

Full Length Research

TEACHERS' PRACTICES OF QUESTIONING AND WAIT TIME IN EFL CLASSROOMS

Wubante Mekonnen

Debre Markos University, Ethiopia. E-mail: wubantemekonnen6@gmail.com

Accepted 12 December 2019

This study examined the teachers' perceived and actual practices of questioning and waits time in EFL classrooms. The study was helpful to teachers in giving opportunities to design a wide range of techniques while implementing questioning and wait time in EFL classrooms. The researcher used interview, observation and questionnaire as data gathering tools. To check the reliabilities of close-ended items, Cronbach alpha was calculated. The results were 0.98 and 0.95. So, the results could fit to the purpose of the study. To check the validity of instruments, the researcher discussed with English experts, other research experts and high school teachers. Forty-two teachers were participated in this study. The target participants were selected by simple random sampling technique. The results of the interview showed that the majority of teachers used questions for checking the students' comprehension, meaning or concept. The results of the study through observation also showed that the most dominant question types in EFL classrooms were knowledge and comprehension. The result from one-way ANOVA again revealed that there were significant differences among EFL teachers' actual practices of questioning. The results of paired samples t-test also revealed that there were significant differences between the teachers' perceived and actual practices of questioning and its associated wait time. The results obtained through using Pearson Product-moment Correlation on the teachers' actual practices also showed that there was weak overall significant correlation between the level of teacher questioning and the associated wait time ($r = 0.30$). EFL teachers also gave shorter wait times in class (1.1 seconds) than they believed they actually would (3.87 seconds). Therefore, EFL teachers should pay attention to their questioning because it is a frequently used tool and the way to good teaching. Since wait time is also a key procedure to complete a teaching conversation, EFL teachers should prolong their wait times reasonably depending on the type of the question at each cognitive level. Moreover, EFL teachers should also make sure that the teaching materials provide an opportunity to ask focused questions that require learners to compare, contrast, persuade, determine cause and effect, predict, infer and establish a certain criteria, which would develop their process of thinking.

Key Words: Teacher Questioning, Wait Time, Practice, EFL

Cite This Article As: Wubante M (2019). TEACHERS' PRACTICES OF QUESTIONING AND WAIT TIME IN EFL CLASSROOMS. *Inter. J. Eng. Lit. Cult.* 7(9): 297-311

INTRODUCTION

English language serves as a medium of instruction both in secondary schools and higher institutions in

Ethiopia. To improve academic performances of students and enhance their communication competence, language-teaching methods play a significant role in EFL classrooms. They also play vital roles in the first

language classrooms. One of the devices that teachers employ in teaching language in both EFL and first language classrooms is questioning (Chaudron, 1988). It is a technique of teaching that should be given attention by language teachers.

Bloom (1956) initiated a cognitive taxonomy with six hierarchical levels of thinking associated with teacher questioning. Bloom's taxonomy is one way of classifying cognitive objectives into sub-divisions ranging from the simplest behavior to the most complex one. Such cognitive taxonomy comprises six processes, which require learners to demonstrate knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Therefore, language learners should learn to talk and be encouraged to make use of target language. In Ethiopia where English is taught as a foreign language, interaction seems to exist as a main feature. As Shomossi (2004) states, questions can be important tool in the language classroom especially in those contexts where the classroom provides the only opportunity to produce the target language. As a result, practicing and applying the language for communication through questioning has a considerable importance to the improvement of learning and enhancing learners' communicative competence.

EFL Teachers ask questions in class to achieve different purposes. Each has implications for the practical aspect of teaching (Cole & Chan, 1994; Gebrielatos, 1992). Concerning the different purposes of classroom questions, Borich (1988) explains questions formed according to the specific purpose can be used as an advance organizer-providing framework for the expected response. All the questions asked for different purposes are also different in type. Anonymous (2010) and Borich (2004) also stated that questions are the tool for bridging the gap between the teachers' presentations of content and the students' understanding of it. It is also indicated that the core of language, which is conducted by language teachers, can be expressed in various ways such as questioning, explaining, discussion or any other kinds of activities that will facilitate learners' language acquisition (Capell et al, 2001; Cotton, 1998; Hussain, 2003). Typically, teachers ask many questions per period, however, the quality and value of questions vary. Some teachers ask specific questions repeatedly. Others also ask questions that are not related to the content due to lack of realization and skills for asking effective questions that are related to the intended level (Cotton, 1998). As a result, the quality and value of questions differ from one to the other.

If we look at a practice of teaching English in Ethiopian secondary schools today, we may observe multifaceted and deep-rooted problems. Studies made by Kifle (2008) on question types and Aklilu (2009) on oral questioning implementations in EFL classrooms confirm that students have difficulties in using the target language and

interacting in the classroom. As their studies indicated, there are also problems on teachers' questioning skills and the wait time provided by them to students to answer questions at various levels. Supporting this view Chaudron (1986) states, teachers' questions constitute a primary means of engaging progress. Therefore, one of the measures to be taken for the improvement of teachers' questioning skills is investigating a research on the area. Although many empirical studies have explored teacher questioning behavior, very few of them have examined such quality in EFL setting (Aklilu, 2009; Chang; 1990; Kifle; 2008; Wong, 2005). In particular, little research has been conducted in the actual practice with senior high school English teachers in their use of questioning skills.

As it is stated above, exposing students to the language in the classroom is useful. It can be practiced through the art of thoughtful questioning skills. Moreover, if we believe that language acquisition will be maximally facilitated by using questioning effectively, the issue of wait time is also very important. Wait time which is the silent period that the teacher pauses after asking a question, is crucial to students' thinking and processing of the question (Lake, 1975; Nunan, 1995; Rowe, 1974). Though giving sufficient wait time has many useful effects in any classroom, teachers do not manage themselves to expand their wait time beyond one or two seconds (Borich, 1988; Capell et al, 2001; Dillon, 1988; Goodwin et al, 1992; Nunan, 1995; Perrot, 1982; Petty, 2004).

As Borich (2004) though every type question has its own importance which measure students' thinking superficially is dominant in language as well as other classrooms. Similarly, Vogler (2005) reported that in the actual classroom studies most of the questions raised by teachers were not inviting students for better language production and thinking abilities. There are local researches done on teachers' questioning behaviors in EFL classrooms. But these researches focus on the types of questions and on how to implement questioning strategies designed for higher institutions. In line with this, local researchers such as Aklilu (2009) and Kifle (2008) have tried to assess on teachers' oral questioning implementation and question types in higher institution EFL classrooms respectively. But the criteria used by these researchers showed that how EFL teachers implement oral questioning strategies and the types of questions that are employed most in higher institution EFL classrooms. Their criteria did not help to compare the teachers' perceived and actual practices on questioning and wait time. Therefore; less focus has been given to the teachers' practices on questioning and waits time in high school EFL classrooms.

As it has been noted, the teachers' practices on questioning and wait time in EFL classrooms need further investigation. There are no studies on this area, and no local research has been conducted on teachers' practices

(perceived and actual) on questioning and wait time in high school EFL classrooms. Even though very few researchers reported on the teachers' questioning behavior and wait time, the results of teachers' actual and their perceived practices on questioning and wait time in EFL contexts is still unclear. Since the occasional use of questioning at all cognitive levels is useful in EFL classes, this could lead the researchers to conduct a further research on the area. Therefore, these and other reasons initiating the present researcher to conduct a study on teachers' actual and their perceived practices on questioning and wait time in EFL classrooms at five high schools in Awi Zone, Ethiopia. To conduct this study, the researcher has formulated the following research questions:

1. What are the philosophies of EFL teachers about the importance of questioning and wait time?
2. Is there any difference between EFL teachers' perceived and actual practices on questioning and wait time?
3. Which level of questioning is employed most in EFL classrooms?
4. Is the level of teacher questioning correlated with wait time?

REVIEW LITERATURE

A number of writers such as Borich (2004); Cooper (1986); Farrant (1980); Kisko and Iyortsuun (1982), Myra and Davis (1997), and others have followed Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) without or with some modifications. Mostly, they distinguish higher-order and lower-order questions in relation to the cognitive categories. According to Kisko and Iyortsuun (1982:9), cognitive questions are concerned with intellectual understanding. The importance of classifying questions in relation to their complexity levels helps teachers to identify the purposes of questioning in the classrooms, and this can promote language learning and teaching in general (Murname, 2008; Williams, 1991). One of the best known systems for determining the intellectual level of questions is Benjamin Bloom's Taxonomy, which proceeds from the lowest level of questions, knowledge, to the highest level, evaluation. This section provides information about the different levels of classroom questions.

1. Classroom Questions

The art of asking the right questions at the appropriate time is not innate. Bloom's taxonomy of learning categorizes cognitive levels into several domains. Questions that elicit responses in the knowledge, comprehension, and application domains are frequently

considered lower-order questions, while questions in the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation domains are considered higher-order questions. Higher-order questions elicit deeper and critical thinking; therefore, teachers are encouraged to ask questions in these domains (Borich, 2004; Myra and Davis, 1997; Vogler, 2005; Zhang, 1999). This does not mean that lower-order questions should not be asked. However, when facts are linked to other forms of knowledge such as subsequent lessons and units, they become stepping-stones for gradually increasing complexity of teaching outcome (Lee, 2009). It is appropriate to ask questions to address all cognitive domains as long as the desired learning outcome is kept in mind and a good mix of questions is used during each teaching session (Cooper, 1986; Myra and Davis, 1997; Paul, 1993). Unfortunately, observations of classroom-based instructors have repeatedly shown that lower-order questions are far more frequently used in the majority of high schools. Perhaps teachers do not value higher-order questions and feel they are not effective, or perhaps a lack of formal training on how to formulate questions to stimulate learning is the root cause.

2. Wait Time

Wait time is one questioning strategy which helps learners to develop higher thought process. In real sense, wait time is the amount of time the teacher waits after asking a question, before a student responds or the teacher comments, gives the answer or presents another question (Goodwin et al, 1992; Kisko and Iyortsuun, 1982). The foregoing idea underlies that the amount of time elapses between asking a question and doing something else in one factor which can have powerful effects on student participation and communication ability in EFL classrooms (Ibid: 17).

Despite teachers' fear and failure to give sufficient wait time, Good and Brophy (1997) suggest that longer wait times are generally preferable than shorter ones because they allow more thinking by more students. Moreover, they advise that shorter wait times may still be important when the class is restive or when time is running out and it is necessary to finish the lesson quickly. In line with this, many research findings showed that most teachers practice very little "wait time"; typically less than or about one second. Information processing involves multiple cognitive tasks that take time (Borich, 2004; Dillon, 1988; Myra and Davis, 1997; Rowe, 1986). Therefore, students must have uninterrupted periods of time to process information; reflect on what has been said, observed or done; and consider what their personal responses will be.

Borich (2004); Dillon (1988); Goodwin et al, (1992); Kisko and Iyortsuun (1982); Nunan (1995); Rowe (1972), and others believe that when students are given

three or more seconds of uninterrupted “wait time”, there are certain positive outcomes: (1) The length and correctness of their responses increase; (2) The number of their “I don’t know” and “no answer” responses decreases; (3) The number of volunteered, appropriate answer by large number of students greatly increases; and (4) The scores of students on academic achievement tests tend to increase.

3. Relationships between Teacher Questioning and Wait Time

Wait time was considered as important as questioning skills in empirical research. Rowe (1974) as cited in Wilen (1991:20) noted that sufficient wait time was important for students to thinking, especially higher-cognitive one, after a question raised by a teacher and before a response given by a student. It was detected that the average teacher wait time was only three seconds when the teacher participants had perceived trainings on questioning strategies and use of wait time for classroom practice, the quantity and quality of their students’ responses improved dramatically. Such finding suggested the importance of sufficient wait time for students to do higher-level thinking and to respond more precisely.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a survey research design to examine the teachers’ practices on questioning and wait time in EFL classrooms. The researcher chose the survey method because of its appropriateness in serving as a tool for collecting information from the sample teachers’ perceived and actual practices on questioning and waits time in EFL classrooms of the study areas. What is more, the method helps the researcher to collect large amount of data in a relatively short amount of time.

Population and Sampling Technique

Awzi Zone is found in the Amhara National Regional State, in Ethiopia. In the Zone there are 13 high schools. Out of these, 5 senior high schools were chosen by the researcher purposely for the study. In the selected high schools there were 42 teachers who are currently teaching English in grade ten. The target participants to the study were selected from these teachers by using simple random sampling technique. The researcher selected the target participants of the study randomly until he has got the required numbers from the population.

The researcher selected the target participants for the study using simple random sampling technique. For this, 10 participant teachers were selected randomly for interview. The researcher also selected 30 participant teachers for observation. The observed teachers were also asked to complete the survey questionnaires. The main reason for this was that the researcher thought reliable information on the actual practices of teachers on questioning and wait time was found from the observed teachers. The researcher also believed that observing the large number of teachers helped him to see various behaviors from the observed participants. It also later enabled him to compare the actual practices of teachers found through observation with what was found from the responses of the participants in the survey questionnaires.

Instruments of Data Collection

Data were collected through a survey method on the teachers’ practices on questioning and wait time in EFL classes using interview, observation and questionnaire.

Ten participant teachers for **interview** were randomly selected (two from each school). Four interview questions were developed for the selected ten participant teachers. Semi-structured interview questions were included in the adapted questions. The interview questions were adapted from the Present Situation of English Teachers’ Questioning in Middle High Schools (Xu Shi-Ying, 2011). To see what actually happens in EFL classes through **observation**, observation checklist was adapted. Thirty teachers were selected in five senior high schools randomly for observation. The whole observation was supported by a co-observer. Short discussion was held with a co-observer on how to complete the question analysis sheet. List out questions on the adapted question analysis sheet generated by teachers based on the established criteria. Both the question analysis sheet and the criteria were adapted from Bloom’s Taxonomy, Effective Classroom Questioning (Goodwin et al, 1992), and Xu Shi-Ying (2011).

The **questionnaire** was also designed to assess the teachers’ perceived practices of questioning and the related wait time in EFL classrooms. The developed questionnaire was administered to the observed thirty teachers who are currently teaching English in the study areas. The questionnaire includes two items: items at various cognitive levels and teachers’ wait time. The former was composed of 20 items and the second part consisted of six items. The questionnaire was adapted from Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956), Effective Classroom Questioning (Goodwin et al, 1992), and Xu Shi-Ying (2011).

Procedures of Data Collection

Before interview, observation, and questionnaires were carried out, different procedures were conducted. First, the interview guides, observation checklists, and questionnaires were developed. The close-ended questionnaires were pilot tested 30 grade nine English teachers at three senior high schools to test the reliability and validity of the instrument and to ensure whether there were unclear, vague or unrelated question items in the questionnaire. The internal consistencies of the two parts of the questionnaire as estimated by Cronbach alpha were 0.98 and 0.95, respectively. So the evidence could be reliable for the study. After the pilot study, the two close-ended questionnaires were used throughout the study because of their high correlation with the total items.

Methods of Data Analysis

The data obtained from the interviews, observation and questionnaire was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The data gathered through interviews were analyzed qualitatively. For the numerical data gathered through observation and questionnaire the researcher used SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version. Descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviations were used to analyze the data from observation and questionnaires. The procedures of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and paired samples t-test were further performed to examine the teachers' perceived and actual practices on questioning and wait time. Moreover, a Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between questioning and wait time.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to assess the teachers' practices on questioning and wait time in EFL classrooms. The data collected through interview, observation and questionnaire were interpreted and analyzed primarily. The information gathered through these instruments was analyzed and interpreted so as to achieve the objectives posed in chapter one by considering the responses of the target participants. This section also focused on reporting the statistical results of the current study. For this, the statistical results of the study are presented according to the sequence of the research objectives. In the beginning, the teachers' philosophies (opinions and beliefs) about the importance of questioning and wait time in EFL classes are reported. Secondly, the results of teachers' perceived and actual practices on questioning and wait time are discussed.

Next, the levels of questioning employed by teachers are described. Lastly, the relationship between questioning and wait time are reported.

Teachers' Philosophies about the Importance of Questioning and Wait Time

Investigating the participants' views about the importance of questioning and wait time in EFL classes was the first major objective of the study. For this, the researcher used interview as the major tool to achieve such objective. A total of ten teachers (two from each school) from the observed teachers were interviewed by the researcher. The main purpose of the interview was to assess the teachers' opinions and beliefs about the importance of questioning and wait time in EFL classes. For this, four leading interview questions were developed to the selected participants. Other questions were also generated from the interviewee. The researcher then used percentages and words to analyze the results of the interview qualitatively. Lastly, the results of the interviewees' responses was presented and analyzed as follow.

The participants were formerly asked to say something about the importance of questioning in their EFL classes. All of the participants (100%) stated that questions help them trigger thinking so they help them to improve the teachers' speaking skills and ability to reason and comment in English. As participants claimed, asking various questions has also lots of advantages. The main ones were: (1) to develop critical thinking abilities; (2) to develop interest and motivation; (3) to improve students' communication; (4) to assess the achievement of instructional goals; and (5) to manage the classroom. Moreover, the participants said that asking questions in EFL classes is important to evaluate the students' preparation and to review/summarize the previous lessons.

The participant teachers added that by considering questioning as one basic device through which students and teachers organize their thinking to achieve their objectives. They stated the major benefits of questioning in that it helps them to think more, to distinguish strengths and weaknesses, to see things critically and to facilitate better understanding. Moreover, as the participants replied, classroom questioning has lots of benefits for both teachers and students in arousing interest, strengthening learning, stimulating critical thinking and developing insights. All the participant teachers also agreed that wait time is a very vital thing in their EFL classes in that it provides students adequate time to think and give complete answers for various questions. They also said that a reasonable wait time is beneficial to get good responses from their students. Moreover, they also stated that wait time is considered as one key procedure

in EFL classes for teachers to complete a teaching conversation.

In addition, the participant teachers also expressed their beliefs and opinions about the advantage of using varieties of levels of questions in EFL classes. As most participants stated, varieties of questions from all cognitive levels is advantageous. For example, using lower level questions (LLQ) such as knowledge and comprehension in their EFL classes help them to: (1) diagnose the students' strengths and weaknesses; (2) reviewing/summarizing content; (3) encouraging students; and (4) stimulating students to seek information their own.

As participants said asking questions from higher level questions (HLQ) such as synthesis and evaluation are usually appropriate for: (1) encouraging students think critically; (2) developing the ability for problem solving; and (3) helping them to connect and integrate ideas together with their own. Moreover, asking questions from higher levels is also basically serving as a tool to lead students for creativity and self-evaluation based on certain established rules, criteria and using their own profiles. But, in their actual classroom situation, they witnessed that they did not ask higher level questions. The main reason for them was the shortage of time to cover the content of the course. Others also said that the background knowledge of the students and the lack of skills for using such questions as the major factors in their EFL context.

The participants were also asked to express their opinions and beliefs about how much time they leave to their students after asking a question as well as its benefits. They suggested that the time given to each level of questioning depending on the lesson and objectives of the lesson. However, when they are asked for a rough figure, they came up with different numbers. Seven participants (70%) expressed their beliefs in that leaving sufficient wait time to students after asking a question is advantageous. In their belief, LLQ such as knowledge and comprehension require 2-10 seconds. HLQ such as synthesis and evaluation also require more seconds and minutes depending on their levels. Other three participants (30%) also stated that leaving too much time to students after asking either of question(s) without considering its level has its own limitation. According to them, the main reason for their ideas was a fear of lacking attention in class after students are getting completion of the given tasks. Thus, as it was understood from the participants' opinions, all of them agreed that appropriate wait time depending on the level and type of questions is essential for both teachers and students to make the teaching learning process 'flexible'. Finally, all participants believed that even if asking both lower and higher level questions is beneficial for both teachers and students, as it was observed in the classroom, there was no suitable room for asking and responding questions

requiring higher thinking abilities.

How does questioning affect students' language development? This was another question by the researcher to the participants. All the participants suggested that questioning has a tremendous effect on students' language development. One thing is that learning is enhanced by questioning since questions lead to grammar and also vocabulary formation. In addition, students can produce more languages through responding questions: thus practice speaking. The participants also agreed that questioning facilitates interaction and student involvement in the lesson. Moreover, they stated that with the right questions students can develop their critical thinking skills, helping them to increase their cognitive levels. They also added by giving students the opportunity to express themselves, appropriate questions make a classroom discourse genuine. What is more, as the participants stated, being able to express their opinions and feelings in the language they are learning through questioning helps to promote self-confidence and motivation. Believing that teachers' questioning should require a certain way of improvement, the researcher raised his final question to the participants to express their opinions how they improve their questioning skills in relation to their teaching. All the participants said that they did not have any means for improving their questioning skills rather than own efforts. They also stated that any trainings (either short, long or both) were not given to them. They also added that they did not have any habit of experience sharing on how to improve their questioning skills in their work areas.

From the interview, it was found that teachers use questions for a variety of purposes: (1) to check understanding/comprehension/ meaning/concept; (2) to help students' thinking critically; (3) to facilitate participation and interaction; (4) to check prior knowledge; (5) to initiate genuine communication; (6) to elicit language; (7) to start a discussion that lead to a topic; and (8) to maintain discipline. Even though it seemed that all participants understand the benefits of classroom questioning, higher level questions were rarely found in all observed classes. The classroom observation also showed that most EFL teachers ask questions to their students for checking comprehension, meaning or concept. Therefore, lower level questions took the highest ranges in all observed classes.

In addition, though teachers believed that sufficient wait time is beneficial for both teachers and students, the classroom observation showed that no sufficient wait time was given for all types of questions asked in all levels. This implies that what teachers thought about the importance of questioning and wait time in EFL classes was not practically done in the real classroom situation. If such situation continues, there may be a negative impact on the effectiveness of language teaching through

questioning in all observed classrooms.

Researchers have appreciated the function and significance of teacher questioning in classroom. According to Doff (1988), Cotton (1998), Hussain (2003) and Richard and Lockhart (2000), questions may encourage students to think. Another function of teacher's question is that questions enable teachers to check students' understanding and mastering of grammar of texts (Fu Li as cited in Xu Shi-Ying, 2011:5). In a word, to enhance students' language learning is one of the important functions of teacher questioning. Even though the participant teachers' personal opinion and beliefs go in line with these, the practical situation showed us the opposite. Most EFL teachers asked various questions in their classes, but it is impossible to say that all have the power that invites learners for more language production and for better thinking abilities. The questions which were asked by EFL teachers in all observed classes require certain improvement.

Teachers' Perceived and Actual Classroom Practices of Questioning and Wait Time

Examining the teachers' perceived and their actual practice on questioning and wait time in EFL classes was the second major objective of the study. To examine the mean score differences of the teachers' perceived practice in using the six types of questioning in EFL classes, descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and one-way ANOVA were used. Moreover, to examine the mean score differences among EFL teachers' perceived and actual practices on wait time in EFL classes, paired samples t-test was also applied. Table 1, 2, and 3 display the results of this section respectively.

To examine the teachers' perceived practice on questioning, a questionnaire with a twenty-item at various cognitive levels was developed and administered to thirty participant teachers who were selected randomly from the study areas. As indicated in table 1, the responses of all participant teachers in their perceived practice showed that as they used all the six question types in their EFL classes. Moreover, all the participant teachers thought that as if they used all the six types of questions at various cognitive levels in their EFL classes. They also agreed with all the listed questioning items (See table 1).

As for the perceived practice of teachers towards the six levels of questioning, the English teachers (30) reported that they gave all types of questions most often in their EFL classes. As it is indicated in table 1, the average mean of the six types of questions at each cognitive level was greater than the expected mean (i.e., 3). Their report showed that all the six types of questions were used equivalently to their students.

The report of teachers' perceived practice in the

questionnaire (table 1) showed that all the six types of questions at various cognitive levels were used more frequently with the average means of 3.55, 3.4, 3.49, 3.52, 3.37 and 3.45 respectively from knowledge to evaluation questions. However, higher order questions like analysis, synthesis and evaluation questions were rarely found in the teachers' actual practices with means of 0.6, 0.5 and 0.27 respectively (See table 5). Furthermore, one-way ANOVA was detected to see the results how teachers use the six types of questions in relation to their perceived practice. Look the following table.

The result of one-way ANOVA revealed that there was no significant difference among the 30 teachers in their self-perceived practice on the use of the six types of questioning in their EFL classes. $F(5, 24) = 2.59$, $P = .13 > .05$ indicates that all EFL teachers were used all the six types of questions equivalently in their classes. Moreover, the result of F-test in this study (2.59) at 4 and 25 degrees of freedom is less than from that of the critical value of F in the table (2.62) with the same degrees of freedom. This also suggested that all EFL teachers thought that as if they were used the six types of questions equivalently in their EFL classes. This result conflicted with what was found previously that there was a significant difference in the use of the six types of questioning in the real classroom practice, that is, $F(5,24) = 4.52$, $P = .000 < .05$. EFL teachers also assumed to give longer wait time while questioning in their classes. The data was collected from the responses of 30 participant teachers through questionnaires as indicated in table 3.

As indicated in table 3, all EFL teachers (30) assumed to give longer wait times while questioning in their classes. But this was not the case as it was observed, what they actually did and what they thought were two different things. The observation showed that very little wait time is given for all levels of questioning (i.e., less than 3 seconds in average). In contrast, teachers thought as if they used longer wait times (i.e., above 3 seconds) for all levels of questioning in their EFL classes. Table 3 displays this. All teachers responded their wait times for all levels of questioning were highly appropriate (all results in table 3 indicate that appropriate wait time is given by all EFL teachers, that is, all are above the expected mean of 3 seconds).

In the questionnaire (table 3), teachers also reported that they frequently gave students at least 3 seconds to respond the question being asked (3.89 seconds in average), and that they ask students to judge and argue about issues by adjusting appropriate wait time (mean = 3.87), which was inconsistent with what was actually observed in the classroom practices (0.32 seconds in average). Generally speaking, what the teachers thought about the appropriateness of the wait time for all levels of questions was not seen in all observed classes.

Table 1: The Results of Teachers' Perceived Practice on Questioning

No.	Questions	Mean	SD
	I. Knowledge		
	I ask students to:		
1	Define a concept, term and an idea.	3.9	1.92
2	Recall/Remember previously learned facts.	3.5	1.11
3	List facts.	3.33	1.24
4	Respond questions by words yes or no.	3.47	1.22
	Average	3.55	1.37
	II. Comprehension		
	I ask students to:		
5	Make comparisons between ideas and concepts.	3.37	1.22
6	Express their ideas in their own words.	3.4	1.04
7	Retell the main idea of the given information.	3.56	1.11
8	Tell differences they find between two things, ideas, and so on.	3.27	1.1
	Average	3.4	1.12
	III. Application		
	I ask students to:		
9	Group things characteristically.	3.43	1.04
10	Develop a set of instructions about the given information.	3.76	1.82
11	Provide evidences for their responses.	3.3	1.18
	Average	3.49	1.35
	IV. Analysis		
	I ask students to:		
12	Identify the causes of something.	3.33	1.18
13	Interpret diagrams, maps, tables --- to draw conclusions.	3.37	1.22
14	Identify characteristics of things for categorization.	3.27	1.11
	Average	3.32	1.17
	V. Synthesis		
	I ask students to:		
15	Think of different endings for stories.	3.5	1.11
16	Find solutions for various problems.	3.3	1.18
17	Connect and integrate many points and make conclusions accordingly.	3.33	1.18
	Average	3.37	1.16
	VI. Evaluation		
	I ask students to:		
18	Assess procedures, steps or ways by establishing certain criteria.	3.5	1.11

Table 1. Continues

19	Place sentences in order of their importance.	3.4	1.28
20	Judge and argue about issues.	3.47	1.22
	Average	3.45	1.2

Table 2: One-way ANOVA Results of Teachers' Perceived Practice on Questioning

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Between Groups	69.4	5	13.9	2.59	.13
Within Groups	128.6	24	5.36		
Total	198	29	19.26		

Table 3: Teachers' Perceived Practice on Wait Time

No.	Items	Mean	SD
1	When I ask my students to define and describe the facts taught in class, I give them ----- seconds. (Knowledge)	4.07	0.94
2	When I ask my students to explain something and tell about similarities and/or differences between certain concepts or things, I give them ----- seconds. (Comprehension)	4.07	0.94
3	When I ask my students to apply what they have learned to solve problems, I give them ----- seconds. (Application)	3.67	0.82
4	When I ask my students to identify the characteristics or features of something and classify them, I give them ----- seconds. (Analysis)	3.6	0.81
5	When I ask my students to connect and integrate different main points and make conclusions accordingly, I give them ----- seconds. (Synthesis)	3.93	0.89
6	When I ask my students to judge and argue about something, I give them ----- seconds. (Evaluation)	3.87	0.86

Therefore, EFL teachers in the study areas should practically show what they have thought in their classes while asking questions with appropriate wait times at various cognitive levels.

Using a paired samples t-test ($p < 0.05$, $df = 29$), the absolute observed t-value (-11.174) was noticed to be greater than the t-critical (2.045). This indicates that there was a significant difference between the teachers' actual and perceived practice while providing wait times for all types of questioning at each cognitive level. The result is summarized in table 4.

As displayed in table 4, the average mean of the actual practices of teachers on wait time is 1.09. In contrast, the average mean of the teachers' perceived practice on wait time is 3.87. When these two means are compared, the result found from the teachers' perceived practice is

much greater than the expected mean (3). This figure shows that what teachers perceive on wait time was not actually done in the study areas. What is more, the mean differences between the teachers' practices in all columns are negative. This also indicates that none of the question type has given appropriate wait time in the teachers' actual practices. The paired samples t-test between the six types of teachers' questioning and their associated wait time results also indicated that there is statistically significantly difference between the level of questioning and the associated wait time at alpha .05 levels with 29 degree of freedom; no question type exhibited appropriate wait time in the teachers' actual classes.

Table 4. Paired Samples T-test Results of Teachers' Actual and Perceived Practices on Wait Time

	Expected Mean	Mean-1	Mean-2	Mean Differences	SD-1	SD-2	T-observed	Sig.
Knowledge and its wait time	3	1.41	4.07	-2.66	0.33	0.94	-14.615	.000
Comprehension and its wait time	3	1.74	4.07	-2.33	0.42	0.94	-12.394	.000
Application and its wait time	3	1.17	3.67	-2.5	0.77	0.86	-2.83	.000
Analysis and its wait time	3	1.22	3.6	-2.38	0.86	0.81	-10.82	.000
Synthesis and its wait time	3	0.67	3.93	-3.26	0.78	0.89	-6.667	.000
Evaluation and its wait time	3	0.32	0.23	-3.51	0.57	0.82	-19.72	.000
Total	18	6.53	23.21	-16.64	3.83	5.26	-67.04	
Average	3	1.09	3.87	-2.78	0.64	0.88	-11.174	

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level, $df = 29$, and $t\text{-critical} = 2.045$

Levels of Questioning Employed by English Teachers

Investigating the levels of teachers' questioning in EFL classrooms based on Bloom's taxonomy was the other major objective of the study. This study observed the questioning behaviors of thirty teachers for thirty periods of class with one observation session for one teacher. The researcher used descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean and standard deviation to analyze the results found from the whole observation. After collecting the data from classroom observation, the data related to teachers' questions were transcribed verbatim. As a result, 296 questions were collected. On the average, 10 questions were given in each period of class. The result is displayed in table 5.

As displayed in table 5, the frequency of the overall levels of questioning for the thirty periods was 296 with the use of six types of questions ranging from knowledge (mean = 4.67 and standard deviation = 1.01) to the minimum of evaluation (mean = 0.27 and standard deviation = 0.450). On the average, 10 questions were given in each period of class. Out of 296 questions, the top two questioning were knowledge and comprehension whose means are 4.67 and 2.87 respectively. The bottom two questioning types were synthesis and evaluation with means of 0.5 and 0.27, respectively. This indicates that lower level questions were dominantly used by EFL teachers in the observed classes. Furthermore, to examine the significance differences among EFL teachers in their questioning behavior, the researcher used one-way ANOVA. The result is summarized in table 6. Apparently, the uses of questioning behaviors varied dramatically among the six types of questions. A successful F-test with one-way ANOVA procedure on the uses of the six types of questioning was detected. The result was summarized as follow.

The one-way ANOVA result showed that there were significant differences among the teachers' questioning in

their actual classroom practice. Table 6 displays this. As indicated in table 6, $F(5, 24) = 4.52$, $p = .000 < .05$ suggested that these types of questions were used in significantly differently by English teachers. In addition, the result of the F-test ($F = 4.52$) is also greater than the critical value of F in the table ($F = 2.62$). This also suggested that there is a significant difference among teachers in the use of the six types of questions in their EFL classes. Though the one-way ANOVA showed that there were significant mean differences among the teachers' actual practice of questioning, it is impossible to know which mean is differed from the rest of the others. So that, to exactly know which mean used significantly than the others, post hoc analysis was applied by the Tukey (HSD) test and the result is displayed in the following table 7

As displayed in table 7, the results indicated that the differences among knowledge with application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation and the vice versa in all columns were statistically significant ($P < .05$). Every mean differences greater or equals to 1.96 are determined as more frequently used question types. Therefore, the result of the study indicated that almost the majority of teachers seem to use knowledge and comprehension questions in their EFL classes. In other words, the EFL teachers were rarely used higher level questions in their classes. Furthermore, paired samples t-test was applied to examine a significant difference between the teachers' actual and perceived practices on questioning (See tables 1 & 5). The means of teachers' actual and their perceived practice results shown in tables 5 and 1 were compared. The result is displayed in the following table 8

As can be observed from table 8, teachers seemed that they used knowledge questions both in their actual and perceived practices with a mean difference of 1.12. However, other question types show negative mean differences in that what the teachers perceived practices

Table 5: Levels of Questions Employed by Teachers

Question Type	N	Frequency	Mean	SD
Knowledge	30	140	4.67	1.01
Comprehension	30	86	2.87	0.83
Application	30	28	0.97	0.62
Analysis	30	19	0.6	0.49
Synthesis	30	15	0.5	0.51
Evaluation	30	8	0.27	0.45

Table 6: One-way ANOVA Results of Teachers' Actual Classroom Practice on Questioning

	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	190.83	5	38.17	4.52	.000
Within Groups	202.8	24	8.45		
Total	393.63	29	46.62		

Table 7: Multiple Comparisons of Teachers' Actual Practice Means on Questioning by the Tukey Test

Questioning Type (X)	Questioning Types (XX)	Mean Differences	Std. Mean Error	Sig.
Knowledge	Comprehension	1.8	0.326	.000
	Application	3.7*	0.431	.000
	Analysis	4.1*	0.480	.001
	Synthesis	4.2*	0.471	.000
	Evaluation	4.4*	0.438	.002
Comprehension	Knowledge	-1.8	0.231	.000
	Application	1.9	0.413	.000
	Analysis	2.3*	0.323	.000
	Synthesis	2.4*	0.341	.003
	Evaluation	2.6*	0.364	.000
Application	Knowledge	-3.7*	0.251	.001
	Comprehension	-1.9	0.265	.000
	Analysis	0.5	0.345	.000
	Synthesis	0.5	0.523	.002
	Evaluation	0.7	0.436	.000
Analysis	Knowledge	-4.1*	0.382	.002
	Comprehension	-2.3*	0.424	.000
	Application	-0.5	0.326	.000
	Synthesis	0.1	0.547	.000
	Evaluation	0.37	0.482	.003
Synthesis	Knowledge	-4.2*	0.226	.002
	Comprehension	-2.4*	0.426	.000
	Application	-0.5	0.543	.000
	Analysis	-0.1	0.236	.002
	Evaluation	0.23	0.424	.000
Evaluation	Knowledge	-4.4*	0.323	.000
	Comprehension	-2.6*	0.117	.001
	Application	-0.37	0.123	.000
	Analysis	-0.23	0.268	.002
	Synthesis	-0.7	0.314	.004

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Table 8: Paired Sample T-test Results of Teachers' Actual and Perceived Practices on Questioning

	Expected Mean	Mean-1	Mean-2	Mean Differences	SD-1	SD-2	T-observed	Sig.
Knowledge	3	4.67	3.55	1.12	1	1.37	3.6	.000
Comprehension	3	2.87	3.4	-0.53	0.83	1.12	-1.7	.000
Application	3	0.97	3.49	-2.52	0.62	1.35	-1.68	.000
Analysis	3	0.6	3.32	-2.72	0.49	1.17	-8.5	.000
Synthesis	3	0.5	3.33	-2.83	0.51	1.18	-12.043	.000
Evaluation	3	0.27	3.45	-3.18	0.45	1.2	-13.589	.000
Total	18	9.88	20.58	-10.7	3.91	7.39	-33.912	
Average	3	1.65	3.423	-1.773	0.65	1.23	-5.652	

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level, $df = 29$, and $t\text{-critical} = 2.045$

towards questioning was not actually done in their EFL classes. In addition, the data in table 8 indicated that the mean of teachers' actual practice on questioning (1.65) was much less than the expected mean (3). In contrast, the same table also displayed that the average mean of teachers' perceived practice on questioning (3.423) was much greater than the expected mean (3). This exploits that EFL teachers did not use all levels of questioning as they perceived they did. The result of paired samples t-test also showed that the T obtained between the teachers' actual and perceived practices on questioning ($t = -5.652$, $df = 29$, $p < .05$) was significantly higher than the t-critical (2.045). This implies that teachers did not use all types of questioning equivalently in their EFL classrooms.

Some researchers like Kifle (2008), Lee (2009), Vogler (2005) and Wong (2005) have also specifically pointed out that classroom teachers' unawareness of questioning levels or insufficient preparation for teaching materials might result in a high tendency of asking LLQ. Lack of questioning skill was also stated as another major problem (Borich, 2004; Cole and Chan, 1994; Dillon, 1998; Farrant, 1980) in that some levels of questions were emphasized by teachers in their EFL classes. In contrast, a HLQ is more divergent and effective in such a way that usually prompts students to use their own knowledge, experiences, backgrounds and beliefs to come up with a response from a broader perspective instead of rendering a single correct answer (Adler, 1982; Chuska, 1995; Kifle, 2008; Xu Shi-Ying, 2011). This type of question is thus seldom found in the regular classroom practices of the study areas due to its demanding nature on teacher questions and student responses.

In fact, higher level questions (HLQ) are more likely to elicit learning experience necessary to such skills as

critical thinking, problem solving, decision making and beyond thinking abilities that invite for creativity and further investigation (Borich, 2004; Cooper, 1999; Xu Shi-Ying, 2011). Providing students with additional number of questions of this sort will not decrease their knowledge, but assist them in employing that knowledge in a divergent way. In contrast, a failure to provide sufficient higher cognitive questions as a part of an instructional process may lead to a negative effect on the development of various thinking levels (Ann, 2005; Ellis, 1993; Lee, 2009).

The Relationships between Questioning and Wait Time

Exploring the relationships between the teachers' questioning and the associated wait time was the last major objective of the study. Before showing the relationships between the two constructs, the researcher analyzed the results of the wait time given for each level of questioning using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation. Then, the researcher applied the Pearson's Correlation Procedure to show the relationships between teachers' questioning and wait time. The results are displayed in tables 9 and 10 respectively. As it was noted, there were 296 questions by thirty EFL teachers (table 5), and the average wait time of those questions was 1.1 seconds as indicated in table.

The means of the wait time to the six questioning types varied with the highest wait time on comprehension questions (mean = 1.74 and standard deviation = 0.78), and the lowest on evaluation questions (mean = 0.32 and standard deviation = 0.23). Furthermore, the Pearson

Table 9: The Level of Teacher Questioning and Associated Wait Time

Level of Questioning	N	Associated Wait Time	
		Mean	SD
Knowledge	30	1.41	0.78
Comprehension	30	1.74	0.86
Application	30	1.17	0.57
Analysis	30	1.22	0.77
Synthesis	30	0.67	0.42
Evaluation	30	0.32	0.23

Table 10: Pearson's Correlation of Teachers' Questioning and Wait Time

Teachers' wait time (N = 30)	Teachers' Questioning						Overall Relationship
	Knowledge	Comprehension	Application	Analysis	Synthesis	Evaluation	
rx _y	**0.45	**0.48	**0.36	**0.18	**0.15	**0.12	**0.30
R _{xy} ²	0.20	0.23	0.13	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.09
Sig.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

** Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Correlation Analysis was conducted to show the relationship between the questioning levels (from 1-6) and the involved wait times. This produced weak overall correlation ($r = 0.30$), suggesting that wait time was not given proportionally according to the cognitive level of questioning type. Generally, the overall correlation between the cognitive level of teacher questioning and the wait time span was weak. The relationship between the teachers' questioning and their involved wait times using the Pearson Correlation Analysis is shown in the following table.10

In table 10, r_{xy} represents Pearson's Correlation Coefficient and r_{xy}^2 stands for the variations which the 'r_{xy}' of participants' questioning and their associated wait times account

The results of the correlation analysis in table 10 indicate that all the teachers' questioning (six types) were less significantly correlated with the participants' wait times at $P < 0.05$. None of the questioning type showed good relationship with its associated wait time. In general, the correlation coefficient of the participants' use in the six types of questioning in knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation accounts for 20%, 23%, 13%, 3%, 2% and 1% respectively. From this, it is possible to conclude that the relationship between HLQ and their associated wait time was very limited as compared to the relationship shown among LLQ and the wait time provided to them.

As the overall relationship, the overall use of teachers' questioning and their wait times in their EFL classes was

very low ($r = 0.30$). On the other hand, this can be explained as there was a weak relationship found between EFL teachers' questioning and their associated wait times given with $r = 0.30$, $r^2 = 0.09$ at $p < 0.05$. Thus, the overall correlation coefficient of the teachers' use in the six types of questioning and the associated wait times in their EFL classes accounts for only 9%. When the level goes up, the correlation between the two constructs slightly positively decreases. As a result, the relationships between the two variables become less and less when the level of questioning moves to HLQ. Although in many cases teachers might shorten the wait time length with certain considerations, the fact that their students need more time to develop and organize their answers cannot be neglected. Insufficient wait time may force students to choose not to think about the questions or to provide incorrect answers before thinking twice (Borich, 2004; Myra and Davis, 1997). The efficacy of questioning could thus be diminished especially for HLQ if sufficient wait time is not presented (Lake, 1975; Lee, 2009; Petty, 2004; Wilen, 1991).

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study showed that there was a significant difference between the teachers' perceived and actual practices of questioning and wait time in EFL classes. Although teachers have witnessed that as if they had good awareness about the importance of questioning

and wait time, their actual practices showed the opposite. What they perceived was not practically applied in their actual EFL classes. Therefore, this implies that there is a gap between the teachers' actual and perceived practices of questioning and wait time in EFL classrooms. The finding of the study also showed that teachers' questioning is regarded as one of the most important activities in EFL classroom. Based on the theory of the cognitive domain, the most important thing is HLQ that can promote students' higher thinking and inviting them for better language production. This is because HLQ can require students to engage in independent thinking such as problem solving, analyzing and evaluating information. In the present survey study, teachers ask various questions in their EFL classes. However, the results of the finding showed that teachers ask LLQ relating to facts or grasping main contents of materials, especially knowledge than HLQ. Therefore, recommendations are forwarded as follows.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. EFL teachers should pay more attention to HLQ after asking a series of LLQ in order to provide an environment rich in opportunities for enabling better language and communication through questioning.
2. EFL Teachers should be trained how to ask HLQ questions and provide sufficient wait times appropriately and effectively.
3. EFL Teachers should also use interviews, role-playing, games and other forms of class walk-around activities as some best remedies to create better ways of language teaching and communication through questioning in their actual classes.

Finally, for further research studies, more research studies on a large scale were required to improve generalization of the results. Moreover, it was recommended to conduct an experimental research which could demonstrate how to improve the actual practices of teachers on questioning and the associated wait times in EFL classrooms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is a pleasure to express sincere thanks to Professor Abiy yigzaw, whose professional guidance is of the very highest quality and who has notably influenced my professional endeavor. I will always be indebted for his patience, guidance, support, and wealth of knowledge which he has shared me throughout the study.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M. (1982). *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*. New York: McMillan.
- Aklilu Gashaye. (2009). *Implementing Teachers' Oral Questioning Strategies in an EFL Classroom* (A Survey Type): Unpublished MA Thesis, Bahir Dar University.
- Anderson, L. and K. Krathwohl, D. (Eds.). (2002). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*: New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Ann, D. (2005). *Alternatives to Questioning: Teacher's role in Classroom Discussion*. EFL Journal 7 (9).
- Anonymous, P. (2010). *Asking Questions*. Retrieved from English.org.uk/articles/asking_questions.
- Berg, B.L. (1998). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berlitz, P. (2000). *Getting Around*. Princeton NJ: Berlitz Language Inc.
- Bloom, B.S. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David Mckay Company, Inc.
- Borich, D. G. (2004). *Effective Teaching Methods* (5th ed.). Texas: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Brown, G. and Wragg, E. C. (1993). *Questioning*. London: Rutledge.
- Capell et al. (2001). *Learning to Teach in the Secondary School: A Comparison to School Experience* (3rd ed). London: Bell and Bain Ltd.
- Chaudron, C. (1998). *Second Language Classroom. Research on Teaching and Learning*. New York: CUP.
- Chen, S.Y. (2005). *Questioning Strategy Use and Perceptions of Native and Non-native Teachers and Students' Responses in all EFL Class at Elementary School Level*; Unpublished MA Thesis, National Taipei Teachers' College, Taipei, R.O.C.
- Chuska, K. R. (1995). *Improving Classroom Questions*. Indiana: Bloomington.
- Cole & Chan. (1994). *Teaching Principles and Practice*. Australia: Prentice Hall.
- Costa, A. (Ed.). (1985). *Developing Minds: A Resource Book for Teaching Thinking*. Alexandria, VA.
- Cotton, K. (2008). *Effective Questioning in the Classroom*. Retrieved from <http://teel.rit.Albany.Edu/enit/index.php>.
- Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- David, O.F. (2007). *Teachers' Questioning Behavior and EFL Classroom Interaction Classroom*. Humanity and Social Sciences Journal 2(2): 127-131.
- Davis, B.G. (1993). *Tools of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dillon, J.T. (1988). *Questioning and Teaching: A Manual Practice*. London: Croom Helm Publishers.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *The Study of Second Language*

- Acquisition*. Shanghai FLE Press.
- Ellis, R. (1995). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.
- Gabrielatos, C. (1992). *Teaching Communication and Interaction Analysis: An Action Research Project* Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the RSA/Cambridge Diploma for Overseas Teachers of English.
- Gall, M. D. (1970). *The Use of Questions in Teaching*: Review of Educational Research 40, 707-721.
- Gall, M. D. (1984). "Synthesis of Research on Teachers' Questioning." Educational Leadership 42, 40-47.
- Good, J. L. and Brophy, J. E. (1997). *Looking in Classrooms* (7th ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Goodwin et al. (1992). *Effective Classroom Questioning*. Instructional Development Division Office of Instructional and Management Services. University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign.
- Guruprasad, P.R. (2009). *Applying Bloom's Taxonomy to Questioning Techniques in the Classroom*. Retrieved from <http://www.teachersnetgazette/guruprasad>.
- Harmer, J. (1983). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Hornby, H.S. (1986). *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary*. London: OUP.
- Hussain, N. (2003). *Helping EFL/ESL Students by Asking Quality Questions*. Retrieved from <http://itesij.org/Techniques/Hussain-Questions.html>.
- Kifle Azerefeegn. (2008). *The Study on Question Types and Questioning Strategies in EFL Classrooms*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Lake, J. H. (1975). *The Influence of Wait Time on the Verbal Dimensions of Student Inquiry Behavior*. Dissertation Abstracts International 36, 6343A.
- Lee, Y.H. (2009). *Teacher Questioning Strategies and Wait Time*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Pingtung, Taiwan, R.O.C.
- Lewis, K.G. (2006). *Questioning and Questioning Techniques*. The University of Texas. Retrieved from [http://www.utexas.EDU \(Miss 662/398\)](http://www.utexas.EDU (Miss 662/398)).
- Lynch, T. (1991). *Questioning Roles in the Classroom*. *ELT Journal* 45(3): 201-210.
- Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: OUP.
- Murname, M. (2008). *Three Levels of Questioning*. Retrieved from http://www.slideshare.net/3_levels_of_questioning.
- Napell, S.M. (2001). *Using Questions to Enhance Classroom Learning*: Education 99(2).
- Nunan, D. (1998). *The Learner-centered Curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Oliver, S. (2009). *Asking Effective Questions*. Retrieved from www.adb.org/knowledgesolutions.
- Paul, A. (1985). *Effective Questioning*. From <http://ddeubel.edublogs.org/2010/10/16/effective-questioning>.
- Perrot, E. (1982). *Effective Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improve Your Teaching*. New York: McMillan Publishing Agency.
- Petty, G. (2004). *Teaching Today: A Practical Guide*. UK: Nelson Thrones Ltd.
- Rain, K. (2001). *Learning to Questioning: Questioning to Learn*: MNUS.
- Richards, M. and Debbie, M. (2010). *Teaching in Today's Incentive Classrooms: A Universal Design for Learning Approach* (4th ed.). USA: Wadsworth.
- Richards, J. and Nunan, D. (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rowe, M.B. (1974). *Wait time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic and fate control*. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 11(2).
- Rowe, M.B. (1986). *Wait Time: Slowing Down May be a way of Speeding up!* *Journal of Teacher Education* 37, 43-50.
- Sanders, N.M. (1996). *Classroom Questions: What Kinds?* New York: Harper and Row.
- Seda, O. (2010). *The Effects of Asking Referential Questioning on the Participation and Oral Production of Lower Level Language Learners in Reading Classes*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Middle East Technical University.
- Shomossi. (2004). *The Effects of Teachers' Questioning Behavior on EFL Classroom Interaction: A Classroom Research Study*. *The Reading Matrix* 4(2).
- Snow, A. (2010). *Applying Bloom's Taxonomy in the Classroom*. Oxford: OUP.
- Thompson, G. (1997). *Teaching Teachers to Ask Questions in EFL Classroom*, *ELT Journal* 51.
- Vogler, K. (2005). *Improve Your Verbal Questioning*. *The Clearing House* 79 (2).
- Willen, W.W. (1991). *What the Research Says to the Teacher: Questioning Skills for Teachers?* Washington DC.
- Willen, W.W. (2001). *Exploring Myths about Teacher Questioning in the Social Studies Classroom*. *The Social Studies* 92 (1).
- Wong, J. (2005). *Research on Teacher Questioning Behaviors in Elementary Schools*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Hsinu University of Education, R.O.C.
- Xu Shi-Ying. (2011). *The Present Situation of English Teachers' Questioning in Senior Middle School and Positive Strategies*. *Asia-Pacific Science and Culture Journal*, Vol.1, 1-15.
- Zhang, Y. (1999). *Teacher Questioning Techniques*. Taipei, Taiwan: Shin Li.