JJMLL

Question Types in Lecture Rooms: EFL Setting as an Example

Mahmoud A. Al-Sobh, Samer M. Al-Zoubi *, Ameen Z. Al Khamaiseh
Department of English Language and Literature, Ajloun National University, Jordan

Fawwaz Al- Abed Al-Haq
The Hashemite University President, Jordan

Abstract

This study aims at exploring the types of questions that English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors and students raised through lecture rooms interaction. The participants of the study consisted of 4 EFL instructors and 60 English Language majors from Ajloun National University / Jordan. Two observation sheets were used to collect data. The Chi-square test (X2) was used to analyze data. The results of this study showed that the total number of questions raised by the instructors was 106, whereas the students raised 73 questions. The instructors used three types of questions: Yes /No questions, closed and display questions and open and referential questions. The results also showed that the number of open and referential questions was low and inadequate. On the other hand, the types of questions raised by students were mainly Yes/No, closed and display. The number of open and referential questions was also low and inadequate similar to the instructors'. There were no statistically significant differences between male and female instructors and students in the number and types of questions raised through classroom interaction due to gender. It was recommended that EFL instructors should raise different types of questions, mainly open and referential ones, to increase lecture room interaction and help students think critically and creatively.

Keywords: EFL, Question Types, Classroom questions, Classroom Interaction, Display questions,
Open question, Referential questions.

Introduction

It should be emphasized that questions are one of the crucial ways to acquire knowledge. Questions raised by teachers and students and their answers are essential as they are a very important component of the teaching-learning process which promotes and enhances communication. Questions and answers create a kind of interaction that is considered significant for both teachers and learners. They have always been the major stock in trade (Sanders 1966). They provide a chance for both teachers and students to interact and be involved in conversation and dialogue. Moreover, teachers' questions may serve various functions such as focusing attention, exerting disciplinary control, getting feedback, and most important

of all, encouraging students to participate and help them be evaluative thinkers (Farahian and Rezaee, 2012.)

Accordingly, a teacher's speech plays an important role in the process of learning. Questions are one act of this talk. They play a considerable role in developing learners' language proficiency in lecture rooms language (Cullen 1998). They are also employed to check student's comprehension to see whether they have acquired knowledge, to focus their attention and involvement in the lesson, to control behavior, and to encourage students to use the target language for communication (Tsui 1995).

In the teaching-learning process, there is an interaction created through communication between teachers and learners. This interaction is created through thinking skills (Zulkifli and Hashim 2019), lessons, lectures and discussions, etc. It is used to keep the ongoing activity to attain the required aims (Liskinasih 2016). Questions are important aspects in the interaction process as they help students think critically, creatively and enhance students' higher-level.

There are different types of classroom questions. The most important are those raised by the teacher in the classroom. They can develop the students' language skills by answering them. These questions are of the following types: rhetorical, procedural, closed, display, and open and referential questions (Erlinda and Dewi 2014).

Yang (2010) classified questions into the following types: Yes/No questions, display and closed questions, and open and referential questions. In Yes/No questions, the response is either yes or no. There are also convergent and divergent types of questions based on students' answers. Convergent requires short answers, while divergent are similar to open-ended questions. These types of questions have been found through classroom interaction of the teaching-learning process. Omari (2018) found that teachers of English dominantly ask open-ended questions through classroom interaction.

Many other classifications of questions are based on Bloom's (1956) for example, Nunan and Lamb 1996 ; Richards and Lockheart 1994, etc.). According to Bloom's classification, cognitive levels of questions are six: Knowledge, comprehension, and application which are considered low levels, the other three are analysis, synthesis and evaluation are considered high-level questions.

Looking at the importance and benefits of questions in creating interaction as well as promoting and developing second language learning, the researchers investigated the types of questions in lectures during the teaching-learning process. The findings of the study may contribute to the existing literature. It may also help fill the gap as few studies were conducted on lecture questions raised by EFL instructors and students.

Related Studies

Several studies investigated classroom questions that EFL instructors and students raise through classroom interaction. Hussein (1983) stated that classroom questions were essential educational activities that served to attain educational aims, such as discovering students' aptitude, willingness, promptness, and create an educational environment. Sanders (1966) connected the kinds of questions to Bloom's taxonomy

which has seven levels: Memory, translation, interpretation, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

Kutami and Sheikh (1992) affirmed that classroom questions helped students learn and be independent in their learning; they learned how to raise questions and take the teacher as a model in raising questions so that it was a skill that could be developed by practice and training.

Yang (2010) pointed out that display questions were commonly asked, whereas referential questions were rarely asked. Display questions had brief answers while referential responses elicited were longer and more complex.

Carin and Sund (1978) argued that questions could be planned before class time occurs through students' interaction in the classroom. They could be classified as convergent that required a limited number of answers and divergent which allowed for several responses, i.e., Wh-questions.

Skilton and Meyer (1993) emphasized that although classroom research focused on student discourse, there was a need to examine students' questions and their effect in the classroom.

Debby and Sterling (1997) explained that effective questions helped learners connect new learning with what they had already known. Martin, Sexton, Wagner, and Gerlovich (1994) mentioned four kinds of questions: Memorial, convergent, divergent, and evaluative. Chuska (1995) argued that application was an effective way for teachers to improve their questioning techniques and increases learners' motivation, and evaluative thinking.

Allwright and Bailey (1991) conducted a study in which they analyzed transcripts of six elementary adult ESL English classes with twenty students per class. They compared teachers' speech with baseline data collected in an experimental study of native and non-native speakers. One point of this study was that teachers used display and referential questions. They also found that ESL teachers used more display than referential questions.

Dalton-Puffer (2007) compared the terms referential and display questions and stated that referential questions can be seen as more natural and may generate students' answers which were better, more authentic, and more complex than display questions which can be seen as restricted consisting of one word. Therefore, Yes/No questions were good for beginners and for those who were not ready to talk.

Shi-Ying (2011) investigated the situation of English teachers questioning in senior high school both from teachers' and students' points of view. He suggested positive strategies for teachers' questioning that teachers should make an effort to get students interested in the questions. The findings showed that appropriate teacher questioning played a significant role in classroom teaching.

Hamiloğlu (2012) examined the types of teachers' questions and the frequency of the use of those types in the EFL classroom. The findings illustrated that convergent questions were the most frequently used ones. These types of questions included Yes/No, short answers, and display questions that cover the use of convergent questions.

Ndun (2012) studied teachers' questions in a junior high English school. It was conducted at public middle school 2 in Soe, South-central Timor. The instrument used was observation. Eight observations

were conducted in four classes of two weeks lessons. The findings indicated that display questions were asked by teachers rather than referential questions.

Al-Sobh, Al-Abed Al-Haq, and Shatnawi (2013) explored the kinds and levels of classroom questions raised by EFL teachers and tenth-grade students. The findings showed that male and female teachers raised three kinds of questions: Wh., Yes/No and multiple choice. There was no statistically significant difference between male and female teachers in the kinds and levels of questions raised. There was a significant difference between male and female students in the number of questions raised.

Qashoa (2013) explored the effect of teacher question types and syntactic structure on EFL classroom interaction. The participants were three teachers teaching at public schools in the UAE, one male teacher, and two female ones. Their teaching experience ranged from 10-17 years. Student's ages ranged from 16-18. Three observations were carried out. Three English language lessons in three secondary classes were recorded. Then the recording was analyzed concerning teachers' questions and students' responses. The findings of the study presented that the total number of questions asked by the three teachers was 105. It is noted that the total questions were displayed, while only 38% were referential. The average length of learners' responses to both question types was quite low.

Omari (2018) analyzed the types of classroom questions which Jordanian English language teachers asked. The sample of the study consisted of 77 teachers randomly selected from different public and private schools in Amman- Jordan. The number of questions collected is 1574, which were analyzed using descriptive statistics; a t-test was used. The findings showed that 80% of teachers' questions were on low thinking levels; 77% were closed-ended questions, and 86% were display questions. The results also indicated that teachers used higher thinking questions, more referential questions, and more open-ended questions at the upper basic stage and secondary stage. It was recommended that EFL teachers in Jordan should ask different types of questions at each grade level.

Susantara and Martawan (2020) examined teacher's questions and student's responses in the English classroom in a case study. Seventh-grade students were involved in the study in SMP Negeri. The data were collected through observation and interviews. The results showed that teachers more frequently raised convergent and display questions rather than divergent and referential questions.

To sum up, questions have been classified into Yes/No questions, closed and display questions and open and referential questions. Different studies have been carried out to investigate the types of questions raised by teachers and students, but few have been done at the university level during lecture time in Jordan. Therefore, this study comes to fill the gap. The results of this study may help instructors, students and curriculum designers.

Statement of the problem

Instructors of English at Ajloun National University complained that their students did not raise an adequate number of questions during lectures, so participation and interaction were low. This might affect students' understanding of the materials they studied. The researchers think that questioning is very

significant and it brings a lot of benefits to the lecture, the most important of which is interaction which helps keep the lecture going on. Therefore, the aims of the teaching-learning process could be achieved.

The researchers investigated the types of questions used by EFL instructors and students. This gives an idea about the effectiveness of questions raised and strategies used to determine the source of the problem and suggest solutions. This also may add a valuable contribution to the existing literature that benefits instructors, students and curriculum designers.

Purpose of the study

This study aimed at exploring and classifying the types of questions raised by EFL instructors and EFL students through lecture room interaction at ANU.

Questions of the study

This study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the types of questions raised by EFL instructors and EFL students through lecture rooms interaction at ANU?

2. Are there any statistically significant differences between male and female instructors and students in the types of questions raised through lecture rooms interaction?

Significance of the Study

This study investigated an important subject which is (EFL) instructors' and students' questions through lecture rooms interaction. The findings of the study may give instructors a clear picture about the type and level of questions raised in EFL English lectures, and whether their questions match the students' cognitive levels, especially the higher ones or not. This study also tried to provide teaching implications for EFL instructors, teacher trainers, textbook authors, and researchers. Moreover, curricula designers may find it beneficial for considering materials and suitable teaching strategies.

Limitations of the Study

The generalization of the results is limited to ANU EFL instructors and students.

Definition of Terms

- ANU: Ajloun National University

- Referential questions refer to questions that elicit real or unfamiliar information to

other participants in the class or questions an instructor or a student asks because he/she doesn't know the

answer. e.g. "What did you do last night?"

Display questions refer to questions whose answers are known to the instructor or student, but he/ she

wants to check whether students can answer them or not. e.g." What is the past simple form of the

verb "fly"?

Participants

The participants of the study were four EFL instructors, (2 males and 2 females) teaching English at ANU, Department of English Language and Literature. Instructors hold Ph.D. in English with five years of experience or more. Students were four classes (60 students, 30 males, and 30 females) of English Language majors studying English language and literature. They were second and third-year English students at ANU.

Data Collection Procedures

Observation was the only means of collecting the data. The researchers developed two observation sheets, one for teachers and the other for students. The researchers attended 8 classes and observed classroom interaction to take notes of classroom questions raised by teachers and their students. The researchers used a tape-recorder to audio-tape all the classes for more accuracy. Therefore, the data for this study were the transcripts of the audiotapes of English lectures attended. Each lecture ran for 50 minutes. Questions were calculated according to Yang's (2010) classification which was adopted, considering not only questions beginning with interrogatives, utterances with rising intonation were considered questions. Analysis of the recordings was Thompson (1997), which included Yes/No, display and closed, and open and referential questions.

Data analysis procedures

The researchers analyzed the types of questions raised by EFL instructors and students according to Yang's (2010) classification. This included: Yes/No questions, open and closed questions, and display and referential questions which were finally counted. Data were analyzed as follows: (1) The researchers calculated the number of questions raised by both instructors and students. (2) The researchers analyzed the types of the classroom questions raised by both instructors and students (3) The percentage of instructors' and students' number and type of questions were calculated (4) Comparison between male and female instructors' and student questions were made. (5) The expected frequencies and standard deviation were calculated. Chi-square test (X^2) was used to determine statistically significant differences between males and females in the type of questions raised through lecture room interaction.

Findings of the study

- Results related to the first question of the study:

What are the types of questions raised by EFL instructors and EFL students through lecture rooms interaction at ANU?

The total number of questions raised in the two sessions was 179 questions. Instructors raised 106 questions, whereas students raised 73 questions. This is shown in tables 1and 2.

Table 1: Number of Instructors' Questions Raised through Lecture Rooms Interaction

Instructors' No.	Session 1	Session 2	Total
1.	22	18	**40**
2.	12	8	**20**
3.	13	9	**22**
4.	14	10	**24**
Total	**61**	**45**	**106**

Table (1)shows that the number of questions raised by EFL instructors was(106) questions through lecture room interaction.

Table 2: Number of Students' Questions Raised through Lecture Rooms Interaction

Class No.	Session 1	Session 2	Total
Class 1	18	15	**33**
Class 2	9	6	**15**
Class 3	7	5	**12**
Class 4	6	7	**13**
Total	**40**	**33**	**73**

Table (2) illustrates the number of questions raised by EFL students through lecture rooms interaction was (73) questions.

Concerning the types of questions raised by both instructors and students through lecture rooms interaction, they are shown in tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Types of Questions Raised by Instructors through Lecture Rooms Interaction

Type of Questions	Session 1	Session 2	Total	Percentage
Yes/No	35	25	**60**	**%56.6**
Closed and Display	20	13	**33**	**% 31.2**
Open and referential	6	7	**13**	**%12.2**
Total	61	45	**106**	**%100**

Table (3) presents the types of questions raised by instructors through lecture room interaction. The instructors' questions were mostly Yes/No with the number of 60 questions with the percentage of 56.6 and closed and display questions with the number of 33 with a percentage of 31.2, whereas the number of the open and referential questions was 13 with a percentage of 12.2 which indicated an inadequate number of open and referential questions on the part of instructors.

Table 4: Types of Questions Raised by Students through Lecture Rooms Interaction

Type of Questions	Session 1	Session 2	Total	Percentage
Yes/No	25	18	43	**58.91%**
Closed and display	10	11	21	**28.77%**
Open and referential	5	4	9	**12.32%**
Total	40	33	73	**100%**

Table (4) shows the types of questions raised by students through lecture room interaction. The students' questions were mostly Yes/No with the number of 43 questions with the percentage of 58.91 and closed and display questions with the 21 questions with the percentage of 28.77, whereas the number of the open and referential questions was 9 questions with the percentage of 12.32 which indicated an inadequate number of open and referential questions on the part of instructors.

- Results related to the second question of the study:

Are there any statistically significant differences between male and female instructors and students in the types of questions raised through lecture room interaction?

The number of instructors 'questions are tabulated according to gender (Male, Female).This is presented in table 5.

Table 5: Number of Instructors' Questions Raised according to Gender (Male, Female)

Instructors' No.	Session 1	Session 2	Total	Percentage
Male 1	22	18	30	
3	13	15	28	
Total	**35**	**27**	**58**	**54.71%**
Female 2	12	10	22	
4	15	11	26	
Total	**26**	**18**	**18**	**45.28%**
Total(Male, Female)	61	45	106	

Table (5) clarifies that male instructors raised (58) questions with the percentage of 54.71%,while female instructors raised(48) questions with the percentage of 45.28.

The number of questions raised by students according to gender (Male, Female) is presented in table 6.

Table 6: Number of Questions Raised by Students according to Gender (Male, Female)

Type of Question	Yes/No	closed and display	open and referential	Total	Percentage
Male	17	10	6	**33**	**45.2%**
Female	20	12	8	**40**	**54.8%**
Total	37	22	14	**73**	**100%**

Table (6) shows the total number of questions raised by students according to gender was 73. Male students raised 33 questions with the percentage of 45.2%, whereas female students raised 40 questions with the percentage of 54.8%. The types of questions raised by instructors and students according to gender (Male, Female) are presented in table 7.

Table 7: Types of Questions Raised by Instructors according to Gender (Male, Female)

Type of Questions	Yes/No	Closed and display	Open and referential	Total
Male	30	20	8	**58**
Female	30	13	5	**48**
Total	**60**	**33**	**13**	**106**

Table 7 presents the types of questions raised by instructors according to gender (Male, Female). Male instructors raised 58 questions, while female instructors raised 48 questions of the three types. Chi-square test (X^2) shows that there were no statistically significant differences between male and female instructors in the number and types of questions raised through lecture rooms interaction due to gender.

Table 8: Types of Questions Raised by Students according to Gender (Male, Female)

Type of Questions	Yes/No	Closed and display	Open and referential	Total
Male	15	12	6	**33**
Female	19	18	3	**40**
Total	**34**	**30**	**9**	**73**

Table 8 shows that students raised 73questions of the three types. Male students raised 34 questions, whereas female students raised 39 questions. Chi-square test (X^2) shows that there were no statistically

significant differences between male and female students in the number and types of questions raised through lecture rooms interaction due to gender.

Discussion

This study aimed at investigating the types of questions that EFL instructors and students raise through lecture room interaction at ANU. This study classified the question types into three types: Yes/No questions closed and display questions and open and referential questions. The percentage of type and number of instructors' and students' questions were calculated. The Chi-square test (X^2) was used to determine statistically significant differences between male and female instructors and students in the type of questions raised.

Table (1) shows that the total number of questions raised by instructors was 106, whereas the total number of questions raised by students was73 as shown in table(2). The number of questions raised by instructors and students was low, and instructors did not use a large number of questions that encouraged students to think, participate, and be motivated. This conforms with Farahian and Rezaee (2012); Tsui (1995).

Table (3) shows that the types of questions raised by instructors were mostly Yes /No questions, 60 with the percentage of 56.6%., e.g.

1. *'Is the life in China the same as life in Hawaii?'*
2. *'Is living a frugal lifestyle the best?'*
3. *'Did the author return to china to discover herself?'*
4. *' Was the grandfather an ambitious man?'*

Closed and display questions were 33 with the percentage of 31.2%, e.g.

1. *' What's the meaning of 'qualms'?'*
2. *'What's the past form of 'fly'?'*
3. *'Who's the main character of the story?'*
4. *' What are some reasons why children work?'*

This means that most of the instructors' questions were almost factual and memorial that don't require a high level of thinking 87.8 % (Yes/No and closed and display), they do not require analysis, evaluation and inference. Such questions do not motivate or encourage students to raise high-level cognitive questions in a creative lecture room interaction. Answers for these questions are limited, stated in the text clearly and do not require high level thinking. Students can answer them easily.

However, the number of referential and open questions was 13 with the percentage of 12.2, e.g.

1. *Do you have a sense of your cultural identity? Why? Why not?*
2. *' How are child laborers treated around the world?'*
3. *' Why do you think the woman think this way?'*
4. *' What is the grandfather's philosophy of work?'*

This shows that the number of instructors' open and referential questions was low and inadequate12.2% . This does not foster students' interest in raising such questions, so students are deprived from the chance of thinking creatively and critically, such questions need higher level of thinking and evaluation to present the answers which are not listed directly in the text.

Concerning students, most of the questions they raised were mostly Yes /No questions 43 with the percentage of 58.91 and closed and display questions which were 21 with the percentage of 28.77.

Yes /No questions, e.g.

1. ' Did the author grow in multicultural mix?'

2. ' Does the grandfather think that Masood is a lazy man?'

3. ' Do you consume more than you need?'

4.'Do you live frugally?'

Closed and display questions, eg.

1.' Where does the story take place?'

2.' What languages does the author speak?'

3. Why did Masood sell his land?'

This indicated that most of the students' questions were almost as factual and memorial as those of the teacher's (87.8 % yes/no and closed, display). They did not require a high level of thinking, analysis, evaluation and inference. This also means that students are not motivated and encouraged to raise high - level questions in lecture interaction.

However, the number of open and referential questions was 9 with the percentage of 12. 2 **e.g.:**

1.' Do you think that coming with your cultural identity is essential? Why? Why not?

2. ' What should we do to consume less and live more simply?

3. 'What's the boy's opinion of his grandfather?

This showed that the number of students' open and referential questions was low and inadequate. Lecture interaction did not help students think creatively and critically. They only imitate their instructors in raising similar types of questions. They are not well trained to raise such questions through using successful questioning techniques

Chi-square test (X^2) was used to determine the statistically significant difference between male and female instructors in the type of questions raised through lecture room interaction. The findings show that there was no statistically significant difference between instructors' gender (male, female) and the three types of questions (Male instructors raised 58 questions, while female instructors raised 48 questions). Most of these questions were low level which did not help students to be creative or boost their evaluative thinking. Male instructors surpassed females in using questioning strategies as they raised more questions in the number and type.

Chi-square test (X^2) was also used to determine statistically significant differences between male and female students in the type of questions raised through lecture rooms interaction. The findings showed

that there were no statistically significant differences due to gender (Male, Female) and type of questions. Male students raised 33 questions while female students raised 40 questions.

The researchers thought that the reason beyond asking a low number of open and referential questions, and more Yes/No and closed types of questions by both male and female instructors and students might be that instructors used inadequate questioning strategies and ineffective questioning techniques with their students, who were not exposed to practice open and referential questions appropriately. They only imitated their instructors as they didn't have experience in asking such questions These findings conform with Farahiain and Rezaee (2012), Al-sobh, Al-abed Al-Haq and Shatnawi(2013), Qashoa (2013), Long and Sato(1983) and Yang(2010) as the number of questions was low, and the majority of them were yes/no and display and closed question. The findings also are in line with Omari (2018) that most teachers' questions are on low thinking levels. Moreover, the findings agree with Susantara and Martawan (2020) and Ndun (2012) that teachers are more frequently raised convergent and display questions rather than divergent and referential questions, and Hamiloğlu (2012) that convergent questions were the most frequently used ones.

The low number and type of questions raised by instructors, both males and females, also confirmed that instructors did not realize the importance of questioning strategies in motivating students and creating a better classroom environment. They should use more suitable questioning strategies to provide students with effective teaching which involves high - level questions to train students and help them think critically, check understanding, diagnose and solve problems.

Conclusions

Following the discussion of the findings of the study, some conclusions could be summed up. Firstly, all the instructors used the three types of questions: Yes/No, closed and display questions with the number of 60 Yes/No questions and 33 closed and display questions, whereas the number of the open and referential questions was 13 which shows an inadequate number of this type of questions on the side of instructors. Secondly, there were no statistically significant differences between (male and female) instructors in the number and type of questions raised through lecture rooms interaction due to gender. This is shown in table 7. Finally, the types of questions raised by students were mainly Yes/No and closed and display with the number of 64, while the number of the open and referential questions was 9. There were no statistically significant differences between male and female students in the number and type of questions raised through lecture rooms interaction due to gender. This is shown in table 8.

In summary, the results of this study could provide EFL instructors with the most common types of questions raised in EFL lectures. Moreover, these results could help instructors recognize how much their questions concentrate on different cognitive levels of their students. They can help develop students thinking abilities by raising different kinds of questions that suit their students' levels. Furthermore, textbook authors and curricula developers might find the results of this study significant in re-evaluating the teaching methods and learning materials currently used at universities in Jordan.

Recommendations

Depending on the findings of this study, the researchers recommend that instructors should use various types of questions since they help to create a suitable lecture rooms atmosphere, motivate and encourage students to think critically. Furthermore, instructor trainers should start a training program for instructors on using different types of questions and effective questioning strategies that can enhance lecture room interaction. Lastly, researchers are recommended to investigate the types of questions raised by instructors and students at other universities.

<div dir="rtl">

الأسئلة التي يطرحها مدرسو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية و الطلبة في المحاضرات

محمود عبد الصبح، سامر محمد الزعبي، أمين الخمايسة
قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها، جامعة عجلون الوطنية، الأردن

فواز العبد الحق
رئيس الجامعة الهاشمية، الأردن

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى استكشاف أنواع الأسئلة الصفيَّة التي يطرحها مدرسو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية وطلبة الجامعات الأردنيَّة من خلال التفاعل الصفي. شارك في هذه الدراسة 4 مدرسين و60 طالبًا من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية وآدابها في جامعة عجلون الوطنية / الأردن. تم استخدام ورقتي ملاحظة لجمع البيانات، وتم استخدام اختبار (X2) Chi-square لتحديد الفروق ذات الدلالة الإحصائية بين المدرسين والطلبة من حيث أنواع الأسئلة المطروحة. وأظهرت نتائج هذه الدراسة أن إجمالي عدد الأسئلة التي طرحها المدرسون بلغ 106 سؤالاً ، في حين طرح الطلبة 73 سؤالاً. طرح المدرسون ثلاثة أنواع من الأسئلة: 60 سؤالاً من نوع نعم / لا و 33 سؤال من الأسئلة المغلقة وأسئلة العرض ، في حين أن عدد الأسئلة المفتوحة والمرجعية كان 13 سؤالاً ، مما أظهر عددًا غير كافٍ من هذا النوع من الأسئلة. من ناحية أخرى ، كانت أنواع الأسئلة التي طرحها الطلبة بشكل أساسي: نعم / لا، وأسئلة مغلقة ، وأسئلة عرض وعددها 64 سؤالاً ، في حين كان عدد الأسئلة المفتوحة والمرجعية 9 أسئلة. أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية بين مدرسي اللغة الإنجليزية والطلبة في عدد الأسئلة المطروحة وأنواعها من خلال التفاعل الصفي يعزى إلى الجنس. أوصت الدراسة بأن يطرح مدرسو اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في الأردن أنواعًا مختلفة من الأسئلة لزيادة مستوى التفاعل الصفي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، الأسئلة الصفية، التفاعل الصفي، أسئلة عرض، أسئلة مفتوحة، أسئلة مرجعية.

</div>

References

Allwright, Dick, and Bailey, Kathleen. 1991. *Focus on the Language Learner*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Al - Sobh, Mahmoud and Al- Abed Al-Haq, Fawwaz.2013. Kinds and Levels of Questions Raised by EFL Teachers and Tenth Grade Students through Classroom Interaction.*Sino – US English Teaching* 2013 10 (6).

Bloom, Benjamin. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*. New York: Longman Green.

Carin, and Sund, Robert. 1978. *Creative Questioning and Sensitive Listening Techniques*. Columbus, Ohio: Clarles E. Merrill Publishing.

Chuska, Kenneth, R. 1995. *Improving Classroom Questions: A Teacher's Guide to Increasing Student's Motivation, Participation, and Higher-level Thinking.* ERIC ED 388624.

Cullen, Richard. 1998. Teacher Talk and the Classroom Context. *English Language Teaching Journal* 52 (3): 187-189.

Dalton-Puffer, Christiane. 2007. *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Debby, Deal and Sterling, Donna. 1997. Kids Ask the Best Questions. *Educational Leadership* 54 (6): 61-63.

Erlinda, Rad and Dewi,S. Tr. 2014. Teachers' Questions in EFL Classroom. *Tadib,* 17 (2): 177-188 .

Farahian, Majid, and Rezaee, Mehrdad. 2012. A Case Study of an EFL Teacher's Type of Questions: An Investigation into Classroom Interaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 47: 161–167.

Hamiloğlu, Kamile. 2012. The Impact of Teacher Questions on Student Learning In EFL. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World (WJEIS)* 2 (1): 2146-7463.

Hussein, F. 1983. Classroom Questions. *The Teacher's Message. Risalat Al-Mualim* 24 (2): 43-50.

Kutami, Yousuf, and Sheikh, Khaled. 1992. Classroom Questions and the Way to Write them. The *Teacher's Message. RisalatAl-Mualim 2* (3): 161-131.

Liskinasih, Ayu. 2016. Corrective Feed beaks in CLT- Adopted classrooms Interactions. *Indonesian Jornal of Applied Lingustic* 6 (1): 60-69

Martin, Ralph; Sexton, Colleen; Tersa, Franklin; and Gerlovich, Jack. 1994. *Teaching science for all children*. Bosten: Allyn and Bacon.

Ndun, Lesly. 2012. *Teachers' Questions in a Junior High School English Classroom.*The graduate thesis of Sanata Darma University Yogyakarta. Retrieved November 18, 2017 from http://repository.usd.ac.id/388/2/12 6332042.

Nunan. David, and Lamb, Clarice. 1996. Communicative Language Teaching: The Self-directed Teacher: Managing the Learning Process. Cambridg. Cambridge University Press.

Omari, Hamzah. 2018. Analysis of the Types of Classroom Questions which Jordanian English Language Teachers Ask. *Modern Applied Science* 12 (4): 1–12.

Qashoa, Sulaiman. 2013. Effects of Teacher Question Types and Syntactic Structure on EFL classroom interaction. *The International Journal of Social Sciences* 7 (1): 52-62.

Richards, Jack C. and Lockhart, Charles. 1994. Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, Norris. 1966. *Classroom Questions.* Harper Collins College Div: Network Harper & Row Publishers.

Shi-Ying, XU. 2011. The Present Situation of English Teachers' Questioning in Senior Middle School and Positive Strategies. *Asia-Pacific Science and Culture Journal* 1 (3): 1-15.

Skilton, Ellen and Meyer, Thomas. 1993. *So What are you Talking about? The Importance of Students' questions in the ESL Classroom.* ERIC.ED 367139.

Susantara, I Putu. D. and Myartawan, I Putu, W. (2020). An Analysis of Teacher Questions and Student Responses in the English Teaching-Learning Process. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation* (3): 254-258.

Thompson, Geoff. 1997. Training Teachers to Ask Questions. *English Language Teaching Journal* 51 (2): 99-105.

Tsui, Amy. 1995. *Introducing Classroom Interaction.* London: Penguin.

Yang,Chi Cheung. 2010. Teacher Questions in Second Language Classrooms: An Investigation of Three Case Studies. *Asian EFL Journal* 12 (1): 181-201.

Zulkifli, Hafizhah, and Hashim, Rosnani. 2019. The Development of Questioning Skills through Hikmah (Wisdom) Pedagogy. *Creative Education* 10 (12): 2593-2605.https://doi.org/ 10.4236/ce.2019.1012187