PAPER NAME

AEFL-Volume-27-Issue-3.2-June-2020.pdf

AUTHOR

la sunra la sunra

WORD COUNT

7011 Words

CHARACTER COUNT

40803 Characters

PAGE COUNT

27 Pages

FILE SIZE

449.3KB

SUBMISSION DATE

Jun 21, 2023 6:17 PM GMT+8

REPORT DATE

Jun 21, 2023 6:18 PM GMT+8

● **13% Overall Similarity**

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

- 9% Internet database
- Crossref database

- 6% Publications database
- Crossref Posted Content database

● **Excluded from Similarity Report**

- Submitted Works database
- Quoted material
- Small Matches (Less then 15 words)

- Bibliographic material
- Cited material
- Manually excluded sources

Senior Editor:

Paul Robertson

Table of Contents

4

Student Teachers' Questioning Strategy in EFL Microteaching Class

La Sunra

lasunra@gmail.com

Zahraini Fajri Nur

zahrainifajrinur@gmail.com

Bio-profiles:

La Sunra is an English lecturer and the Secretary of English Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature. His research interests include Applied Linguistics, reflective teaching practice, metacognition, critical thinking, corrective feedback, teacher professional development, language teaching methods and approaches, classroom management, and communication strategy including questioning strategy in EFL Microteaching Course. Before taking his Ph.D. candidacy at Universitas Negeri Makassar, he had completed his Master's degree in American Studies at Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia. He has ben teaching English at Universitas Negeri Makassar for 20 years. He has been active presenting papers at national and international conferences.

Zahraini Fajri Nur is a fresh graduate of English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, and a lecturer assistant for Microteaching Course. Her research interests include Applied Linguistics, language teaching methods and approaches, classroom management, and communication strategy including questioning strategy in EFL Microteaching Course. She has also taught English at some English Courses in Makassar.

Abstract

Questioning has been considered as one of the most essential and important techniques and skills in instructional processes. Questioning helps teachers to check if the

students understand what they have been taught, to enhance students' involvement in classroom learning activities and to promote students' creative thinking in classroom interaction. Student teachers are therefore recommended to be able to master this technique and skill and practice it in Microteaching class before coming into schools for teaching practice. This study aimed to investigate the types of questions the student teachers produce during the microteaching sessions in EFL Microteaching class. The method of the study was qualitative in nature. The subject of the study was the EFL student teachers attending Microteaching class during the odd semester of academic year 2018/2019. The results of the research showed that (1) the student teachers showed convergent and divergent beliefs with regard to teacher questions; (2) the types of questions used by student teachers in microteaching practice sessions mainly consisted of echoic and epistemic questions in almost all their subcategories; (3) the questioning strategies used by the student teachers ranged from structuring, nominating, probing, leading, and pausing questions. Besides, the study also revealed that the student teachers mostly used low order questions, and less high order questions.

Introduction

The teaching and learning process is inseparable from the interaction between teacher and students. In many cases, interactions that occur are one-way interactions where students only listen to what is conveyed by the teacher. The result is students being inactive and learning in the classroom becoming ineffective. Therefore, teachers and students use questions to build good learning interactions. Questions asked by students usually aim to get an explanation whereas the purpose of the teacher asks aims to measure students' understanding, get information from students, and stimulate students to think. So, the teacher's questioning skills are also a benchmark for students' ability to answer questions from the teacher.

Asking question is one technique to make students think. When students think critically, their curiosity will grow. To satisfy this curiosity, students will ask. It is in line

with Sanjaya (2006: 264) which states that learning in essence is asking and answering questions. In this case the question is seen as a reflection of curiosity, while answering questions describes a person's ability to think. The ability to ask is all question sentences or all that require students' response to a problem in the teaching-learning process. It can be seen that teachers' question skill plays pivotal role in EFL classroom. Teacher's question is not enough if only "does anyone want to ask? Or" are there any question? "But the teacher needs to provide challenging and interesting questions, so that students want to participate in the class. In addition, the question must be systematic with good grammar because the teacher is a role model for students. Currently the 2013 curriculum is designed using a scientific approach that expects teachers to be able to develop critical thinking skills and complex student reasoning about the problems around them. so, the scientific approach is referred to questioning.

Another interesting rsearch finding was reported by Delima, E.M (2012). In her research, she found that the reticent students prefered two types of questions: low-level questions and valuing questions. With low-level questions, the students found it easy to recall information they have learned. Similarly, valuing questions helped them express their beliefs, attitudes, and ideas. She further concuded that the reticent students were oncouraged more to take active part in class discussion if teachers ask low-level questions and valuing questions.

The importance of questinoing srategy in teaching is also shown by Sunggingwati et.al (2013). In a multiple site case study, Sunggungwati and Nguyen (2013) found that the implementation of questioning strategy in EFL classroom requires teachers' knowledge and confidence. Therefore, EFL teachers need to be equipped with more professional teacher development program. They further argued that if teachers are trained extensively in self-questioning and use guided questions, students are able to generate higher levels of questions.

Similarly, Padmadevi & Artini (2019) found out that although questioning skill is an important basic teaching skill to be practiced, most of the student teachers used basic questioning strategy and rarely exercised the advanced level type of questions in the simulation phases of Microteaching course. Moreover, they also found that during the simulation phases, the student teachers learned from peer's feedback, from discussion and

through reflection from which students can ask questions and develop their critical thinking. In other words, peer's feedback, discussion, and reflection help student teachers improve their basic teaching skill including basic questioning skill as well as their advanced questioning skill including questions for stimulating critical thinking, questions for guidance, and questions for exploring divergent and complex answer.

The research findings revealed by the previous studies especially those of Sanjaya (2006), Delima, E.M (2012), Sunggingwati and Nguyen (2013), and Padmadevi & Artini (2019) indicated that questioning strategy remains an increasingly research interest area in EFL education. Questioning strategy is not only important for teachers in teaching but also for students to help support their reading comprehension and critical thinking, including the student teachers who are preparing themselves to be teachers for the millenial generation in this challenging twentieth century.

Students in the millennial generation with more advanced developments in the future will face more severe challenges. If so, student teachers who will become future teachers need to equip themselves with the ability to teach. In the microteaching class, they learned instruction techniques to later be applied to the teaching practice program. The sudents' qustioning is one skill that is the focus of attention to be explored. Therefore, this study carried out the strategy of asking student teachers to cover the types of questions they use and the level of questions used related to students' cognitive abilities.

Taxonomy of Questions

In literature, questions have been classified into several taxonomies intended to describe their fundamental nature. For the teaching purposes, these taxonomies of questions can be used by teachers to formulate questions intended to elicit specific cognitive processes. The basic way to characterize questions is to classify them as either convergent or divergent. A convergent question, often called a closed question, is intended to elicit a specific response or a narrow list of possible responses. Educators use convergent questions to draw a single "best" response from learners. In contrast, divergent questions, also known as open questions, elicit a wide range of responses that often require substantive elaboration. Divergent questions do not have a single "best"

response. Educators use divergent questions to stimulate dialog and explore a range of issues related to the topic.

A basic way to classify questions is to examine their cognitive level or complexity. It is Bloom who originally described a hierarchal approach to cognition which was subsequently modified by Anderson and Krathwohl. Bloom taxonomy of questions can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Taxonomy of Question based on Bloom's Cognitive Domain

Cognitive Domain	Cognitive Level	Actions Required	Sample Question
Remembering (Knowledge)	Low	List, name, identify, show, define, recognize, recall, state	What is the mechanism of action of acetaminophen?
Understanding (Comprehension)	Low	Summarize, explain, interpret, describe, compare, paraphrase, differentiate, visualize, restate, put in your own words	Describe the goals of therapy in patients with malignant pain?
Applying (Application)	Low	Solve, illustrate, calculate, use, interpret, relate, manipulate, apply, classify, modify, put into practice	According to the World Health Organization guidelines on persisting pain in children, what would be the most appropriate treatment choice in this case scenario?
Analysing (Analysis)	High	Analyse, organize, deduce, choose, contrast, compare, distinguish	Given the patient's symptoms, what are the most likely etiologies of her pain?
Evaluating (Evaluation)	High	Evaluate, estimate, judge, defend, criticize, justify	Based on the findings of this study, what do you believe is the role of pregabalin in the

			treatment of post-herpetic neuralgia?
Creating (Synthesis)	High	Design, hypothesize, support, schematize, write, report, discuss, plan, devise, create, construct	This patient has had four emergency room visits in the past month due to uncontrolled pain. How would you manage this patient to prevent yet another urgent care visit?

(Revised Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Anderson, L.W. et all; 2001)

As can be seen from the table above, questions may address various levels of cognitive domain starting from remembering or memorizing facts to process involving critical thinking. In terms of the difficulty level of cognition, these domains are classified into lower and higher order thinking. The table above shows that the lowest level of cognitive process is remembering or memorizing facts or information, and as Palmadevi & Artini (2019) found, most student teachers frequently posed these types of questions during peer teaching simulations. Questions aimed at eliciting students' comprehension are those requiring them to summarize information, explain it in their own words, interpret it logically based on the context. Similarly, application questions deal with executing a procedure or process, mental or physical to a new situation. Likewise, analysis questions require the students to organize the information into meaningful parts and analyze the relationship among them. Next, evaluation questions are questions that may reguire students to make judgments, to criticize a certain product, or to determine the appropriateness of a product or process for a given problem. Finally, the most challenging and difficult question is creating questions. This type of question may reguire students to create alternative hypotheses based on their observation toward the existing phenomena, design a new and dfferent strategy to complete a task, or formulate a distinctive product.

Questions may also be classified into knowledge dimensions. Based on this classification, Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) describe 4 types of knowledge: factual,

conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive. These knowledge dimensions range from concrete to abstract. Anderson and Krathwohl explain that factual questions often ask students to recall specific elements from a reference source. Factual questions are questions that aim to collect information about things for which there is a correct answer. This type of question needs comprehension and analysis in order to provide correct answer. Conceptual questions refer to the questions reguiring students to create an answer rather than simply to recall information. Certain principles or theories usualy underly the creation of answer to this type of question. Procedural questions are questions that might ask students about well-established methods for gathering information or selecting the most appropriate equation in a particular situation. Finally, metacognitive questions deal with questions demanding students to articulate a cognitive strategy required to complete a task or examine personal motivations and values. The classification of question according to knowledge dimensions can be described in the following.

Table 2. Classification of Question Based on Knowledge Dimensions

Knowledge Dimension	Cognitive Level	Sample Question
Factual	Low	According to the textbook, what dose of morphine would be equianalgesic to 10mg of hydromorphone?
	High	Based on the results of this study, what would the equianalgesic dose of hydromorphone for a patient who is currently taking morphine 30mg daily and how confident can we be in that estimate?
Conceptual	Low	Describe the steps in the WHO pain management pyramid?
	High	In what ways is the WHO pain management pyramid similar to the National Comprehensive Cancer Network cancer pain guidelines? In what ways are they different?
Procedural	Low	What interviewing techniques can be used to determine the severity of a patient's pain?

	High	Several techniques are available to evaluate pain. What do you perceive are the strengths and weaknesses of each?
Metacognitive	Low	Thinking back on your encounter with this patient, how well do you think you addressed his pain?
	High	Given that you feel you handled the patient interaction in a less than optimal manner, what do you think would help you do a better job addressing patients' pain in the future?

(Adopted from Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001)

Another taxonomy of teacher questions is proposed by Ellis in Farrell (2009) who distinguishes between two main types of questions and their sub-categories. The two main types in this taxonomy include echoic and epistemic questions. Echoic questions seek the repetition of an utterance or the confirmation of information, whereas epistemic questions seek information of some sort' (Farrell & Mom, 2009, p. 53). Various sub-categories of echoic questions encompass comprehension checks, clarification requests, and confirmation checks, while sub-categories of epistemic questions include referential, display, expressive and rhetorical questions.

Table 3. Taxonomy of Teacher Questions

Types of Question	Sub-categories	Sample
Echoic	Comprehension Checks	All right? Ok?
	Clarification Requests	What do you mean?
	Confirmation Checks	Do you mean ……?
Epistemic	Referential	Why didn't you do your …?
	Display	What's the opposite of "up"?
	Expressive	It is interesting, isn't it?
	Rhetorical	Why didn't you do that? Because you …

146

(Adapted from Farrel, 2009, p.54)

Within the epistemic question types in table 1, two main types of questions language teachers often ask are display and referential questions. Research suggests that display type questions, or questions in which the answer is known to the teacher, can provide an opportunity for students to display their knowledge and understanding. In contrast, referential questions, or questions in which the learner is required to express their opinion, reasoning or information, are said to promote more genuine communication in the second language classroom (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983).

Questions may also be classified according to the intention of the questioner. Based on this idea, the types of questions are divided into five: a) Structuring, b) Nominating, c) Probing, d) Leading, and e) Pausing (E. C. Wragg and G. Brown (1993), Shaunessy (2005), Orlich, et.al (2010).

Methodology

A. Context and Subject of The Research

This qualitative research was conducted in order to examine the questioning strategy used by the student teachers in microteaching practices and the beliefs behind the use of the questioning strategy. Qualitative research allowed the researchers to study the participant in natural setting (Creswell, 2012). It was used because the researchers could make a complex picture, examine the words, detailed reports from the participants' views and conduct studies in natural situations.

The subject of the study was the EFL student teachers attending Microteaching class during the odd semester of the academic year 2018/2019. Twenty student teachers attended this course. For the sake of microteaching practice session, these student teachers were divided into 4 groups – each group consisted of five members. Each group decided a topic, discussed it, prepared mini lesson plan, and later taught it in microteaching practice session. Each member of the groups played different roles – micro-teacher, observer, time keeper, assistant, and student. Each group interchangeably presented their microteaching practice session for 15 – 20 minutes and followed by a post observation

conference between the micro-teacher and observers lasting approximately 15 minutes. The following day a semi-structured interview was conducted on the basis of the four student teachers' convenience. When a group presented their microteaching practice session, all members of other groups became students except two of them became external observers. Therefore, four EFL student teachers acted as micro-teachers – two male student teachers and two female student teachers. They presented their microteaching practice session on basic questioning teaching skill. The types of questions analysed in this study derived from these four student teachers. This is to say that these four student teachers became the participants in this study. The pseudonyms ST1, ST2, ST3, and ST4 have been assigned to the four participating student teachers in order to maintain anonymity. The ST 1 and ST2 were female, and the ST3 and ST4 were male student teachers.

B. Procedure and Data Collection

The data for study were collected for a three-week period. The data were collected through peer observations followed by post observation conference, video recording, and semi structured interview. Peer observation was used to uncover the components of questioning skill performed by the micro-teacher. Some of the student teachers who served as observers assessed the quality of the components of the questioning skills by the presenter or micro-teacher. The components included question content, question distribution in class, giving time to answer questions, or nominating questions to student. In addition, there were also other components based on higher level questions such as questions based on cognitive levels and reasoning questions. Video recording was used to capture the types of questions the student teachers (micro-teachers in this case) asked during the microteaching practice session. The data from this recording helped the researchers transcribe the detailed questions the micro-teachers produced during the microteaching practice session. Semi structured interview was applied to allow the student teachers space to express their beliefs. First, an initial interview was conducted in order to gain insights about the student teachers' beliefs about teacher questions. The beliefs they stated in this initial interview would be used as the starting points for making comparisons across the different methods of research used. The pre-observation interview

was conducted one hour before the microteaching practice session began and was recorded. The questions asked related to what the student teachers had planned to do in the class for that day. The post observation interview was conducted one hour after the class ended, and questions in this interview were mainly about what had just happened in that day. The final interview was conducted one week after the final observation. The final interview revisited questions from the initial interview along with new questions which were designed to further explore various aspects of teacher questions and thus allow for further beliefs to surface. A follow-up interview was also conducted after the data had been analyzed and written for the student teachers' reactions and comments. All interviews were recorded and transcribed.

C. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed to investigate and answer the following research questions:

(1) What are the student teachers' beliefs about teacher questions?

(2) What types of questions do the student teachers ask during the microteaching practice session in EFL Microteaching class?

(3) What are the questioning strategies used by the student teachers in microteaching practice session in EFL Microteaching class?

These research questions guided the collection and analysis of data. When all of the observations and interviews were transcribed, they were coded and analysed. In order to ensure the data were reliable, all of the transcripts were coded and analysed on three separate occasions by the researchers in order to ensure that the codes were consistently identified (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Once it was concluded that all of the categories were concrete, they were compared with the other types of data to investigate similarities. This data triangulation was used as a strategy to increase the validity of evaluation and research. Thus during data analysis, all evidence was compared and cross-checked with other types of evidence. Before terminating data analysis, various study member checks were performed whenever possible to elicit feedback from the student teachers on the appropriateness of the analysis and interpretations presented in the findings below (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Results and Dicussion

Results

The results of the research are presented on the basis of the main research questions.

I. **Student Teachers' Beliefs about Teacher Questions**

Data dealing with all student teachers' stated beliefs are presented in Table 4. The participating student teachers' beliefs have been divided into two categories, namely: beliefs about questions, and beliefs about questioning types they ask during their microteaching practice sessions in EFL Microteaching class.

Table 4. Student Teachers' Beliefs and Student Teachers' Questions

Beliefs	ST1	ST2	ST3	ST4
A. Questions				
Questions can be used to introduce a topic.	✔	✔	✔	✔
Questions can be used to promote noticing	✔	✔	✔	✔
Questions can help students build on prior knowledge.	✔	✔	✔	✔
Questions can be used to promote critical thinking	✔	✔	#	✔
Questions can be used to promote cultural awareness	#	✔	✔	#
B. Questioning Practices				
Types of questions should be sequenced with a purpose	✔	✔	✔	#
If students do not understand the question, teacher needs to change questioning strategy.	✔	✔	✔	#
Some questions are planned before class, but new questions are formed in response to the way the lesson unfolds	✔	✔	✔	✔
It is important to ask more questions in which students can express their opinion, reasoning or unknown info.	✔	✔	✔	X
It is important to ask more questions in which students can demonstrate their knowledge.	✔	X	#	✔
It is important to frequently check for comprehension.	✔	✔	✔	✔
Perceived average number of questions asked each Microteaching practice session.	15 – 30	15 – 30	10 – 30	8 – 25

Key: ✔ = agree;   X = does not agree;   # = not stated

As indicated by Table 4, many beliefs regarding questions and questioning strategy were common to all of the teachers in this case study. However, certain beliefs were stated only by particular student teachers. For example, ST4 was the only student teacher to indicate that they frequently used questions that allowed students to display their knowledge. In comparison, the remaining other student teachers said that they preferred to ask higher order questions that required students to express their opinion, reason or provide information. Similarly, each student teacher indicated a range for the average number of questions used in a microteaching practice session that varied from one student teacher to another.[14] The average number of questions used in a lesson, as indicated by each teacher, fell within 8 – 30 questions.

II.   Types of Questions Student Teachers Ask during the Microteaching Practice Session

The types of questions asked by the student teachers during the microteaching practice sessions were taken from the observation data and were presented individually.in the following separate tables per student teacher. The types of questions individual student teacher produced during the microteaching practice sessions were classified into seven categories: comprehension check, clarification request, confirmation check, referential, display, expressive, and rhetorical. The tables underneath showed the number of questions in each category the individual research participants produced during the microteaching practice sessions.

Table 5. ST1's observed questioning types

Observed Microteaching Session	Question Types							Total No. of Questions
	CC	CR	CN	R	D	E	RH	
1	5	2	3	2	15	0	0	27
2	5	3	5	2	15	1	0	31
3	10	4	4	4	25	1	1	49
Total	20	9	12	8	55	2	1	107
Frequency (%)	18.7	8.4	11.2	7.5	51.4	1.9	0.9	100

Key: CC   = Comprehension Check

         CR   = Comprehension Request

         CN   = Confirmation Check

         R   = Referential

         D   = Display

         E   = Expressive

         RH   = Rhetorical

Table 6. ST2's observed questioning types

Observed Microteaching Session	Question Types							Total No. of Questions
	CC	CR	CN	R	D	E	RH	
1	7	2	3	1	15	0	0	28
2	5	3	5	2	20	1	0	36
3	10	5	4	5	30	1	1	56
Total	22	10	12	8	65	2	1	120
Frequency (%)	18.3	8.3	10	6.7	54.2	1.7	0.8	100

Key: CC   = Comprehension Check

         CR   = Comprehension Request

         CN   = Confirmation Check

         R   = Referential

         D   = Display

         E   = Expressive

         RH   = Rhetorical

Table 7. ST3's observed questioning types

Observed Microteaching Session	Question Types							Total No. of Questions
	CC	CR	CN	R	D	E	RH	
1	3	2	3	2	10	0	0	20
2	4	3	4	3	15	0	1	30

3	8	5	4	5	25	1	2	50
Total	15	10	11	10	50	1	3	100
Frequency (%)	15	10	11	10	50	1	3	100

Key: CC   = Comprehension Check

CR   = Comprehension Request

CN   = Confirmation Check

R   = Referential

D   = Display

E   = Expressive

RH   = Rhetorical

Table 8. ST4's observed questioning types

Observed Microteaching Session	Question Types							Total No. of Questions
	CC	CR	CN	R	D	E	RH	
1	3	2	3	2	10	0	0	20
2	4	4	4	3	15	1	1	32
3	8	7	5	5	25	1	2	53
Total	15	13	12	10	50	2	3	105
Frequency (%)	14.3	12.4	11.4	9.5	47.6	1.9	2.8	100

Key: CC   = Comprehension Check

CR   = Comprehension Request

CN   = Confirmation Check

R   = Referential

D   = Display

E   = Expressive

RH   = Rhetorical

III.   Student Teachers' Questioning Strategy in Microteaching Practice Session

The questioning strategies used by the four student teachers during microteaching practice sessions ranged from structuring, nominating, probing, leading, and pausing. These questioning strategies were presented in the table underneath.

Table 9. Student Teachers' Questioning Strategy in Microteaching Practice Session

Questioning Strategy	Sample Questions Student Teachers Asked
Structuring	- Any other answer about descriptive text? - Are you ready (to learn) - Is everybody here? - Does anyone remember what we learned last week? - Can anyone tell us why it is important for us to introduce self?
Nominating	- Who can answer? - Does anyone want to volunteer to answer? - Andy, what about you?
Probing	- Do you agree with your friend opinion? - Why do you agree with your friend opinion?
Leading	- People agree that asking questions is important. In your opinion, why do you think asking questions is important in your daily life?
Pausing	- After you watch this video, anyone can tell me about suggest and offer? … Any expressions of suggest and offer you identify from the video?.... Ok? Yes, please!

As indicated by the table above, the questioning strategies performed by the participating student teachers included five categories: structuring, nominating, probing,

leading, and pausing. The use of these questioning strategies is closely related to the function or purpose of the question asked.

Discussion

In general, convergence was found between student teachers' beliefs and their observed classroom practices for all participants. However, some patterns of divergence were also found. Convergent and divergent examples will now be outlined.

Convergent beliefs

ST4's beliefs with regard to teacher questions were mostly convergent with his types of questions asked in the microteaching practice sessions. During the follow-up interview, ST4 indicated that he asked display questions most frequently and expressed that his reason for doing so was to try 'to get [the students] to come up with specific answers'. When contrasted with his observed questioning practices, this belief is consistent. Display questions formed the bulk of questions in each observation and constituted 47.6% of the total number of questions asked. Similarly, ST4 indicated that he also frequently employed comprehension checks, citing the reason was 'to make sure [the students] understand what we're doing in class. In terms of the frequency for different question types, echoic questions made up 38.1% of the total number of questions asked, with comprehension checks comprising over half at 14.3%. Furthermore, ST4 employed expressive questions at a lower frequency of 1.9% when compared to the frequency of display questions. ST4 also indicated that he asked questions to introduce a topic and get the students to think about the topic that's going to be covered in class' (follow-up interview). Consistent with stated beliefs, it was observed that ST4 used referential questions to introduce the topic of the new unit.

The student teachers' stated beliefs also converged with their observed questioning practices. It is observed that a higher proportion of display questions were asked compared to the other question types. Display questions comprised the bulk of the total questions asked across all four observations (around 50.5% in average). In the follow-up interview, the student teachers stated that 'they [higher proficiency students] have to be able to answer questions; they have to be able to formulate their opinions in a

logical way. This belief regarding the requisite language abilities of high proficiency students is convergent with the high proportion of display questions.

Divergent beliefs

ST2 is an interesting case because although she exhibited some convergence in her beliefs and her questioning practices in the classroom, she also exhibited divergence and that is why we placed her in this section. For example, her convergence was exhibited when she stated it was important 'to make sure the students were following the lesson' and in order to do so, she performed 'a lot of comprehension checks; it doesn't matter the level' (follow-up interview). This belief is consistent with some of her observed questioning practices. The frequency of echoic questions, which includes comprehension and confirmation checks as well as comprehension request, constituted 36.6% of the total number of questions. Of that 36.6%, comprehension checks formed 18.3%. However, not all of her teacher beliefs were consistent with her questioning practices. With regard to the frequency of question types asked, ST2's statement, 'I seem to ask a lot of critical thinking questions, especially at higher levels', indicates that facilitating higher order thinking is a priority (follow-up interview). Referential questions are defined as questions in which the learner is required to express their opinion, reasoning or information in order to promote genuine communication (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983). There may be multiple answers which are unknown to the teacher (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983). However, when compared with observed questioning practices, Table 5 to 8 indicated that each lesson was dominated by display questions which are defined as questions in which the answer is known to the teacher and provide an opportunity for students to display their knowledge and understanding (Brock, 1986; Long & Sato, 1983). This type of question made up 50.5% of the total number of questions asked. Referential questions constituted only about 8% of the total number of questions asked.

Convergent and divergent beliefs and practices related to teacher questions in microteaching practice sessions

The results of this study generally suggest instances of patterns of both convergence and divergence between the four student teachers' beliefs and practices regarding their questioning practices in the classroom. When we examine each of the four

teachers individually we can see examples of both divergence and convergence. The proportion of display questions far exceeded the proportion of referential questions across all observations. In contrast to ST2, ST4's belief regarding the importance to use a lot of display questions was consistent with his questioning practices. The proportion of display questions was much higher in comparison to the proportion of referential questions. However, we must also consider that both ST2 and ST4 have had to employ more display questions in order to promote participation among their students with lower language proficiency. Indeed, research indicates that display questions may be more effective than referential questions at promoting student participation at lower language proficiencies since students potentially lack the language necessary to attend to the demands of a referential question or higher order question.

Effective Questioning Strategies Performed by Student Teachers in Microteaching Practice Sessions

As indicated by Table 9, student teachers applied different questioning strategies in microteaching practice sessions. These included structuring, nominating, probing, leading, and pausing.

A. Structuring

The structuring may be a brief exposition of the topic, a review of a series of questions and explanations based on a previous lesson or a statement of objectives. So that, it related to the setting when learning occurred.

B. Nominating

This strategy is done by first asking questions to students so that all students are involved in learning. If, nomination is done at the beginning then other students will tend to feel uninvolved or until the feeling does not have the responsibility to answer. Most student teachers nominated after it was seen that no students were willing to answer questions. They nominated based on certain considerations such as nominating students who were rarely active in the class or who at that time were not focused on learning.

C. Probing

Probing is a strategy used to explore initial questions to obtain more detailed information. In this strategy, efforts were made to obtain additional information from the previous statements students.

D. Leading

Leading questions encourage students to answer questions with the desired answers. This question was hardly raised by student teachers. Generally student teachers used a scientific approach with discovery learning models. So it affected the lack of application of leading question strategies. In this case the student teachers tried to facilitate students to understand learning, not direct them to get the desired understanding. This strategy needs to be avoided because students will not be able to think critically and convey their ideas.

E. Pausing

Giving time to students to think and organize their answers is one of the strategies that need to be done. Most student teachers gave students time to think and then they would nominate if no one answers or uses other strategies such as leading or probing. However, some student teachers did not resolve questions and then asked again or discussed other matters.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Referring to the research findings and discussion, some conclusions were conluded. First, the student teachers showed convergent and divergent beliefs with regard to teacher questions. They used convergent questions to get simple precise information about their students e.g. students' attendance and students'readiness for the class. On the other hand, they used divergent questions to get more detail and varid information from their students. Second, the types of questions used by student teachers in microteaching practice sessions mainly consisted of echoic and epistemic questions in almost all their subcategories; Their echoic questions include comprehension check, clarification request, and confirmation check whereas their epistemic questions cover referential, display,

expressive and rhetorical questions with display questions appeared more dominant than the others In terms of knowledge dimension, student teachers mostly used factual and conceptual which are low order questions. There are a small number who were able to provide meta-cognitive questions, but the question is usually only a simple reflective question that does not really require high cognitive abilities. Third, the questioning strategies used by the student teachers ranged from structuring, nominating, probing, leading, and pausing questions. While from all the strategies used, the leading strategy is rarely used by student teachers because student teachers think that students will not be able to think critically and convey their ideas. The application of high order questions by student teachers is considered less optimal. From the beginning they did not design learning devices or questions that encourage students to think critically so students do not have the opportunity to understand concepts, hone the ability to analyse a problem, or find a solution to a problem. This is to say, most student teachers used the types of factual questions and closed questions meaning they were confident to use questions categorized as high order questions.

Pedagogical Implication

Since the student teachers may only be able to use simple and factual questions during the microteaching practice sessions, and are not confident enough to ask questions requiring higher cognitive abilities, it is of necessary to provide them with self questioning training in which they may practice constructing questions of any types from reading texts. A part of the training may be done inside the classroom with the lecturer's facilitation as a model for them, and other parts of the training may be done in groups and independently outside the classroom in order to have deepr and convincing understanding. By so doing, the student teachers may be more skillful in designing and using various types of questions and more well prepared for being professional teachers in the future. Similarly, the lecturers in charge of writing and speaking courses need to pay careful attention and if possible integrate 'questioning strategy' in their courses and at the same time devise a way to provide ample opportunity for their students to practice constructing and using questions of any types and any levels of difficulty in their courses.

References

Anderson, L. M., and Krathwohl, D. R. (eds.). (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York:* Longman,

Bloom BS. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc;

Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 77–59.

Bulent, et. al. (2016). An Analysis of Teacher's Questioning Strategies. *Educational Reseacrh and Reviews Journal.* 11(22)

Creswell, J., (2012). *Educations Research Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitatif and Qualitatif Research.* United States: Tearson Educations, inc.

Delima, E.M. (2012). *A Reticent Student in the Classroom: A Consequence of the Art of Questioning*. Asian EFL Journal. Professional Teaching Articles. Vol. 60 May 2012.

Farrell, T.S.C. (2009). *Talking, listening and teaching: A guide to classroom communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Farrell, Thomas S.C. & Mom, Vanbupa. (2015). *Exploring teacher questions through reflective practice*. Volume 16. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Kim, Sungho. (2015). *An analysis of teacher question types in inquiry-based classroom and traditional classroom settings*. Graduate College, University of Iowa.

Long, M. H. & Sato, C. J. (1983). *Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions*. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 3–34). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Mitchell, Jim. (2006). *Teachers' Impicit Theories Concerning Questioning*. *British Educational Research Journal.* 20 (1).

Nappi, S Judith. (2016). *The Importance of Questioning in Developing Critical Thinking. The Delta Kappa Gamma, 30-41.*

Orlich, et.al (2010). Teaching Strategies: *A quide to Effective Instruction*. Boston: Wadsworth.

Palmadevi, N.N. and Artini, L.P. (2019). *Assessment Instruments for Improving English Teaching Skills through Microteaching in Indonesia*. Asian EFL Journal Research Articles. Vol. 21 Issue No. 2.2 March 2019

Sanjaya,W. (2006). *Learning Strategy*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Shaunessy, (2005). *Questioning Strategies for Teaching The Gifted.* Texas, Prufock Press, Inc.

Sunggingwati, D., & Nguyen, H. T. M. (2013). Teachers' Questioning in Reading Lessons: A Case Study in Indonesia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *10*(1).

Wragg,E. C., and G. Brown (1993). *Questining in the Primary School.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Yang, Hao (2017). A reserach on the effective Questioning in Class. *Science Publishing Group.* 5(4) 158-163.

10 epdf.pub   <1%
Internet

11 Montha Chumsukon. "Developing Geography Curriculum Framework fo...   <1%
Crossref

12 Anastasia Baan, Markus Deli Girik Allo, Andi Anto Patak. "The cultural ...   <1%
Crossref

13 ethicallingua.org   <1%
Internet

14 Elaheh Tavakoli, Mohammad Davoudi. "Question generation behavior o...   <1%
Crossref

15 dspace.pdpu.edu.ua   <1%
Internet

16 N Ratmaningsih, D S Logayah, A Abdulkarim, N N Afidah. "Literacy Villa...   <1%
Crossref

17 present5.com   <1%
Internet