

*

: (22) (18) (40)

(likert) (36)

(Mcclain and Auita, 1985)

(Thistlethwait, 1990) .(2000)

*

Burns and Roe,)

.(Thistlethwait, 1990)

.2009/4/5

2008/3/5

(1982

.(1985)

(1992)

(1998)

(Rosen shine, 1980)

(1993)

(1996)

:

.(1998)

.(Collins, 1993)

)

.(2000

.(2003

)

.(2003)

)

.(2000

:

.(2002)

.(2000)

:

.(2000)

"

:"

:(1997)

:

- (2000)

:

-1
(0.05)

-2

(0.05)

:

:(1999) .(1998)

()

:

()

(2005)

()

()

()

(613) (1179)

(566)

()

()

(2004) (% 62) (2007-2006)

()

(84)

(2002)

()

(106)

(53)

()

∴
(GORT - 4) (Tawre)

(WASI) (Combos, 1992)
()

()

(Combos, 1992)
(Erwin, 1993) (Torgesen, 2004)

(2002) (Erwin, 1993)

(2005)

(Dpong, 1998) (49)
(2002)

(2005)

(Dpong, 1998)
)

(

(2004) (52)
(10)

(Torgesen, 2004)

∴

Erwin,) (Combos, 1992)

)		Norges,)	(Dpong, 1998)	(1993
.((2004

(1)

:

(Face validity)

:

)	()		
.(.()		
)	()		(80)
.()			
)			(116)	
)	()	(40)	
.(.((22)	(18)
				(%55 %45)

: (4-1)

)	()		(10)	(10)
.(.()	(180)	(400)	
)	()		(%55 %45)	(220)
.((2)	.(:
(19)			:		:

(20)

(3) (1) :

(1) (2) (Holisty)

(5) (3)

(3) (4)

(3) (5) (1) (% 84)

(1) (6)

(2) (7) (1)

(3) (8)

(3) (9)

(4) (10)

:

(3) (1)

(2) (2)

(3) (3)

(2) (4)

(6) (3) (5)

(7) (1)

(8) (1)

(2) (9) (1)

(1) (10)

% 82	
% 85	
% 83	
% 86	
% 84	
% 84	

(12)

(9) (20)

(% 75) (3)

.(Test-Retest)

(30)

: (%91)
 -
 Cronbach) (%79) (Alpha
 -
 - :
 (20)
 :
 .(1.99 -1)
 -2)
 .(4-3) .(2.99 (2004)
 .(4)
 .()
 -
 .(2004)
 :
 : (Holisty) -1 ()
 .() (Likert)
 ()
 : -2 (2004)
 .() (16)
 :(Cronbach Alpha) -3
 :(ANOVA) -4
 :(Tukey) -5
 Split -)
 : (%85) (half

(3)

3.68	9.65	
3.24	13.00	
3.02	13.57	
3.67	12.18	

:
:

(19)
.(-)

(3)

()
. (2)

(9.65)

(2)

.(13.00)

%27.5	11	
%52.5	21	
%20	8	
%100	40	

.(13.57)

(ANOVA)

(0.05 = α)

.(4)

(2)

(4)

.(%27.5)

(11)

.(Tukey)

.(%52.5)

(21)

.(5)

(8)

(5)
(0.05 = α)

.(%20)

:

(0.05)

.(3.34 -)

.(3)

(4)

45.278	501.198	2	1002.39	
	11.069	397	4394.54	
		399	5396.94	

(5)

(Tukey)

* 3.92 - (0.000)	* 3.34 - (0.000)	_____	
0.575 - 0.388	_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____	

.(0.05)

*

.(6)

(0.05 = α)

(5)

(6)

.(3.92 -)

(5)

18.65	135.68	
18.05	136.20	
17.77	135.77	
18.12	135.19	

(0.05 = α)

.(575.0 -)

(6)

:

:

(0.05)

(135.68)

(136.20)

(135.77)

(6)
(ANOVA)

(0.05 = α)

(7)

(7)

.965	036.	11.841	2	23.683	
		329.930	397	130982.067	
			399	131005.750	

(40)

(7)

(.965)

:

:

:

:

(8)

(1997)

(21)

:

:

(11)

(0.05)

(% 52.5)

()

(0.05)

)

(2004

.(2004)

-
-
-

: :

: .2 .
2002

: 1 . 1985
1997

2003
: .1 .

1997
.1 :

.28 2001
23
2000

- .125 -112 25 . 1998 .3
- Burns, P. and Roe, D. 1982. *Teaching reading in today elementary schools*. Boston: U.S.A. Houghton Mifflin Company. - 1992 " "
- Collins, N. 1993. *Teaching critical reading through literature*. Ohio: the ERIC Clearing House on Reading English. . 2000 .4
- Combos, R. 1992. *Developing critical reading skills through whole language strategies. Foundation Reading, II, Southern Nazarene. University.* (ed. 353556). . 2005
- Dpong, W. 1998. *Effect of SPIN reading system on English reading comprehension, retention, and reading strategies of mathayom suksa 5 student*. Retrieved October 13, (2005) from: <http://www.grad.cmu.ac.th/abstract/1998/edu980648.html> .231-231 (2) . 2000
- Erwin, R. 1993. *Growth critical reading and evaluation of arguments among non proficient college reading stat, da*. University of New York Buffalo. . 2003
- Mcclain and Auita – bell. 1985. *Using traditional literature to teach west critical reading skills*. (paper presented at the annual meeting of the far regional conference of the international reading.(ed. 260381). .156-115 23 . 2004
- Rosen Shine, B. 1980. *Skills Hierarchies in Reading Comprehension pines (eds). Theoretical Issues In Reading Comprehension*. New Jersey. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. . 2000
- Thistlethwait, L. 1990. *Critical Reading for at Risk Students. Journal of Reading*. 33, 586-592. . 1996
- Torgesen, 2004. *Assessing growth in critical reading skills*. Retrieved October 13, (2005) from: <http://www.fcrr.org/assessment/PDF files/midschrev1/pdf> .260 -230 (1) (16) . 1998

The Degree of Arabic Language Teachers' Practice in Teaching Critical Reading at the Basic Tenth Grade and its Effect on Students' Achievement and Attitudes Toward Reading

*Suad Abd-Elkareem Alwaeli and Diya Mohammad Abu-Alruz**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at measuring the degree of arabic language teachers' practice in teaching critical reading at the basic tenth grade and its effect on students achievement and attitudes toward reading. to achieve the aims of the study, the researcher chose a random sample of (40) male and female teachers. The researchers used two instruments, which are observation form and an achievement test in reading: then they ascertained their validity and reliability. The observation form included five major skills for critical reading: distinction, method, absorption, inference and decision-making. The test included two chosen texts with a number of multiple choice questions. Results showed that the students, whose teachers practice the skills at the intermediate level, achieved better than those whose teachers practice these skills at the low level. Results also revealed that the students, whose teachers practice the skills at a large degree, achieved better than those whose teachers practiced them at the low level. In addition, results showed no difference among students' achievement according to teachers' degree of practice. Finally, the results showed no difference between students' achievement toward reading according to the type of practice.

Keywords: Skills, Critical Reading, Basic Tenth Grade, Student Achievement, Attitudes.

* Department of Education, Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University and the Ministry of Education-Jordan. Received on 5/3/2008 and Accepted for Publication on 5/4/2009.