

*

(37)

(193)

(

(51)

):

.(

)

)

(

.(

)

:

:

(13

) "

" :

" :

(74

) "

"

" :

(197

) "

.(125

) "

.

(Nelson, 1990)

()

()

*

.2009/11/22

2009/2/21

/

(Alan, 1996)

(Vaishali, 2006)

(1997)

(Bruce and

Timothy, 2002)

(Evans and Saxe, 1996)

(Thomas, 2005)

(Aikenhead, 1994)

(Hess, 2001)

(Rise, 1991)

(Claire, 2004)

(Harwood and Hahn, 1990)

(Alan,

1996)

:

:

(Cook, 1984)

(National Council Social Studies, 2007)

(Bickmor, 1993)

(Hess, 2001) .

(Johnson and Smith, 2000)

(1999)

(1999 /1998)

(21)

:

:

(Skeel, 1995)

:

(Carolyn, 2007) .

(Hyde and Buth, 2002) .

(Wilson et al., 1999)

)

(468)

(1993)

(48)

(11)

(2001)

()

(25) (191)

(62)

(:
:

(2004)

(24)

(12)

(12)

((414)

(216)

()

(24)

- (33.3)

(16.7)

(16.7)

-

:

-

(2006)

-

	-		
			-
	-		
		:	
			-1
:			
			-2
.2009 /2008			
:			-3
.(80)			-4
:			
.(70)			-5
			-6
	-		
.()	-	:	
	-		
:			
()	-1		
.2009 /2008			
	-2		

(51)

-3

(37)

(193)

-6

(9 -7)

:

-

-

:

-

()

:

-1

-2

()

-3

-1

-4

-2

(41)

-5

-3

(8)

-4

(25)

-5

: (2004)

100 x _____ =

+

.(0.82)

-

-

(x √)

.(37)

(37)

()
()

(100)

" :

:

"

(29.6)

(80)

(37)

(25.9)

(70)

(1)

0.016	6		1
0.026	10		2
0.010	4		3
0.026	10		4
0.029	11		5
0.013	5		6
0.021	8		7
0.024	9		8
0.013	5		9
0.069	26		10
0.072	27		11
0.082	31		12
0.010	4		13
0.034	13		14
0.021	8		15
0.010	4		16
0.008	3		17
0.026	10		18

0.032	12		19
0.010	4		20
0.013	5		21
0.010	4		22
0.008	3		23
0.005	2		24
0.005	2		25
0.024	9		26
0.032	12		27
0.013	5		28
0.010	4		29
0.002	1		30
0.133	50		31
0.032	12		32
0.016	6		33
0.053	20		34
0.029	11		35
0.013	5		36
0.035	13		37
100	371		

(1)

.(0.133)

(50)

:

1921

(27)

.(0.072)

(31)

.(0.082)

(2)

(0.005) (0.005) (0.005)

(0.002) (1) (2) (26) -

(0.069)

(2004)

" :

"

(2006)

(2)

(2)

0.36	0.84	1
0.46	0.68	2
0.38	0.82	3
0.47	0.66	4
0.23	0.05	5
0.32	0.88	6
0.48	0.35	7
0.46	0.70	8
0.45	0.72	9
0.48	0.64	10
0.42	0.76	11
0.41	0.78	12
0.45	0.72	13
0.38	0.82	14
0.7	0.92	15
0.48	0.64	16
0.45	0.72	17

0.42	0.76	18
0.44	0.74	19
0.34	0.86	20
0.50	0.47	21
0.47	0.66	22
0.48	0.64	23
0.50	0.56	24
0.50	0.50	25
0.47	0.66	26
0.44	0.74	27
0.41	0.21	28
0.48	0.64	29
0.47	0.66	30
0.30	0.90	31
0.48	0.64	32
0.34	0.86	33
0.38	0.82	34
0.40	0.80	35
0.36	0.84	36
0.44	0.74	37
4.13	0.69	

(2)
(69)

(80)

" : :

"

.(3)

(3)

0.49	0.56	1
0.45	0.70	2
0.42	0.76	3

...

0.49	0.44	5
0.31	0.88	6
0.49	0.43	7
0.40	0.20	7
0.48	0.63	8
0.43	0.75	9
0.48	0.62	10
0.39	0.80	11
0.44	0.73	12
0.44	0.72	13
0.25	0.93	14
0.46	0.68	15
0.49	0.59	16
0.36	0.83	17
0.45	0.72	18
0.49	0.57	19
0.33	0.87	20
0.43	0.24	21
0.46	0.68	22
0.46	0.68	23
0.49	0.60	24
0.46	0.68	25
0.49	0.59	26
0.41	0.77	27
0.49	0.40	28
0.45	0.28	29
0.31	0.88	30
0.33	0.87	31
0.43	0.74	32
0.33	0.87	33
0.31	0.88	34
0.41	0.78	35
0.48	0.36	36
0.45	0.70	37
3.88	0.66	

(3)

(66)

(70)

" :

"

.(4)

(4)

0.50	1.52		5	1
0.49	1.60		3	2
0.45	1.27		15	3
0.49	1.58		4	4
0.48	1.62		2	5
0.30	1.09		32	6
0.36	1.15		25	7
0.27	1.07		34	8
0.32	1.11		29	9
0.27	1.07		34	10
0.010	1.00		37	11
0.42	1.23		16	12
0.46	1.29		13	13
0.46	1.70		1	14
0.34	1.13		26	15
0.50	1.52		5	16
0.50	1.49		8	17
0.48	1.35		10	18
0.50	1.52		5	19
0.50	1.47		9	20
0.48	1.35		10	21
0.42	1.23		16	22
0.42	1.23		16	23
0.46	1.31		12	24
0.46	1.29		13	25
0.38	1.17		22	26
0.40	1.19		20	27
0.41	1.21		19	28
0.32	1.11		29	29

...

0.38	1.17		22	30
0.30	1.09		31	31
0.40	1.19		20	32
0.34	1.13		26	33
0.30	1.09		33	34
0.34	1.13		26	35
0.38	1.17		22	36
0.010	1.00		36	37

(4)

" : (125) " : (0.46) (1.70) -
(0.50) (1.52) -

.(256) " " :

(1.00) : (0.48) (1.62) -
(0.010) -

(0.49) (1.60) -

(1.00) - (0.01) -

(0.49) (1.58) -

.(Johnson and Smith, 2000) (Hess, 2001) 1994)

" :	:	(1.07)	.	-
	"		(0.27)	
	"			
()	:	(1.07)	.	-
	-		(0.27)	
.(41)	-			
(59)	:			
	-1			
	-2	(1.09)	.	-
	-3		(0.30)	
		(61) "	" :	
	-4			
	-5			
	-6	" :	:	

(Skeel,

.(Hyde and Buth, 2002) (Carolyn, 2007) 1995)

:	-1	:
---	----	---

(Aikenhead,

)
(.

Research in social education, (21): 341-84.

Bruce, E. Larson and Tinmothy, A. Keiper. 2002. Classroom Discussion and Threaded Electronic Discussion: Learning in Two Arenas. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, (2): 1528- 5804. 1997

Carolyn, R. Fallahi. 2007. Using Pebate in Helping Students Discuss Controversial Topics, *Journal of College Teaching and Learning*, 4(10). 2006

Claire, Hilary. 2004. *Dealing with Controversial Issues with Primary Teacher Trainees as Part of Citizenship Education*, London. Metropolitan University, United Kingdom. (1) (33) 2004

Cook, Kay. K. 1984. Conroversail Issues: Cocens for Policy Makers. *Eric Digest*, No (14) ED253465. 2004

Evans, R. and Saxe, D. 1996. *Hand book on Teaching Social Issues*, National, Council for the Social Studies Washington D.C. 1993

Harwood, Angela, M. and Hahn, Carol, L. 1990. Controversial Issues in the Classroom, *Eric*: ED327453.

Hess. D. 2001. Teaching Students to Discuss Controversial Public Issues, *Eric Digest*. Eric Clearing house for Social Studies/ Social Science Education, Bloomingtor In (BBB 24392). (16) 1999

Hyde, C. A. and Buth, B. J. 2002. Multicultural Content and Class Participation: Do Students Self - censor? *Journal of Social Work Education*, (38): 241256. 2001

Johnson, D.W. and Smith, K. 2000. Constructive Controversy, *Chang*, 32, 128-37. (20)

National Council for the Social Studies. 2007. All rights reserver / academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher.

Nelson, J. 1990. Charting a Course Backword, *Social Education*, (155).

Riss, P. 1991. Science Controversy, *Science Scope*, 15 (3): 24-27.

Skeel, D. J. 1995. *Elementary Social Studies*, Challenges for

Aikenhead, G. S. 1994. *The social contract of science: Implications for Teaching Science in Solomon and G.S*, Aikenhead (Eds) STS Education, International Perspective on reform, N. Y. Teachers College Press.

Alan, L. Lockwood. 1996. Controversial Issues: The Teachers Crucial Role / [http:// members. ncss. org/ se/ 6001/ 4600105. htm](http://members.ncss.org/se/6001/4600105.htm).

Bickmore, K. 1993. Learning inclusion: Inclusion in Learning: Citizenship Education in a pluralistic society, *Theory and*

- Issues, Experts Say, Know Your Stuff. [http:// www.edweek.org/ login.html? source= http.](http://www.edweek.org/login.html?source=http)
- Wilson, Elizabeth, Suhal. Cyhthia, Has, Mary and Laughlin, Margaret. 1999. Teachers Perspectives on Incorporating Current Controversial Issues in to the Curriculum, Paper Presented at the Annual Meating of the National Council for the Social Studies (79) th.
- Tomorrow's word Han court Brace College Publishers, New York.
- Tnomas, E. Kelly. 2005. Addressing Controversial in Classrooms Perspectives on Sound Ethical and Educational Practices, [http:// translate. google. com/ translate?hl= arandsl= enandu= http.](http://translate.google.com/translate?hl=arandsl=enandu=http)
- Vaishali, Honawar. 2006. To Aviod Pit Falls on Controversial

The Extent to Which History Teachers Aquire the Argumentative Issues in the Jordan Modern History Textbook and the Degree of the Students' Under Standing of Them

*Hani Obeidat**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to know the extent to which history teachers acquire the argumentative issues in the Jordan modern history textbook and the degree of the students' understanding of them. To achieve the goal of the study, a list of the most important argumentative issues which should be found in the textbook was prepared. An achievement test of (37) items was prepared to measure the teachers' acquisition and the students' level of understanding. The instrument of the study contains open questions to the history teachers about the most important ways to cure the argumentative issues and the causes that stop the teacher from discussing those issues. The sample of the study consists of the modern history textbook for the first secondary literary stream, 51 history teachers and 193 students. The results of the study revealed that the most argumentative issues available are overall development, vigilance, independence and national. But the least argumentative issues are regional and political opposition. The results revealed also that the history teachers and their students' understanding to the argumentative issues were below the level which is accepted educationally. Also, the argumentative issues that don't compatible with the nature of the society are political tyranny, missionary, terrorism and colonialism. The issues that compatible with the society are independence, environment health, democracy, national and global peace.

Keywords: The Acquisition Level, History Teachers, Jordan Modern History Textbook, Controversial Issues.

* Faculty of Educational Sciences, King Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan. Received on 21/2/2009 and Accepted for Publication on 22/11/2009.