

(51)

(1979)

.(NCSS , 1993)

(1973)
)

(Grave & Avery, 1997)

.(1984

(Newmann, 1991; Newmann, 1990; Onosko, 1990)

(1999)

(1986)

(Martorella , 2001)

(Downey & Levstik , 1991)

(2002)

.(Richard, 1991)

.(Kathryn & luther , 1994)

(1978)

(1983)

(1981)

:

(Greene, 1994)

(NCHS , 1994)

: (12-5)

(White, 2000)

(Accountability Movement)

()

(NCSS, 1994)

:

)

(Haas & Laughlin, 1999) .(...

.()

: " :

.(130 1992)

:
.

1992)

.(132

1999)

.(NCSS , 1994)

(Mayer,

.(Wineburg, 2001)

.(1981)

(1987)

(100)

(1987)

(45)

(9)

(3)

(Evans,1988)

(Wineburg & Wilson, 1992)

(Yeager & Davis, 1994)

(3)

(58)

(Levstik & Barton, 1996)

(9)

(Yeager & Wilson, 1997)

(30)

(Lincoln, 1998)

(4)

(1998)

(140)

(Carollyn,1999)

(1999)

(101)

(2001)

(118)

(2003)

(26)

(1998 1987 1987)
 (Evans, 1988)
 (Yeager & Davis, 1994) .

(Carollyn, 1992;)

Wineburg&Nilson, 1990
 2001 1999)
 (2003) (2003)

(2003) (2001 1999)
 (Evans , 1988, Wineburg&Wilson,1992;
 .Levsitk & Barton,1990; Yeager&Davis,1994)
 1987 1987)
 (2003) (1999 1998
 :Winburg & wilson, 1997; Yeager & Davis,1994)
 (Winburg&Wilson,1992;Evans,1988) (2001
 &Barton,1996)Wineburg & Wilson ,1992
 . (Levsitk

:

:

:

•

:

.1

.

.2

.

:

•

:

:

.1

: .2

: .3

: .4

: .5

:
.1

.2003/2002
.2

.2003/2002
.3

.4

(73) 2003/2002

.2003/2002

(51)

(%69)

:

.1

.2

:

.1

.2

:
: :

•

•

.(NCHS , 1994)

•

(12)

:

(15)

(9)

(6)

(8)

(50)

(14)

•

(4)

(4)

(6)

(15) () (12) () (9)()
 (6) () (8) () (50)
 (4) (5) :

(1) (2) (3)
 (12) (4) (4)
 (4)

(10) (% 80)
 (12) : (50)
 (6) (15) (9)
 (8)

(11)

(Test – Retest)

(0.84)	(0.86)	(0.82)
(0.86)	(0.90)	(0.88)
:		
(*4)		.1
(48=12*4)		
(24=6*4)	(60=15*4)	(36=9*4)
	.(200=50*4)	(32=8*4)
(*2)		.2
(24=12*2)		
(12=6*2)	(30=15*2)	(18=9*2)
	.(100=50*2)	(16=8*2)
		.3
		:
:		:
		:
		•
		•
		•
		•
		:

2004 21

/

) .1

.(

) .2

.(

-77 1983)

.(82

: (Holsti , 1969 , p.140)

$$100 \times \frac{\quad}{\quad + \quad} =$$

()

:

: .1

0.82	0.83	0.81	
0.88	0.92	0.85	
0.85	0.85	0.84	
0.83	0.83	0.82	
0.87	0.86	0.88	
0.85	0.85	0.84	

:

.2

0.81	0.83	0.79	
0.80	0.82	0.77	
0.82	0.80	0.84	
0.78	0.74	0.82	
0.86	0.87	0.85	
0.81	0.81	0.81	

()

•

•

•

•

•

:

()

:

:

(1)

(1)

34.47	599	35.45	335	33.29	264	
33.83	588	33.97	321	33.67	267	
9.95	173	9.21	87	10.84	86	
11.18	203	10.58	100	12.99	103	
10.07	175	10.79	102	9.21	73	
%100	1738	%100	945	%100	793	

(1)

:

: •
 () :
 (% 33.29) () (% 33.67)
 (%12.99) ()
) (%10.84) ()
 .(% 9.21) ()
 () : •
 (% 33.97) () (%35.45)
 (%10.79) ()
 (%10.58) ()
 .(%9.21) ()
 : •
) (%34.47) () :
 () (%33.83) ()
 (%10.07) () (%11.18)
 .(%9.95) ()
) ()
 :

.1

()

.2

(Inhelder & Piaget)

(15-11)

(Thornton & Vuckelich, 1988)

()

.3

(Yeager & Wilson, 1997)

.(Lincoln, 1998)

:

.1

:

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

(Yeager & Wilson, 1997)

(Lincoln, 1998)

:

:

t-test ()

(3) (2)

(2)

1.93	3	23.10	1.91	3.19	22.92	1.94	3.86	23.27	12	
1.92	2.81	17.32	1.84	3.40	16.59	2.01	2.83	18.06	9	
1.82	3.32	27.30	1.84	3.8	27.63	1.80	3.80	26.98	15	
1.90	2.21	11.38	1.98	2.38	11.88	1.81	2.88	10.88	6	
1.98	2.56	15.85	1.94	3.21	15.51	2.03	2.91	16.20	8	
1.90	11.61	94.96	1.89	13.19	94.53	1.91	11.73	95.36	50	

(2)

(23.10) (22.92) (23.27)

(60)

(17.32) (16.59) (18.06)

(26.98) (45)

(75) (27.30) (27.61)

(10.88)

(11.38) (11.88)

(16.20) (30)

(40)		(15.85)	(15.55)	
(94.53)		(95.36)		
		.(250)	(94.96)	
				:
(2.01)		(2.03)		:
	(1.81)		(1.94)	•
				:(1.80)
(1.94)		(1.98)		:
.(1.84)			(1.91)	•
	(1.93)		(1.98)	:
.(1.82)		(1.90)	(1.92)	•
			(2)	
		(2.01)		(2)
				.(2.03)

(3)

()

	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)		
95.39	16.20	10.88	26.98	18.06	23.27		1
							•
11.73	2.91	2.88	3.80	2.83	3.86		•
51	51	51	51	51	51		•
200	32	24	60	36	48	(1)	•
63.69	38.76	34.95	62.01	45.25	45.71	(1) ()	•
...		•
100	16	12	30	18	24	(2)	•
2.81	0.48	2.98	5.67	0.15	1.34	(2)	•
0.007	0.633	0.004	...	0.882	0.186		•
94.53	15.51	11.88	27.63	16.55	22.92		•
13.19	3.21	2.38	3.8	3.40	3.19		•
51	51	51	51	51	51		•
200	32	24	60	36	48	(1)	•
57.09	36.70	36.36	60.84	40.83	56.20	(1) ()	•
...		•
100	16	12	30	18	24	(2)	•
2.96	1.09	0.35	4.46	2.97	2.42	(2)	•
0.005	0.280	0.726	...	0.005	0.019		•

(3) :

	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)		
94.96	15.85	11.38	27.30	17.32	23.10	•	3
11.61	2.56	2.21	3,32	2.81	3	•	
51	51	51	51	51	51	•	
200	32	24	60	36	48	(1) •	
61 .6	44.98	40.72	70.43	47.64	59.24	(1) () •	
...	•	
100	16	12	30	18	24	(2) •	
3.10	0.21	1.99	5.81	1.73	2.15	(2) •	
0.003	0.684	0.052	...	0.091	0.037	•	

(3)

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(1)

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(1)

(1)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

(2)

.1

.2

.3

.4

:

:

(4)

(4)

	.1	.1	
	.2	.2	
	.3	.3	
	.4	.4	
	.5	.5	
	.1	.1	
	.2	.2	
	.3	.3	
	.4	.4	
	.5	.5	
	.1	.1	
	.2	.2	
	.3	.3	
	.4	.4	
	.5	.5	

(4)

()

•

•

•

•

•

•

:
:
:(2002)
:
:(1983)
:(1998)
:
:171-135 (1)3
:(2001)
:
:146-119 (3)17
:
:(6)
:(1981)
:(1987)
:
:(1)
:(1999)
:
:(1973)
:(2003)
:
:(1999)

.(1987)

.(1983)

.(1986)

.(1978)

.(1979)

(1984)

.(1981)

.14-2 : ()

.(1992)

Carolyn , K. (1999). Secondary social studies student engagment with historical thinking and historical empathy as they use oral history interviews
Dissertation Abstract International -60/09, 3258.

Downey, M. & Levstic, L. (1991). Teaching and Learning history. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning. (400-410). New York, Macmillan.

Evans, R. W. (1988). Lessons from history teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history, Theory and Research in Social Education. XVI, (1), 203-205.

Graves, M. & Avery, P. (1997). Scaffolding students reading of history, The Social Studies, 88 (3)134-138.

Greene S. (1994). The problem of learning to think like historian: Writing history in the culture of classroom, *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2) 89-96.

Haas, M. & Laughlin. (1999). Meeting the standards, *Social Studies Readings for K-6 Educators*, Washington: NCSS.

Holsti, O. W. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*, New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Kathryn , T. & Luther , W. (1994). Learning to think historically, *Educational Psychologist* ,29 (2) , 71-77.

Levstik, L. & Barton, K. (1996). They still use some of their past: Historical salience in elementary children's chronological thinking, *Curriculum Studies*, 28 (5), 531-576.

Lincoln, P. (1998). *Reading writing and history: Teaching for historical thinking and understanding* (Textbook, *Writing Across the Curriculum*) Dissertation Abstract International -A59/06, 1972.

Martorella, P. H. (2001). *Teaching social studies in middle and secondary schools*, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Mayer R. (1999). Use the story of Ann Hutchinson to teach historical thinking, *The Social Studies*, 90 (3), 105-109.

NCHS.(1994). *National standards for history: Historical thinking standards*, Los Angeles University of California.

NCSS.(1993). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies: Building understanding and civic efficacy: *Social Education* , 57 (4), 213-223.

NCSS.(1994). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies: Building social understanding and civic efficacy. In *National Council for the Social Studies. The Curriculum Standards for Social Studies 157-177*, Washington. D. C. National Council for the Social Studies.

Newmann, F. (1990). Higher – order thinking in teaching social studies: A rationale from assessment thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22 (1), 41-56.

Newmann , F. (1991). Promoting higher-order thinking skills in social studies: Overview of 16 high school departments. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, XIX (4), 324-340.

Onosko , J. J. (1990). Comparing teachers' instruction to promote students thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22 (5), 443-461.

Richard , M. (1991). Teaching through analytical and reflective thinking skills, *The Social Studies*, 82 (5), 191.

Thornton, S. J., & Ronald V. (1988). Effects of children's understanding of time concepts on historical understanding. *Theory and Research in Social Education* IVI (1) 169.

White, C. (2000). *Transforming social studies education*, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, LTD.

Wineburg S. S. & Wilson S. M. (1992). Subject matter knowledge in the teaching of history. *Advances in Research on Teaching*, (2).305-347.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts*, 1 Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Yeager , E. & Davis, Jr. (1994). Understanding the knowing how of history: Elementary students teachers thinking about historical texts. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 18 (2), 2-9.

Yeager, E. & Wilson, E. (1997). Teaching historical thinking in social studies methods Course: A case study. *The Social Studies*, 88 (3), 121-126.