	**1.209**	**1.332**	**0.837**	**3.905**	**0,001**	**Distinctive**
2	**3,994**	**1.372**	**2.318**	**1.419**	**4.427**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
3	**2,978**	**1.230**	**2.050**	**0.232**	**4.893**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
4	**2,583**	**1.480**	**1.303**	**0.676**	**4.007**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
5	**2,972**	**1.108**	**2.033**	**1.287**	**4.789**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
6	**3,138**	**1.268**	**2.000**	**1.352**	**6.922**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
7	**2,083**	**1.227**	**1.055**	**0.232**	**4.936**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
8	**2,305**	**0.950**	**1.722**	**0.913**	**2.454**	**0,010**	**Distinctive**
9	**3,861**	**1.046**	**2.388**	**1.128**	**5.741**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**

10	**1,855**	**0.333**	**1.500**	**0.941**	**2.671**	**0,009**	**Distinctive**
11	**2,305**	**1.390**	**1.444**	**1.476**	**3.144**	**0,002**	**Distinctive**
12	**3,365**	**1.443**	**2.527**	**1.403**	**3.063**	**0,003**	**Distinctive**
13	**2,869**	**1.150**	**1.472**	**0.654**	**6.298**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
14	**2,567**	**1.198**	**1.705**	**0.576**	**7.016**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
15	**3,944**	**1.119**	**2.305**	**1.166**	**6.081**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
16	**3,527**	**1.133**	**2.083**	**1.204**	**5.241**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
17	**3,121**	**1.218**	**2.311**	**1.837**	**5.635**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
18	**3,750**	**1.441**	**2.320**	**1.878**	**2.666**	**0,010**	**Distinctive**
19	**3,138**	**1.222**	**2.333**	**1.242**	**6.216**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
20	**3,472**	**1.383**	**2.250**	**0.603**	**4.859**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
21	**3,805**	**0.576**	**3.205**	**1.260**	**2.164**	**0,034**	**Distinctive**
22	**2,805**	**1.190**	**1.588**	**0.903**	**3.680**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
23	**2,916**	**1.130**	**1.711**	**0.398**	**4.032**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
24	**3,694**	**1.190**	**2.500**	**1.158**	**4.313**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
25	**3,694**	**1.116**	**2.888**	**1.469**	**2.619**	**0,011**	**Distinctive**
26	**3,111**	**1.237**	**1.555**	**0.734**	**6.487**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
27	**3,638**	**1.046**	**2.222**	**0.929**	**6.075**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**
28	**3,777**	**1.244**	**1.833**	**1.158**	**6.860**	**0,000**	**Distinctive**

Internal consistency coefficient: the simple correlation coefficient (Pearson)was used to extract the consistency coefficient to measure the degree of correlation of each item with the total items' degree of the scale, and the degree of each item with the degree of dimension that it belongs to by using the system of (SPSS) on the computer. As shown in the table (4):

Table (4) shows the values of correlation coefficients for the phrases of the scale with the final grades of the scale

The item	The correlation coefficient	The item	The correlation coefficient	The item	The correlation coefficient	The item	The correlation coefficient
1	0,369	8	0,331	15	0,376	22	0,451
2	0,356	9	0,358	16	0,381	23	0,534
3	0,389	10	0,364	17	0,368	24	0,471
4	0,299	11	0,475	18	0,342	25	0,335
5	0,426	12	0,504	19	0,340	26	0,404
6	0,419	13	0,444	20	0,460	27	0,384
7	0,403	14	0,408	21	0,408	28	0,321

***The tabular value for correlation coefficient in the degree freedom of (190) and level of significance (0.05) = (0.167).**

Stability of the scale:

Re-testing method: the researcher applied the scale on a sample of (12) students who were chosen randomly from a sample scale of Sulaimaniya University community, then re-applied to the same sample after two weeks from the first application, and by using the correlation coefficient (Pearson) between the degrees of the first application and the degrees of the second application, the result of stability factor of the scale was (0.86).

Alpha Cronbach stability coefficient: to calculate the stability of the scale by using Alpha Cronbach's way the contrast counted for each item of the representational systems and the total variation of the scale, the value of reliability coefficient in this way was (0.88) which is a relatively high stability and a good indicator of the consistency and homogeneity of the items.

2. Description and correction of the scale of representational systems:

After carrying out the procedures by the researcher in the previous steps, the scale of representational systems became finalized and consist of (28) items which distributed to each of them (3) alternatives, and the degree (2) has been given for each selection and zero to two the other alternatives. Besides, the total grades ranged for each alternative between (0-56) degrees and this indicates that the greater the degree of the respondent on the alternative it suggests a high tendencies of the student to the method, the more the degree of the respondent reduces refers to the low tendency to this method, thus the scale became in its final form and ready for application on the sample of the study.

3.8 Self-efficiency scale: the researcher adopted the concept of scale of self-efficiency that was designed by (Alwan, 2014) to measure the self-efficiency. The validity factor of the scale has been found through internal consistency coefficient between each individual and the total grades of the scale where correlation factors ranged between (0, 35-.66). Whereas the reliability coefficient has been found by re-testing which reached (0.79) as well as the stability coefficient of the scale reached (0.83) by using (alpha coefficient). Despite that the scale enjoys transactions of validity and good stability and that it has been applied to various Arab and Iraqi communities and other studies on self-efficiency, but the researcher wanted to investigate the standard characteristics of validity and reliability of the scale as follows:

The standard features to measure self-efficiency: validity of scale (virtual validity): to check the validity of the scale and the validity of its items in measuring anything, the scale was displayed on a group of specialized experts and the appendix (1) for the purpose of judging its validity (see appendix 2). To analyze the views of experts on the items of the scale test was used (Ch ^{2}) for one sample, and each item considered to be valid when the calculated value of Chi-square function at the level (0.05), and table 5 shows that:

Table (5) Chi-square test results of the views of specialist experts paragraphs about the validity of items of self-efficiency scale.

Number of item	Number of experts	Approvers	Disapprovers	Percentage of approval	The counted Chi-square	Significance
(1,3,4,8,10,11,13,19,21,25,26)	22	22	Zero	100%	22	Significant
(2,5,7,9,12,15,17,23)	22	21	1	95,45%	18,18	Significant
(6,14,16,18,20,22,24)	22	20	2	90,91%	14,72	Significant

*** The value of tabular Chi-square at the degree of freedom at (1) and the percentage of error (0.05) = (3.84).**

-**The stability of the scale**: the stability of the scale was extracted by the two way retest as follows:

3. Method of re-test:

stability has been found through the application of the scale twice with the interval of (15) days and on a sample of (12) students, who were randomly selected from the departments (scientific and humanitarian and Physical Education) from Gramian, Sulaimaniya and Salahuddin universities. The reliability coefficient has been found by calculating correlation coefficient (Pearson) between the grades of students in the first application and their grades in the second application. The value of reliability coefficient reached (0.83) and this value considered to be acceptable to describe the tool as having good stability.

Alpha Cronbach's method: this equation applied on the degrees of the members of the consistency sample who were (12) students, and the value of the stability coefficient was (0.88) which is a further indication that the stability coefficient of the scale is good.

4. Preparing the scale instructions:

The researcher prepared the scale instructions which shows the way of answering its items and urge the respondent to be accurate in his answers, also the respondents were asked not to leave any item unanswered with no need to mention their names.
The exploratory experiment: the scale applied on a sample of (12) students who were chosen randomly from the students of the third and fourth stages by (6) of each stage and (4) for each department in Garmian University to answer the items of the scale which consisting of (26) items, and the purpose of conducting the exploratory experiment was the same as in the exploratory

experiment to measure the representational systems, and the way of answering was clear and understandable, besides that the time it took to answer reached to (10-12) minutes.

Describing the scale of concept of self-efficiency in its final form and method of correcting it:

The alternatives to answer the items of the scale are: (applies to me completely, applies to me much, applies to me a in a moderate degree, applies to me a little bit, does not apply to me) where the grades (1-5) given to the positive items and reversible for the negative items. The total degree of the scale reached (130) degrees and medium-premise (78) degrees, the minimum degree (26), thus the concept of self-efficiency scale is ready for application to the basic research sample.

Final application of the scale: after completing the building of the representational systems scale and ensuring that self-efficiency is appropriate for the research sample to measure the purpose that was built for, where the scale which has been applied for the period from 03/26/2014 until 31/03/2014 on a sample of (108) students from Garmian, Sulaymaniyah and Salahualdin universities by (36) students from each university divided into 18 (male students) and 18 (female students) and distributed on the third and fourth stages by (9) students from each stage distributed to (practitioners and non-practitioners of sports) by percentage of (50%) for each of them from the research sample. **The statistical means**: The researcher used the computer (SPSS) system to analyze the following data: ((Statistical mean, standard deviation, simple Pearson correlation coefficient Spearman Brown equation, t-test, Chi-square, the percentage, the stability coefficient of Alpha Cronbach, average premise)).

Display, analyze and discuss the results:

1. First goal: identify the favorite representational systems and self-efficiency in the research sample depending on the research variables (gender, and the attitude from practicing sports).

Table (6) the frequencies, percentages of the representational systems for practitioners and non-practitioners of sports, according to academic specialization.

The specialization	Practitioners of sports(Physical education)		Non-practitioners of sports (scientific specialization)		Non-practitioners of sports (humanitarian specialization)		The total	
The representational systems	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Audio	**5**	**4,63%**	**5**	**4,63%**	**6**	**5,55%**	**16**	**14.82%**
Visual	**18**	**16,67%**	**15**	**13,89%**	**13**	**12,04%**	**46**	**42.59%**
Kinetic sense	**31**	**28,70%**	**7**	**6,48%**	**8**	**7,41%**	**46**	**42.59%**
The total	**54**	**50%**	**27**	**25%**	**27**	**25%**	**108**	**100%**

Table (7) the frequencies, percentages o representational systems by gender (males and females).

Gender	(Males)		(Females)		The total	
The representational systems	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Audio	7	6,48%	9	8,34%	16	14,82%
Visual	22	20,37%	24	22,22%	46	42,59%
Kinetic sense	25	23,14%	21	19,45%	46	42,59%
The total	54	50%	54	50%	108	100%

Table (8) frequencies, percentages of self-efficiency between practitioners and non-practitioners of sports, according to academic specialization.

The specialization	Practitioners of sports(Physical education)	Non-practitioners of sports(scientific	Non-practitioners of sports(Humanitarian	The total of non-practitioners of sports

			specialization)		specialization)			
The variable	Statistical mean	Percentage	Statistical mean	Percentage	Statistical mean	Percentage	Statistical mean	Percentage
Self-efficiency	88,47	68,05%	41,39	31,83%	35,34	27,18%	76,73	59,02%
The Total	54	50%	27	25%	27	25%	108	100%

Table (9) frequencies, percentages of self-efficiency by gender.

The specialization	Males		Females			
The variables	Statistical mean	Percentage	Statistical mean	Percentage		
Self-efficiency	80,52	61,94%	61,94%	65,14%		
The total	54	50%	50%	50%	108	100%

Table (10) frequencies, percentages and the results of Chi ^{2} systems of representational systems of practitioners and non-practitioners from sports.

The representational systems	The total number	Attitude from practicing sports		Value of Chi^2		Significance
		Practitioners	Non-practitioners	Calculated	Tabular	
Audio	16	5	11	2,25	3,84	Insignificant
Visual	46	18	28	2,17	3,84	Insignificant
Kinetic sense	46	31	15	5,56	3,84	Significant
Total	108	54	54			

-At the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (2-1 = 1)

Table (11) frequencies, percentages and the results of Chi ^{2} square of representational systems according to gender.

The representational systems	The total number	Gender		Value of Chi^2		Significance
		Males	Females	Calculated	Tabular	
Audio	16	7	9	0,125	3,84	Insignificant
Visual	46	22	24	0,043	3,84	Insignificant
Kinetic sense	46	25	21	0,174	3,84	Significant
Total	108	54	54			

-At the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (2-1 = 1).

Table (12) shows the statistical means, standard deviations, the calculated value of (T), the level of significance and the significance of the differences according to on the attitude from practicing sports inself-efficacy.,

The attitude from practicing sports				The value of (T)	Level of significance	Significance of differences
Practitioners		Non-practitioners				
Statistical mean -	Standard deviation	Statistical mean -	Standard deviation			
88,47	9,17	76,73	8,53	4,26	1,98	Significant

Table (13) shows the statistical means, standard deviations, the calculated value of (T), the level of significance and the significance of the differences according to gender and self-efficiency.

Gender				The value of (T)	Level of significance	Significance of differences
Male		Female				
Statistical mean -	Standard deviation	Statistical mean -	Standard deviation			
80,52	7,69	84,91	8,30	1,89	1,98	Insignificant

Table (14) shows the correlation coefficient between the (practitioners and non-practitioners) and gender (male and female) and the representational systems (audio, visual, kinetic sense) and self-efficiency.

Practitioners	Non-practitioners	Male	Female	Audio	Visual	Kinetic sense	Self-efficiency
1	0,12	0,07	0,06	0,11	0,60*	0,49*	0,56*
2		0,11	0,15	0,21	0,44*	0,24	0,42*
3			0,09	0,04	0,38*	0.21	0,57*
4				0,14	0,39*	0,17	0,65*
5					0,21	0.03	0,16
6						0,37*	0,54-*
7							0,52*

***The value of tabular (R) at 0.095 level of confidence and the degree of freedom (7) equal to 0.35**

5. Discussing the results:

Through viewing and analyzing and the results, the researcher has founded that the method of (kinetic sense) is the favorite one for the practitioner students of sports and this attributed to the fact that this style has relation to the nature of their specialization which requires practical practicing of sport skills which has a direct relation to the senses, muscles and interconnection between them, it is called neuromuscular compatibility. While the visual style was the favorite choice of the sample of non-practitioner students of sports, because this attributed to that the watching of the explained subject and realize it visually which in turn lead the

subject to be absorbed better and more appropriate and remain in the memory longer period. The relative preference of the scientific specialization on the humanitarian is because that the students of scientific specialization have the capacity and the preparations to use the scientific and cognitive information better than students in the humanitarian specialization, and this may due to the nature of the study in addition to the experience and practicing of using scientific and cognitive information to keep up with their scientific specialization and its requirements during the study and that is what caused them to choose the appropriate way to face the learning requirements (Litzinger, 2005).

The researcher attributed the lack of morale differences between males and females to the cognitive motives and considering it as an internal case which existed in both (males and females), and it depends on the cognitive construction of each learner. Since learning opportunities are equal for both, for that reasons random differences between them were founded, which prevails that the prevalent representational systems in universities are equal for both college students between (males and females) and both preferred the two styles (the of kinetic sense, and visual) on audio style. But with respect to the outstanding of practitioner students of sports of physical education on their peers of non-practitioners of sports is due to the fact that the practical process that associates their theoretical lessons are all factors that motivate the student to deal with skill in a direct way in front of the colleagues and possibly other viewers which is an opportunity to prove and challenge themselves and this is not available for non-practitioner students of the sports (Vita, Enza 2002.118). With regard to the relations between research variables, the researcher attributes the relationship between practicing sports and all of the representational systems of (visual and kinetic sense) is the need of the students to these two variables more than the others despite the importance of the third variable which is the (audio), and this positive indicator confirms that the students at the university level are able to diagnose and choose the suitable style for themselves and that develops their potentials, knowledge and information and keeping it for a longest time possible (Bander, 2011:173). While the non-practitioners of sports the relationship was paired with the representational system (visual) being their preferred one because it is one of the most stable methods in their memories compared to the audio manner, while the style (kinetic sense) came after the (visual) which is the opposite choice of practitioners of sports, this shows that the need of students for this type of styles it comes in second place and on the basis of actual need for it or on the basis of being used by the teaching staff for this style (Abu Ghazal, 2008:165).

The relationship between gender (male and female) and the representational systems (visual, kinetic sense) is attributed (by the researcher) to the lack of difference between the both (male and female) because they are subjected to the same tactics, as well as they are studying the same curriculum and are going through the same environmental, social, scientific and cultural circumstances as they are energized form the same source of knowledge, science, and information from relevant literature sources. (Bander, 2011).

The relationship between practitioners and non-practitioners of sports for both (male and female) with the self-efficiency goes back to the fact that the university students at this age stage have gone through the experiences that are enough to know their personal and internal interests and they are careful to get their academic achievement keen and have motives to develop themselves because this has a relation to the vocational and technical future each in his field of specialization. This stage at university will probably be the last chance for them to develop their abilities and their and their knowledge and this would be the basis where the future built upon and everyone is keen to excel, according to his abilities (Abu Al-Nadi 2010:110).

The researcher sees that the relationship between the representational systems (visual, kinetic sense) with each other on the one hand and with the self-efficiency on the other hand, are the most favorite methods at a close level or completely identical. Thus, they go on a one line in terms of direction and strength which in turn applies to the relationship between them and the self-efficiency (Hilal,2011:152).

The Conclusions and recommendations:

6. Conclusions:

-The practitioner students of sports of Physical Education prefer the representational system (kinetic sense) on the rest of the systems followed by the (visual) then the (audio) systems. -Non-practitioners of the students of sports from scientific and humanitarian departments prefer the representational system (visual) on the rest of the other systems and then followed by the (kinetic sense) then the (audio) systems. -The male students prefer the representational system (kinetic sense) on the rest of the other representational systems followed by (visual and audio) systems. -The female students prefer the visual representational system on the rest of the others followed by (kinetic sense then the audio) systems. -The practitioners of sports outperform on the non-practitioners morally in the self-efficiency. -The female outperformed the males in self-efficiency relatively.

-There are no morale differences between the practitioners and non-practitioners of sports in the representational systems (audio, visual).

-There are morale differences between the practitioners and the non-practitioners of sports in the representational systems (Kinetic sense) in favor of the practitioners of sports. -There are no morale differences between males and females in the representational systems (audio, visual and kinesthetic sense).

-There is a morale relationship between the practitioners of sports and the two representational systems (visual and kinesthetic sense) on the one hand and self-efficiency on the other. -There is a morale relationship between the non-practitioners of sports and the representational system (visual) on one side and self-efficiency on the other side.

-There are morale differences between (males and females) with representational system (visual) on the one hand and self-efficiency on the other.

-There is a morale relationship between the representational systems (visual and kinetic sense) on the one hand and self-efficiency on the other.

-There is a moral relationship between the representational system (kinetic sense) on the one hand and self-efficiency on the other.

7. THE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Make balance between the three representational systems (audio, visual, kinetic sense) as means of necessary, different and various styles of learning necessary for all specializations and as needed without neglecting any of them.

2. Directing teachers to use teaching means which are most favored by students taking into account their specializations so the focus should be on the means of (kinetic sense) for the students of practitioners of sports then the visual, then the audio. While the emphasis should be on the visual style for the non-practitioners of sports in the scientific and humanitarian departments, then (kinetic sense) then the audio.

3. Transit from the traditional methods of the representational systems to modern methods which raise students' motivation to learn .

4. Develop guidance, cognitive and psychological programs to improve the level of self-efficiency for the non-practitioners of the sport.

5. Provide scientific atmosphere that contributes to the integrated development of the academic character and encourage them to increase the knowledge to take advantage of recent advances in learning and the means of social communication and internet technologies. 6. Do further and similar researches between the stages of study, colleges and universities in these two important variables.

7. Do further researches that aim to find out the relationship between these two variables, and other psychological variables that has relationship with learning means and develop the self-efficiency like developing the self-esteem, the mental health, job satisfaction and teaching methods.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Abo Al-Nadi, Hala (2010). ***The Most Favored Learning Styles among Al-Isra Private University Students***. "Reality ... Ambition", Journal of Scientific Education and Psychology", , p 16., issue 1.

- Abo Ghazal, Ashreef (2008).***The Impact of the Employment of a Suggested Program Based on Taking into Account the Visual, Auditory and Kinetic Learning Styles to Collect Seventh Grade Students of English Language and their Attitudes Towards it.***Unpublished Master Thesis, College of Education, Al-Azhar University.

- Al- Nefiei, Ma'touq Abdullah (2010).***Social skills and their relationship to Self-effectiveness of the Outperformed and Ordinary high school students in Jeddah***.Unpublished Master Thesis, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah.

- Al-Masoudi, A. Saleem (2015).***Prevalent Learning Styles among Tabuk University Studens***. The Pedagogical Specialized Magazine,Volume 4 Issue 1.

- Al-Zayat, Fathi(1999) .***Infrastructure of Self-efficiency and its Determinants.*** The Sixth International Conference for PsychologicalCounselting, Psychological Counselting Center, Ain Shams University, Cairo.

- Hanover, B (2002).***Investigation of the Role of the Gender in Developing Self-efficacy, the Development Social Psychology of Gender***. N.J. Lawrence-Erlbaum Associates.

-Hilal, Z., Al Nabhani***D*** (2011)***ifferences in Learning Styles of the Students of Sultan Qaboos University in Light of Some of the Variables***. Journal of Educational Sciences, Issue 1, Part 2.

-Al-Shabol, Anwar Qassem (2004).***Strategy Management and its Impact on the Perceived Self-efficacy, and the Center of Control among a Sample of People with High and Low Achievement in the Upper Basic Stage***. Unpublished PhD Thesis, The Amman Arabic University for Graduate Studies, Oman.

-Alumran, J. I. (2008).***Learning Styles in Relation to Gender, Field of Study, and Academic Achievement Bahraini University Students***. "Individual Differences Research", 6 (4),303 – 316 .

-Alwan, Sally, Talib: ***The Self-efficacy of the Students of University of Baghdad***. Journal of Educational and Psychological Research, p. 33 (2013).

- Bandar , A. Al-Sharif (2011).***The relationship of Favored Learning Styles of Learning achievement with of students who Have learning difficulties " A Predictive Study"***. Journal of "Arab Studies in Education and Psychology", Vol. 15, No. 3.

-Bandura, A, (1997). ***Self-Efficacy: The Exercise Of Control*** ,W.H.Freeman, New York.

-Bandura, A. (2000). ***Exercise of Human Agency Through Collective Efficiency***. Current Directions in HumanScience, 9:75-78.

-Fleming, N and Mills, C. (1997). ***Not Another Inventory, Rather a Catalyst for Reflection, from to Improve the Academy***. Vol. (11), P.(137).

-Fleming, N. D. &Bonwell, C. C. (2002). ***How to Learn Best: A Students Guide to Improved Learning***. Colorado: Green Mountain Falls.

-Geche, TesfayeJale (2009).***Learning Styles and Strategies Ethiopian Secondary School Student in Learning Mathematics***. University of South Africa.

-Hurley, J. B. (2003). ***Personality Type Today.Harper and Row***.ColphonBooks . New York.

-Lincoln, F. &Rademacher, B. (2006). ***Learning Styles of ESL Students in Community Colleges***. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30 , 485 – 500.

-Mcauley , E (1985) : ***Modeling and Self-efficacy A Test of Bandera's Model*** . Journal of Sport , Psychology.

-Vita, Enza (2002). ***The Enneagram Personality Types***.New Age.