

تحليل مهارات طلبة التربية العملية (2)
في جامعة الحسين بن طلال في صياغة وتوجيه الأسئلة الشفوية
وكيفية التصرف بإجابات الطلاب

*

▪

**

▪

(2)

▪

.(2)

▪

(24)

.(%90)

(%83.3)

▪

▪	-	-	-	*
▪	-	-	-	**

：

.(1985)

()

»：

.«

：

：

·

·

(1997)

：

：

.«

»：

(Aschner)

：

.(1973)

：

·

(Floyd)

(348) (3.5)
(Schreiber)
(Wright & Nathall) .
(Floyd, 1970)

()

.(96 1985)

.
 :

.(1986)
 : ()

.(93 1974)
 :

:
 :

-

.(Blosser, 1973)

.() :

.

:

-1

.

-2

.

-3

.(1986)

-4

.

-5

.

:

.

(2)

:

:

(2)

-1

/

/

(2)

-2

.

(2)

-3

/

.

:

.

·
:
:
:
·(1982)
: (2001)
·
·
:
·(1991)
:

·(2000)
:

·
:
: (Floyd, 1960)
90-70 ()

(Davis and Tinsley, 1967)

(44)

: (Bloom)

(2600)

(1300)

: (Rowe,et al. 1974)

(Rowe)

(Trowbridge & Bybee)

(Stevens, 1912)

(%80) :

.(Trowbridge & Bybee, 1986)

(1988)

(%83.4)

(%11.3)
.(1988) (%5.3)
(1990)
.(1990)
» (1991)
«
:
-
:
(%32.4) (%47.2)
(%5.6) (%13.1)
.(%0.7) (%1)
(0.05 ,) -
.()
(0.05 ,) -
()
.(1991)
.
()

.

(2)

:

.

: -

2002/2001

(35)

.

: -

(24)

/

/

(1)

(2)

.

2002/3/10

.

2002/6/5

: -

-1

.

: -2

: -

(2)

.

(2)

: -

(2)

-3

:

-4

.(2) (1)

-5

(2)

2002/2001

-6

-7

.(/ 1)

-8

-9

..... (2)

-10

(2)

2) (2)

.(/

-11

.

:

:

.

-

-

-

:

-

:

-1

(1)

(2)

%32	200	
%25	155	
%23	150	
%10	65	
%8	50	
%2	10	
%100	630	

(1)

(2)

.

(%32) (200)

(%25) (155)

(%23) (150)

(%10) (65)

(10) (1)

.

(%2)

:

-2

(2)

.

(2)

630	60	570	630	100	110	420	630	430	230	630	550	80	630	130	40	460	
100 %	%10	%90	100 %	%16	%17	%67	100 %	%63	%37	100 %	%87	%13	100 %	%20	%7	%73	%

. (2)

(460) : (2)
(%7) (40) (%73)
(%20) (130)

. (2)
:

(2)
(%13) (80)
(%87) (550)
(2)

:

(2) : (2)

(%63) (430)
(230)

(%37)
(2)

()

:

(2)
(%67) (420)

(%17) (110)

(%16) (100)

.

(2)
(%90) (570)
(60) (2)
.(%10)

: -

.(2)

(3)

(2)

%44.45	280	-	
%22.22	140	-	
%66.67	420		
%3.17	20	-	
%7.94	50	-	
%2.38	15	-	
%13.49	85		
%11,11	70	-	
%3.17	20	-	
%3.17	20	-	
%2.38	15	-	
%19.83	125		

%100	630	
------	-----	--

:

(280) (%66.67) (420)
(140) (2) (%44.45)
(85) .(%22,22)
(%3.17) (20)
(%7.94) (50)
(%2.38) (15)
(2)
(125)
(%11,11) (70) :
(2)
(20)
(20)
(15) (2)
(2)

(4)

(2)

%		%		
58.44	14	41.66	10	(5-3)
66.67	16	33.33	8	.
16.67	4	83.33	20	.

(10) (4)

(Rowe)

(5-3)

.(%58.44) (14) (2)

(8)
(16)

(2)
(%33,33)
(%66.67)

(4)

.

(2)
(%83.33) (20)
(%16.67) (4)

:

(2)

-

(2)

(5)

(2)

%		(2)	
%14.28	90	-	
%12.69	80	-	
%15.88	100	-	
%12.69	80	-	
%55.54	350		
%4.77	30	-	
%3.17	20	-	
%4.77	30	-	
%2.38	15	-	
%6.35	40	-	
%1.58	10	-	
%1.58	10	-	
%2.38	15	-	
%26.98	170		
%4.77	30	-	
%3.17	20	-	
%2.38	15	-	

2003- -

%3.17	20	-	
%3.97	25	-	
%17.45	110		
%100	630		

:-1

(350)	(5)
(630)	(%55.54)
(80)	(%14.28) (90)
	(12.69)
(100)	
	(15.88)

$$\begin{array}{rcccl}
 (80) & & & & \\
 & & & & .(\%12.69) \\
 & & & : & -2 \\
 & (\%26.98) & & (170) & \\
 & & & : & \\
 & & & (\%4.77) & (30) \\
 & & (2) & & \\
 (2) & & : & & \\
 & (\%3.17) & & (20) & \\
 & & & & .(\%4.77) \quad (30)
 \end{array}$$

. (2)

/ :

(%2.38) (15)

.
/

/ (%6.35) (40)

(1.58) (10)
- 3)

(5

.

.(%1.58) (10)

(15)

.(%2.38)

:
(110)

-3

(%17.45)

(%4.77) (30)

■

(2)

(%3.17)

(20)

2

(2)

(15)

(%2.38)

.(%3.17)

(20)

(2)

(%3.97)

(25)

□

□

/

(1)

-1

(200)

$$\left(\quad \right)$$

(155)

(%32)

(%23)

(150)

(%25)

(65)

 $(\%8)$

(50)

(%10)

.(%2)

(10)

..... (2)

:

.

.

Stevens,)
(Davis and) 1990 1991 (1912
(Tinsley, 1967)
(2) (2) -2
(%73) (460)

(130)
(%20)

.

(2) (2) -3
(550)
(80) (%87)
: (%13)
:
...

(2) . -4
(%63) (430)
(%37) (230)

:
.
« » / « »
. « »
(2)

.....	(2)	
(2)	(2)	-5
(%67)	(420)	
(110)		
	:	(%17)
	(%16)	(100)
(2)	(2)	-6
(1)		
	(10)	
(570)		
(60)	(%90)	
	.(%10)	
(2)	(3)	-7
(420)		

2003- -

: (%66.67)

(280)
(2) (%44.45)

(2) : (3)
(140) (%22,22)

(85) (2) : (3) -8
(%13.49)

(2) (%3.17) (20)
(50) (%7.94)

. (2)

(2) (3) -9
(125)

(%19.83)

(70)

(%11,11)

(2)

(%3.17)

(20)

(2)

(%2.38)

(15)

(2)

(2) (4) -10
(5-3)
(%41.66) (10)
(%58.44) (14)
(%33,33) (8)
(%66.67) (16)
(20)
(4) (%83.33)
(%16.67)
(5-3)
(Rowe, 1974)
:
(20)
(%83.33)
.
(5) -11
(350)
(%55.54)
: (%15) (100)
(2)
:

(2)

: (Rowel, 1979)

.

(2) : (5)
(%26.98) (170)

(2)
(%2.38) (15)

.

(2) : (5)
(10)

(%1.58)

.

...

(2)

.(%3.17) (20)

(20) (30) $(\%3.17)$ $(\%17.45)$ (5) (110) $(\%4.77)$ (20) $(\%3.17)$ (25) $(\%3.97)$

■

$$(2) \quad \vdots$$

(2) $\square$ $\rightarrow$ $\square$

1

.....	(2)	
	(2)	-
7	:(1973)	.1
	:(1985)	.2
: .1	:(1974)	.3
	:(1991)	.4
	:(2001)	.5
.1986 2	:(1986)	.6
	:()	.7
	:(1985)	.8
	:(1974)	.9
	:(1981)	.10

	:(1988)	.11
	:(1986)	.12
	.1	
	:(1986)	.13
.(21)	(21)	
	:(2000)	.14
	:(1982)	.15
.1	:(1970)	.16
2	:(1985)	.17
	1	
	:(1991)	.18
	:(1988)	.19
	:(1997)	.20
1	:(1987)	.21
	:(1990)	.22

1. Blosser. P.E. (1973) ***Handbook Effective Questioning Techniques***, Education Associates, INC. Ohio, U.S.A.
2. Bridge Trow . L. W and Bee. R. W (1986). ***Becoming a Secondary School Science Teacher***, 4th edition, Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, U.S.A.
3. Davis, O. L. and Drew C. Tinsley (1967). 'Cognitives Revealed by Class room Question Asked by Social Studies', ***Journal of Education***. Vol (45), No (21).
4. Floyd, W. D (1970), 'An Analysis of the Oral Questioning Activity in Selected Colorado Primary Classrooms', ***Dissertation Colorado State College University, Microfilm***, (60-1970).
5. Martin, J (1979). 'Effects of teacher higher order questions on student products variables single classroom study'. ***The Journal of Educational Research***. Vol. (72) No (4).
6. Row, M.B and others (1974). Wait-Time and Rewards as instructional variables their influence on language Logic fate control, Wait Time, ***Journal of Research in science Teaching*** (2).

(12)

(2)

(12)

(2)

2003- -