

*

(17)

(45)

:

:

:

(1999)

:

-

)

-

:

(1998

(Hassel, 2002)

*

2007/7/24

2009/1/27

/

(2005)

(2003)

:

(2004)

(Beyer, 1987)

:

(Muilenburge and Berqe, 2000)

(Harris, 2002)

:

:

(Shaw, 1996, Brawne,

(ManZo, 1998; Fleith, 2000)

(Paul, 1990)

.2000)

:

(James, 1996)

:

:

Ramer, 1999; Smith, ,2000)

:

(1999;

:

(Newmann, 1991)

(16)

(56)

(2002)

(4)

(16)

(Narramore, 1993)

()

(2007)

(tsai, 1996)

)

(11)

(2004

(1994)

(Chiodo and Sai, 1997)

(Onosko, 1990)

(12)

(10)

(84) (1997)

(25) (200)

(35)

(%72.9)

(2004) (%80)

(40) (60)

(Andrews, 2000) (%83)

(%99)

(%89)

(Ruland,

2000)

(

(342)

()

(2000)

(2001)

(33)

(17)

(55)

(24)

(31)

:

-1 .

(2004)

-2

(1.99

()

(9)

(Onosko, 1990)

.(2001)

(New mann, 1991)

(5)

(Chester - field Ray, 2002; Stroge, 1997)

(9)

(21)

(17)

.()

()

.(0.85)

()

.()

.()

(3 - 2.5)

(2.49 - 2)

.2007/2006 -1)

(2004

: (2)

(2)

.(Brawne, 2000)

" (2.06) " -2 (0.54) (1.71)

(0.88)

(1)

" (0.86) " -3 (2.03)

.(2005) (2002)

(2.02) " -4 " New Mann,1991 Chiodo and Sai, 1997 (0.98) .(2001

(2007/ 2006)

(Paul, 1990) (2)

.(Harris, 2002)

:

" -1

: (2.11)

.(0.83)

("t" test)

: (3)

) (1999)

(3)

()

0.84	0.20	43	1.71	28.90
			2.19	29.47

(4)

0.56	1.71	35	
0.79	1.89	5	+
0.34	1.70	5	
0.55	1.72	45	

(5)

f				
0.954	0.047	0.015	2	0.029
		0.312	42	12.31

:

.(2002)

(4)

(3 X 1)

(One Way ANOVA)

:

:

(5)

(1)

(One Way ANOVA) (3 X1)

.(6)

(6)

F				
0.64	0.83	0.57	2	1.86
		0.68	42	17.05

(6)

-2

)

(

-3

:

-1

2001

1994

.45-13 :(10) 19

2004

1999

1

2004

1998

.67

2004

2004

4

2005

1

2002

- don't, how we all can. *Clearing House*, 71 (5). 2003
- Muilenburg, L. and Berge, Z. 2002. A frame work for designing questions for on line learning retrieved. 2007
Web www.emoderators.com.
- Narramore, R. 1993. The effect of selected classroom activities on creative thinking, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53 (11). 1997
- New mann, F. 1991. Promoting Higher order thinking skills in social studies: overview of A study of 6 high school Departments. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, (4). 2000
- Onosko, J. 1990. Comparing teachers instruction to promote students thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22 (5): 443.
- Paul, R. 1990. Critical thinking, what every person needs to survive in A rapidly changing world, Sonoma, Center for critical Thinking and Moral Critiques: California Sonoma State University.
- Ramer, C.A. 1999. The Influences of the Jefferson – centennial practicum on the self- efficacy of the five social studies student teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59 (9).
- Ruland, J. P. 2000. Relation of class room environment to growth in critical thinking ability of first year college students, *DAI*, 60 (8).
- Shaw, V. F. 1996. The cognitive processes Informal Reasoning. *Thinking and Reasoning*, 2: 51-80.
- Smith, S. 1999. Impact of non- classroom experience on critical writing ability. *NASPA Journal*, (36) (2).
- Stroge, J. 1997. Improving schools through teacher in stroge Evaluating teaching, A guide to current thinking and best practice (1-7) Thousand Oaks: California.
- Tsai, M. 1996. secondary school teacher perspectives of teaching Thinking in social studies classes in the Republic of China. *DAI*, 57 (2): 569.
- Andrews, Sharon. 2000. Critical thinking in south dalota public schools grades (4,5,7) influence of teachers behaviors, perceptions, and attitudes, D,A,I.A611.03. P888, AAC, 99-654.
- Beyer, B. 1987. Practical Strategies for teaching of thinking. Bostoh. Allyn and Bacon.
- Browne, M. 2000. Distinguishing features of critical thinking classrooms. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5 (3): 301.
- Chester-field, Ray. 2002. Classroom observation tools. U.S Agency for International Development. wDS.
- Chiodo, J. and Sai. M. 1997. Secondary school teachers, perspectives of teaching Critical thinking in social studies classes in the Republic of China. *The Journal of Social Studies Review*, 21(2): 3.
- Fleith, D. 2000. Teacher and student perceptions of creativity in the classroom Environment. *Roeper Review*, 22 (3): 148.
- Harris, R. 2002. Creative thinking t techniques, www. Virtual salt. co.
- Hassel, C. L. 2002. Why critical thinking. regents at the University of Minnesota.
- James, P. Byrnes. 1996. Cognitive development and learning in instructional contexts. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
- Manzo, A. 1998. Teaching for creative outcomes why we

The Degree of History Teachers Use of Class Actions that Develop Student's Thinking Skills

*Hani H. Obeidat**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the degree of history teachers use of class actions that develop student's thinking skills. To achieve the goal of the study, the researcher developed a note card included (17) descriptive of the teacher for the development of student's thinking skills. The validity and reliability of the note card were done. The application of this card on a sample of (45) male and female history teachers in Ma'an Directorate of Education, through the use of the direct observation technique.

The results of the study showed that the procedures sometimes are used by history teachers in classrooms that develop students' thinking skills. This means that the degreed use was low. Also, the results indicate that there is no statistically significant differences due to the sex, experience and qualifications on the level of use. The researcher recommended a number of recommendations including: training courses for history teacher that focus on the theoretical and practical parts to provide them with the skills in which to develop the students' thinking.

Keywords: Degree, Class Action, Thinking Skills, History Teachers.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Ma'an, Jordan. Received on 24/7/2007 and Accepted for Publication on 27/1/2009.