



.

-

2010 / 1431



.

-

2010 / 1431

.

:

:

-

/

.

/

-

2010 / 1431



جامعة القدس
عمادة الدراسات العليا
كلية العلوم التربوية / أساليب التدريس

إجازة الرسالة

واقع استخدام معلمات العلوم في المرحلة الأساسية الدنيا للعروض العملية،
والصعوبات التي يواجهنها من وجهة نظرهن في مدارس القدس.

اسم الطالبة: صفاء موسى علي حسن.
الرقم الجامعي: 20811395

المشرف: الأستاذ الدكتور أحمد فهميم جبر.

نوقشت هذه الرسالة وأجيزت بتاريخ 6/26 / 2010م من لجنة المناقشة المدرجة أسماؤهم
وتواقيعهم:

1- الأستاذ الدكتور أحمد فهميم جبر	رئيس لجنة المناقشة	التوقيع.....
2- الدكتور محسن محمود عدس	ممتحناً داخلياً	التوقيع.....
3- الدكتور عبد الغني الصيفي	ممتحناً خارجياً	التوقيع.....

القدس - فلسطين

2010م / 1431هـ

:

.

.

....

.

.

.

.

.

إقرار:

أقر أنا مقدمة الرسالة أنها قدمت لجامعة القدس لنيل درجة الماجستير وأنها نتيجة أبحاثي الخاصة باستثناء ما تم الإشارة له حيثما ورد، وإن هذه الرسالة أو أي جزء منها لم يقدم لنيل أي درجة عليا لأي جامعة أو معهد.

التوقيع:

الاسم: صفاء موسى علي حسن.

التاريخ: ٢٦ / ٦ / ٢٠١٠ م

2010/2009

(332)

. (166)

(26)

. (26)

Cronbach)

(t-test) " "

(Alpha

:

.(%79.76)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

.(%61.47)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

Abstract

This study aims at identify the reality of the elementary science teachers' use of demonstrations and the difficulties they face from their own perspective in Jerusalem schools.

This study was carried out during the second semester of the scholastic year 2009/2010 where the study population consisted of all science teachers who teach Science subject from first grade to the fourth grade in both governmental and private schools in the city of Jerusalem; the total number of school teachers was (332). The study sample was selected according to the random stratified method, and it consisted of (166) school teachers. As for data collection, the researcher used the questionnaire as the study tool following a verification of its validity and reliability. The questionnaire was divided into two sections; the first section was intended to identify the reality of the elementary science teachers' use of demonstrations; it included (26) paragraphs. As for the second section of the questionnaire, its purpose was to identify the most important difficulties that face science teachers when they use demonstrations in teaching. It consisted of (26) paragraphs too

The researcher use statistical methods like means, percentiles, standard deviations, Pearson correlation, Cronbach Alpha, t-test and one way ANOVA test. Following data processing, the study revealed the following outcomes:

The reality of the elementary science teachers' use of demonstrations was at a high degree where the total percentage was (79.76%). The results also indicated that there were not any significant statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the reality of the elementary science teachers' use of demonstrations in Jerusalem schools related to years of experience, scientific qualification and supervising authority variables.

The results also showed that the degree of difficulties that face the elementary science teachers' use of demonstrations from their own perspective in Jerusalem schools was average in general where the total percentage was (61.47%). The results have shown that there are difficulties at a very large level due to the lack of lab assistants who help the teachers in their demonstrations beside the swelling of curriculum with information, concentration of the system of exams on knowledge that is related to memorization and rote learning and an increase in the teachers' weekly teaching loads.

The results also indicated that there were not any significant statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the difficulties facing science teachers when they use demonstrations from their own perspective in Jerusalem schools related to years of experience and scientific qualification variables. The results also showed that there are no significant statistical differences at the level of ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the means of the difficulties facing science teachers when they use demonstrations from their own perspective in Jerusalem schools due to the school supervising authority in favor of governmental schools.

In light of these outcomes, the researcher recommended the need to hold training courses for science teachers and to encourage them to attend such courses so as to train them on the intensive use of demonstrations in their classroom instruction. The study also recommends that the science teachers' school load be reduced in order to allow them use demonstrations and have enough time for preparation. Also equipment, tools and necessary teaching materials have to be available .

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

: 1.1.1

()

.(2004)

).

(2004

.(2001)

)

.(2004)

(

(2004)

.(2003)

.(2004)

[36] .(:)

(1166) .

(1039)

(932)

.(2003

) .

.(2003

:

(1999)

:

2.1

:

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

.8

: **3.1**

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$:

: **4.1**

:
.1

.2

: **5.1**

: **6.1**

)

-

(

. 2009 /2010

-

-

: **7.1**

:

.....

:

()

:

:

.1

.2

.1

.2

.3

.()

: **1.2**

) :

.(

[30 -31 :]

): .

.(

.[259]

:

:

":

.(83 :1) ."

":

:

.(1994) ."

(1999)

(1999)

:

.

) .

.(1977

:

1.1.2

(1999)

(2004)

(1987)

(1977)

(2002)

(1973)

(2009)

(2009)

(2000)

) (45 :2000)
(157 :1997 84 :1957
216 :2002) (111 :2005)
2009) (89 :1999
(95 :1994 125: 1983 184 :1994 226:
(119 :2001)

(2009 :130)

2.1.2 :

:

_____ -

(2005)

.1 :

.2 :

.3 :

.4 :

.5 :

_____ -

(2009)

:

.1 :

) : .2
.(

:_____ -

(2009)

:
: .1
.(....)

: .2

: 3.1.2

:

: .1

(1999)

.(2001 1987)

: .2

.(1977 1999)

: .3

(1973 2009)

)

:

.(1977

: .4

)

.(1973 2009

: .5

(1977)

(1973)

)

.(2009

.(2004)

.6

2004 1999)

.7

.(2001 2005

: **.8**

)

.(1977

)

.(2001 1987

)

.(2009

: **.9**

)

)

(2001

(

)

.10
.(2009

: **4.1.2**

:

- .1 2009)
- .2 .(1999 2001
- .3 1973)
2009)
- .4 .(1973
) ()
- .5 .(2009)
)
- .6 .(2001 1999 2005
)
- .7 .(2002)
- .8 .(2001)
- .9 1973) ()
(2005
- .10 1999 2005)
)
- .11 .(2001 1999
)
- .12 .(2001 1999 2005)
- .13 .(1987)

: **5.1.2**

:
: .1

.(1987 2001)
.2

.(2009 2004)
:
.3

2001)
.(1987
() .4

.(2004 1987) -
.5

.(2009)

: **6.1.2**

: .

	:	.1
	:	.1
	.(1977)	.2
	.(2009)	.3
)	.(1977 1999	.4
.)	.5
	.(2009	.6
	.(2009)	.7
)	.(2009	.8
	:	.2
	:	.1
	.	.2
	.(1977)	.3
.(2009)		.4
2009)		.4
	.(2009	

.5
)
 .(2009

.6
)
 2009
 .(1977

.7
)
 2009
 .(1977

.8
)
 .(2009

.9
)
 .(2009

.10
)
 .(2009

.11
)
 2009
 .(1977

.12
)
 .(2009

.13
)
 .(1977

.14
)
 .(2009

.3
 :

:
)
 1999
 .(2009

.2
)
 2009

1999
 .(1977

.3

.(1977

1999

2009

)

.4

1999

2009

)

.(1977

: 2.2

: 1.2.2

(2003)

(95)

:

%50.84

.%41

.%79.7

%50

%54.2

%54.5

(1999)

(395)

(32)

(43)

:

(21.3 %)

.1

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

.2

.3

:

(1999)

(52)

:

(131)

LCD

:

12 %40

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

()

.6

: 2.2.2

(2009)

()

:

(72)

()

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

()

(2009)

(26)

(33)

.()

:

(%40.9)

:

(2007)

(60)

(30)

(30)

(27)

:

(30)

2007/2006

(40)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

()

()

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(2004)

()

(87)

:

:

)

(

(2002)

.()

(121)

(118)

() ($\alpha < 0.05$)

.()

(1995)

1913

1992

NSTA

%31.7

%5

%41.6

% 4

%17.8

()

%1

%19.4

%6.8

%30.1

%42.7

%8.9

%53.2

%7.6

%27.8

%9

%.2.5

%80.8

()

%10.3

(1992)

(60)

(20)

:

3.2.2

(Joyner,2004)

(Michal al. 2004)

(Henderson, Fisher, and Fraser, 2000)

(40)

(35)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(Luft, 1999)

(Anderson, Thomas & Others, 1994)

(Clermont, Borko & krajcik, 1994)

()

(Shepardson, and Moje & Kennard- McClelland, 1994)

(Exline, 1989)

(6)

)

:

:

.(

:

(Roadruk, 1988)

(25)

:

($\alpha \leq 0.01$)

(Harly and AL-faleh, 1983)

(21)

(40)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(Purser and Renner, 1983)

(135)

(68)

(67)

()

.()

)

(

:

3.2

:

.1

(1999)

(2003)

.(1988)

(1999)

.2

(2009)

.(1999)

(1999)

(2009)

(2007) () .3

(1994) (2004) (2004)

.(1983) (2002) (2000)

(1983) (1992)

() .4

(2009) (2009)

(1995) (1999) (2003)

.(1994)

() .5

(2009) (2009) ()

.(1995) (1999) (2003)

()

()

.()

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

.7

: 1.3

: 2.3

2009 /2010

.(1.3) (332)

.2009/2010

:1.3

106	
226	
332	

: 3.3

(166)

.(2.3)

(%50)

:2.3

42.17	70	5	
31.33	52	10 -5	
26.50	44	10	
100.00	166		
20.50	34		
73.50	122		
6.00	10		
100	166		
31.93	53		
68.07	113		
100	166		

: 4.3

5 1

26

1

25

(1) . 5

(Validity)

1.4.3

(3)

: (2)

:

(26) :

(26) :

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(1)

(Pearson)

(4.3) (3.3)

0.0001	0.49		1	
0.0001	0.33		2	
0.0001	0.36		3	
0.0001	0.19		4	
0.0001	0.45		5	
0.0001	0.53		6	
0.0001	0.45		7	
0.0001	0.40		8	
0.0001	0.61		9	
0.0001	0.65		10	
0.0001	0.43		11	
0.0001	0.60		12	
0.0001	0.40		13	
0.0001	0.58		14	
0.0001	0.53		15	
0.0001	0.62		16	
0.0001	0.56		17	
			18	
0.0001	0.61			
			19	
0.0001	0.61	()		
			20	
0.0001	0.64			
0.0001	0.63		21	

0.0001	0.51		22
0.0001	0.60		23
0.0001	0.57		24
			25
0.0001	0.29		
0.0001	0.56		26

(3.3)

(0.01)

()

(4.3)

:4.3

0.0001	0.37		1
0.0001	0.40		2
			3
0.0001	0.65		
			4
0.0001	0.54		
			5
0.0001	0.51		
			6
0.0001	0.71		
			7
0.0001	0.60		

			8
0.0001	0.67		
0.0001	0.64		9
0.0001	0.71		10
0.0001	0.73		11
0.0001	0.62		12
0.0001	0.68		13
0.0001	0.40		14
0.0001	0.51		15
0.0001	0.46		16
0.0001	0.42		17
0.0001	0.60		18
0.0001	0.53		19
0.0001	0.46		20
0.0001	0.54		21
0.0001	0.64		22
0.0001	0.64		23
0.0001	0.51		24
0.0001	0.55		25
0.0001	0.53		26

(4.3)

(0.01)

(Reliability)

2.4.3

(Cronbach Alpha)

(0.693)

(Cronbach Alpha)

(0.912)

:

5.3

:

-

()

.1

(4)

()

.2

(5)

.3

.4

(Cronbach Alpha)

.5

.6

.7

(166)

.%100

(166)

.8

: **6.3**

:

: **1.6.3**

10 - 5 5) :

.(10

.1

.() :

.2

.() :

.3

: **2.6.3**

.1

.2

: 7.3

(SPSS)

(Cronbach Alpha)

(t-test) " "

(One way analysis)

:

.	%80 (4)	.1
.	(%79.9 - %70) (3.99 - 3.5)	.2
.	(%69.9 - %60) (3.49 - 3)	.3
.	(%59.9 - %50) (2.99 - 2.5)	.4
.	(%50.0) (2.5)	.5

.1
.2
.3
.4
.5
.6
.7
.8

:

: 1.4

.(1.4)

:1.4

	87.00	0.60	4.44		13	1
	85.9	0.7	4.3		21	2
					22	3
	84.82	0.7	4.24			
	84.7	0.73	4.23		6	4
	84.58	0.74	4.23		15	5
	84.1	0.73	4.2		14	6

	83.86	0.62	4.19		2	7
	82.41	0.77	4.12		5	8
	80.96	0.71	4.05		12	9
					24	10
	80.6	0.8	4.03			
	80.36	0.81	4.02		3	11
	79.88	0.86	3.99		7	12
	79.88	0.73	3.99		11	13
					23	14
	79.88	0.84	3.99			
	79.64	0.78	3.98		16	15
	79.64	0.84	3.98		17	16
	78.55	0.75	3.93		10	17
					8	18
	77.83	0.85	3.89			
	76.99	0.83	3.85		4	19
					19	20
	76.39	0.88	3.82) (
					18	21
	75.54	0.96	3.78			
	73.25	0.77	3.66		1	22
	70.6	0.86	3.53		9	23
	70.6	0.91	3.53		26	24
					20	25
	70.48	0.86	3.52			
					25	26
	64.46	1.01	3.22			
	79.76	0.49	3.99			

(1.4)

(79.76)

(11) (1.4)

(14) 3 24 12 5 2 14 15 6 22 21 13

20 26 9 1 18 19 4 8 10 17 16 23 11 7

.25

(1)

"

"

(%87)

"

"

(64.46)

:

:2.4

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(2.4)

:2.4

0.47	3.95	70	5	
0.44	4.01	52	10 - 5	
0.57	4.02	44	10	
0.49	3.99	166		

(ANOVA)

(3.4)

(ANOVA)

:3.4

0.70	0.35	0.085	2	0.17		
		0.24	163	39.16		
			165	39.33	المجموع	

(3.4)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(0.65)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

:

:3.4

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(4.4)

:4.4

0.68	3.99	34		
0.43	4.00	122		
0.35	3.85	10		
0.49	3.99	166		

(ANOVA)

(5.4)

(ANOVA)

:5.4

0.65	0.42	0.10	2	0.20		
		0.24	163	39.13		
			165	39.33		

(5.4)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(0.65)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

:

:4.4

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

()

(6.4)

() :6.4

0.268	1.11	164	0.62	4.05	53		
			0.41	3.96	113		

(6.4)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(0.268)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

:

:5.4

.(7.4)

:7.4

	74.94	1.29	3.75		24	1
	72.89	1.14	3.64		20	2
	71.81	1.02	3.59		25	3
	71.69	1.28	3.58		17	4
	69.76	1.17	3.49		5	5
	69.28	1.18	3.46		16	6
	69.16	1.12	3.46		26	7
	65.90	0.78	3.30		1	8
	65.90	1.00	3.30		2	9
	65.90	1.00	3.30		21	10
	60.84	1.19	3.04		14	11
	59.76	1.07	2.99			

					6	12
	59.52	0.97	2.98		12	13
	57.71	1.17	2.89		4	14
	56.51	1.19	2.83		22	15
	52.77	1.12	2.64		10	16
	51.45	1.06	2.57		11	17
	51.33	1.19	2.57		23	18
	50.72	0.84	2.54		13	19
	50.48	1.04	2.52		19	20
	49.28	0.94	2.46		3	21
	48.92	1.04	2.45		15	22
	48.55	1.12	2.43		18	23
	46.39	1.04	2.32		8	24
	43.61	1.04	2.18		9	25
	42.65	1.00	2.13		7	26
	61.47	0.61	3.07			

(7.4)

(61.47)

(7.4)

.17 25 20 24

26 16 5

.14 21 2 1

22 4 12 6

.19 13 23 11 10

18 15 3

.7 9 8

:

:6.4

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(8.4)

:8.4

0.61	3.09	70	5	
0.56	3.04	52	10 - 5	
0.67	3.09	44	10	
0.61	3.07	166		

(ANOVA)

(9.4)

(ANOVA)

:9.4

0.88	0.13	0.05	2	0.10		
		0.37	163	60.88		
			165	60.98		

(9.4)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(0.88)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

: **:7.4**

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(10.4)

:10.4

0.64	2.95	34		
0.61	3.11	122		
0.52	3.10	10		
0.61	3.07	166		

(ANOVA)

(11.4)

(ANOVA)

:11.4

0.41	0.90	0.33	2	0.66		
		0.37	163	60.32		
			165	60.98		

(11.4)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

(0.41)

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

:

:8.4

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

.

()

(12.4)

() :12.4

			0.72	3.29	53		
0.001	3.24	164	0.52	2.97	113		

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(12.4)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(0.001)

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

.1

.2

:1.5

: :1.1.5

: (1.4)

-

(3.99)

.(%79.76)

-

(%87.00)

(4.44)

-

(%79.88)

(3.99)

()

(%64.46)

(3.22)

(2003)

.%79.7

:

:2.1.5

:

($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

: **:3.1.5**

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

: **:4.1.5**

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

: :5.1.5

: (7.4)

.(%61.47)

(3.07)

-

-

-

-

-

) (27)

.(

(1999)

:

(1999)

:

(2009)

:

:

(2009)

: **:6.1.5**

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(1999)

: **:7.1.5**

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

(1999)

: :8.1.5

:

$(\alpha \leq 0.05)$

: :2.5

:

.1

.2

.3

.4

.5

.6

:

.2-1 1 :

1 . .(2001)

.(1995)

)

.2 7 (

.(2000)

1 . .(1999)

1 . .(1987)

) .(1994)

1 .(

.(2009)

. 4 .(2004)

.(1994)

1 .

) .(2009)

1 .(

.(2009)

1 .

.(2003)

.(2002)

.(1999)

.(1992)

.112 -92 (26)

1 . .(2009)

2

.(2002)

.(2001)

1 .

6 .

.(1977)

.(2009)

.(1999)

1 .

1 .

.(2003)

.(2005)

1 .

.(1957)

.(1999)

.(1973)

.(1983)

1 .

.(1999)

.(2007)

1 .

.(2001)

.(2004)

1 .

.(2005)

Anderson, T.H. et. al.,(1994). A text analysis of two pre-secondary science activities. **Journal of Curriculum Studies**, 26(2)

Clermont, C. and Borko, H. and Krajcik, J. (1994). Comparative study of the pedagogical content knowledge of experienced and novice chemical demonstrators. **Journal of food Science Education**. 31(4), 419- 441.

Exline, Joseph D. et, (1989). Better textbook activities for better science education. **Science – Activities**,26(2) A pr- may.

Harty, H. and AL-Faleh, N. (1983). Saudi Arabian Students Chemistry Achivement and Science Attitude Stemming from Lecture - Demonstration and small Group Teaching Methods. **Journal Research in Science Teaching**. 20 (9) 861- 875.

Henderson, D. Fisher, D. and Fraser, B.(2002). Interpersonal Behavior Laboratory Learning Environment and Students Outcomes in Senior Classes. **Journal Research in Science Teaching**. 37(1), 26- 43.

Joyner, M. (2004). **Improving Student Achievement in Science Though Content Development**. The metropolition Community Collages. Retrieved 15/ 6/2004, from [http://: Improving Student Achievement in Science Through Content Development. htm](http://Improving Student Achievement in Science Through Content Development. htm).

Luft, J. (1999). Teachers' salient beliefs about a problem-solving demonstration classroom in-service program. **Journal of food Science Education**. 36(2), 141- 158.

Michal, Z. Devora, S. Efart, L. and Ruth, M. (2004). Diomind A new Biology Curriculum That Enables Authentic Inquiry Learning. **Journal of Biological Education**. 38(2), 59- 68. Available: File// A: EBSCO host, htm.

Purser, R. and Renner, J. (1983). Results of two Tenth Grade Biology Teaching. **Journal of food Science Education**.67, 85- 98.

Roadurck, M.D. (1988). Teacher attitudes toward chemical demonstrations. Barriers to utilization. **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 50, 404.

Shepardson, D. Mojr, E. Kennard-McClelland, A. (1994). The impact of science demonstration on children's understandings of air pressure. **Journal of food Science Education**. 31(3), 243- 258.

(1)

: / _____

: _____

(x) أمام ما ينطبق عليك

10 () 10-5 () 5 () :

() () () :

() () :

_____:

_____:

					.	.1
					.	.2
					.	.3
					.	.4
					. ()	.5
					.	.6
					.	.7
					.	.8
					.	.9
					.	.10
					.	.11
					.	.12
					.	.13
					.	.14
					.	.15
					.	.16
					.	.17
					.	.18
					.()	.19

						.20
						.21
						.22
						.23
						.24
						.25
						.26

						-
						.1
						.2
						.3
						.4
						.5
						.6
						.7
						.8
						.9
						.10
						.11

						.12
						.13
						.14
						.15
						.16
						.17
						.18
						.19
						.20
						.21
						.22
						.23
						.24
						.25

(2)

.

."

."



_____:

:

(x)

10

()

10-5

()

5

(): :

()

()

(): :

()

(): :

					.	.1
					.	.2
					.	.3
					.	.4
					.	.5
					.	.6
					.	.7
					.	.8
					.	.9
					.	.10
					.	.11
					.	.12
					.	.13
					.	.14
					.	.15
					.	.16
					.	.17
					.	.18
					.()	.19

						.20
						.21
						.22
						.23
						.24
						.25
						.26

						-
						.1
						.2
						.3
						.4
						.5
						.6
						.7
						.8
						.9
						.10
						.11
						.12

						.13
						.14
						.15
						.16
						.17
						.18
						.19
						.20
						.21
						.22
						.23
						.24
						.25
						.26

(3)

.

		.	1
		.	2
		.	3
		.	4
		.	5
		.	6
		.	7
		.	8
		.	9
		.	10

(4)

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Al-Quds University
Faculty of Educational Science
Graduate Studies Programs



جامعة القدس
كلية العلوم التربوية
برامج الدراسات العليا

الرقم: ب د ع / ١٢ / ١٣٨ / ٢٠٠٩

التاريخ: ٢٠٠٩ / ١٢ / ٢٨

حضرة مدير التربية والتعليم المحترم
محافظة القدس الشريف

الموضوع: تسهيل مهمة

تحية طيبة وبعد،،،
تقوم الطالبة: صفاء موسى حسن ورقمها الجامعي (٢٠٨١١٣٩٥)، بدراسة تتعلق برسالة
ماجستير بعنوان
" واقع استخدام معلمات العلوم في المرحلة الأساسية الدنيا للعروض العلمية والصعوبات التي
تواجهن من وجهة نظرهن في مدارس القدس "
لذا يرجى من حضرتكم تسهيل مهمة الطالبة المذكورة أعلاه والتعاون معها في الحصول على
أعداد المعلمات، ولتطبيق الدراسة خلال الفصل الدراسي الثاني ٢٠٠٩ / ٢٠١٠م.

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم

والله الموفق


د. محسن عدس

منسق برنامج أساليب التدريس / كلية العلوم التربوية

(5)

Awqaf Department
Directorate of Education
Jerusalem

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



دائرة الأوقاف العامة
مديرية التربية والتعليم
القدس

Tele fax: ٧٦٦٥٨١-٦٢٧٦٥١٤

Email: info@awqaf-jdoe.sch.ps

من ب. 19092 P.O.Box

تلفن: ٦٢٧٦٥١٤-٦٢٨١٥٨١

الرقم: ت م/٨٦٨/١٥٧٨٤
التاريخ: ٢٠١٠/١٠/٢٠ م
الموافق: ٢٤/محرم/١٤٣٠ هـ

مديرو ومديرات المدارس المحترمين/ات

تحية طيبة وبعد،،،

الموضوع : الدراسة الميدانية

لا مانع من قيام الطالبة "صفاء موسى حسن" بالقيام بدراستها بعنوان "واقع استخدام معلمات العلوم في المرحلة الأساسية الدنيا للعروض العلمية والصعوبات التي تواجههن من وجهة نظرهن في مدارس القدس" لذا يرجى من حضرتكم تسهيل مهمة الطالبة والتعاون معها في الحصول على أعداد المعلمات، ولتطبيق الدراسة خلال الفصل الدراسي الثاني 2010/2009م على ان لا يؤثر ذلك على سير العملية التعليمية.



مع الاحترام،،،

مدير التربية والتعليم لمحافظة القدس الشريف

س.س.ب.ب

38		1.3
39		2.3
41		3.3
42		4.3
48		1.4
51		2.4
51	(ANOVA)	3.4
52		4.4
53	(ANOVA)	5.4
54	()	6.4
55		7.4

58		8.4
58	(ANOVA)	9.4
59		10.4
60	(ANOVA)	11.4
61	()	12.4

79		1
84		2
89	.	3
90		4
91	.	5

1	:
2	
5	
6	
7	
7	
7	
8	
9	:
10	
23	
23	
26	
31	
35	

37	:
38	
38	
39	
39	
40	
44	
44	
45	
46	
47	:
48	
50	
52	
53	
55	
57	
59	
60	
62	:
63	
64	
65	
65	
66	

68	
68	
69	
70	
71	
72	
76	
78	
92	
94	
95	