

Seminar Internasional LN

USULAN SEMINAR INTERNASIONAL LUAR NEGERI



The 3rd Postgraduate Research Symposium,
December 1st, 2015, Selangor University Malaysia.

Pengusul:

Dr. Masduki, M.Pd
NIP: 104 9009 0182
NIDN: 0723096201

**UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH MALANG
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN**

OKTOBER, 2015

**HALAMAN PENGESAHAN
SEMINAR INTERNASIONAL LUAR NEGERI**

Judul Kegiatan : Seminar Internasional
Peserta :
a. Nama Lengkap : Dr. Masduki, M.Pd.
b. NIDN : 0008106601
c. Jabatan Fungsional : Lektor
d. Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
e. Nomor HP : 081334816151
f. Alamat email : masdki@yahoo.com
Pelaksanaan Kegiatan : The 3rd Postgraduate Research Symposium,
December 1st, 2015, Selangor University
Malaysia
Biaya Penelitian Keseluruhan : Rp. 6.000.000,00

Malang, 27 Oktober 2015

Mengetahui
An. Ketua Program Studi,
Sekretaris,

Pengusul,

Bayu Wicaksono, M.Ed., PhD.
NIP. 104 0611435

Dr. Masduki, M.Pd
NIDN. 00081066

Mengetahui:
Dekan FKIP,

Dr. Poncojari Wahyono, MKes
NIP.196201121990021001

BIODATA PENGUSUL SEMINAR INTERNASIONAL LN

I. IDENTITAS DIRI

- 1.1 Nama Lengkap : Dr. Masduki, M.Pd
1.2 Jabatan Fungsional/Gol : Lektor/III-C
1.3 NIP/NIK/NIDN : 1966100819931005
1.4 Tempat dan Tgl lahir : Tulungagung, 8 Oktober 1966
1.5 Alamat Rumah : Jl. Blimbing 19 Sumbersekar, Dau
1.6 No Telepon/Faks : 03417605020
1.7 Nomor HP : 081334816151
1.8 Alamat Kantor : Jl. Raya Tlogomas 246 Malang
1.9 No Telepon/Faks : 0341-464318 Ext. 163
1.10 *e-mail* : masdkii@yahoo.com
1.11 Bidang Keilmuan : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

II. RIWAYAT PENDIDIKAN

No. Program	S1	S2	S3
2.1. Nama PT	IKIP Malang	IKIP Malang	UM
2.2. Bidang Ilmu	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
2.3. Tahun Masuk	1986	1996	2006
2.4. Tahun Lulus	1989	1999	2009

III. PENGALAMAN PENELITIAN (bukan skripsi, tesis, maupun disertasi)

Sebagai ketua peneliti selama 5 tahun terakhir dimulai dari penelitian yang paling diunggulkan sampai penelitian tidak diunggulkan.

No.	Tahun	Judul Penelitian	Pendanaan	
			Sumber	Jumlah (Ribu Rp)
3.1	2015	EFL Questioning Skills in Reading Comprehension Courses at UMM	UMM	25.000
3.2	2014	Developing Peer-Assistance Writing Model to Promote Students' Writing Skills: The Synthesis of Topping's and Teo's Models	DIKTI-Hibah Bersaing	Rp. 35.000
3.3	2010	Individualized Instruction In	UMM	Rp. 35.000

	Listening Comprehension Classes		
--	---------------------------------	--	--

Tuliskan sumber pendanaan: PDM, SKW, Fundamental Riset, Hibah Bersaing, Hibah Pekerti, Hibah Pascasarjana, RAPID, atau sumber lainnya

IV. PENGALAMAN PENULISAN ARTIKEL ILMIAH DALAM JURNAL (*tidak termasuk makalah seminar/prosiding, artikel surat kabar*) Urutkan judul artikel ilmiah yang pernah diterbitkan selama 5 tahun terakhir dimulai dari artikel yang paling relevan menurut Saudara sampai yang tidak diunggulkan.

No.	Tahun	Judul Artikel Ilmiah	Volume/Nomor	Nama Jurnal
1.	2015	Peer-Assistance Writing Model to Promote Students' Writing Skills	Vol. 1	ELITE

V. PENGALAMAN PEROLEHAN HKI

Urutkan judul HKI yang pernah diterbitkan 5-10 tahun terakhir.

No	Judul	Nomor Pendaftaran/Program
5.1	-	-

Semua data yang saya isikan dan tercantum dalam biodata ini adalah benar dan dapat dipertanggungjawabkan secara hukum. Apabila di kemudian hari ternyata dijumpai ketidak-sesuaian dengan kenyataan, saya sanggup menerima risikonya.

Demikian biodata ini saya buat dengan sebenarnya untuk memenuhi salah satu persyaratan dalam pengajuan bantuan seminar Internasional.

Malang, 27 Oktober 2015
Pengusul,

Dr. Masduki, M.Pd
NIDN. 0008106601

USULAN ANGGARAN

RENCANA KEGIATAN SEMINAR INTERNATIONAL LUAR NEGERI

1. Kegiatan Seminar: 3rd Postgraduate Research Symposium, December 1st, 2015, Selangor University Malaysia.
2. Anggaran: Rencana anggaran kegiatan seminar internasional sebesar Rp. 6.000.000,-

Malang, 27 Oktober 2015
Pengusul,

Dr. Masduki, M.Pd
NIDN. 0008106601

RENCANA TEMA YANG AKAN DISEMINARKAN

ABSTRACT

TEACHER'S QUESTIONING STRATEGIES IN READING COMPREHENSION COURSES FOR EFL

By

Masduki

This study stems from an idea that classroom interaction is not only initiated by teachers, but it also commenced by students in a classroom setting. The teacher-student involvement is usually represented in the form of question-and-answer interaction. During the interaction, questions are dominantly posed.

This study has a particular concern with questions of Indonesian non-native English teachers; that is, clarifying an issue on EFL teacher questions in Reading Comprehension (RC) courses. More specifically, the study was done to explore and to describe the types of questions posed by EFL teacher and students in RC courses, along with the responses created by both parties.

The research project was executed by employing the qualitative study as a classroom research, focusing on the observation of teacher question and the students' responses as the interactive effects of the questions. The data in the forms of teachers' and students' utterances (questions) were obtained through non-participant observation. Two teachers teaching reading comprehension classes in Language Center Muhammadiyah University of Malang were selected as the research subjects to be observed. As the research also required the subjects' opinion and understanding of certain phenomena, it needed data that were elicited using interview.

The analysis reveals the obvious types of questions posed by EFL teachers in Reading comprehension courses. The types include display and referential questions. Both display and referential questions that occurred in the classes were in the closed and open form. With the closed forms, the teachers required the students to provide only one correct answer. Meanwhile, with the open form, they wanted their students to give more than one right answer. The closed and open forms were found in interrogative with yes/no questions and wh-questions, commands, and statements. The statements consisted of a complete sentence and were added by raising intonation to show that the teacher asked a question. The forms of referential question was also found closed and open. The closed referential was found in interrogative with yes/no questions, wh-questions and statements. But, the teacher employed open referential questions in the forms of wh-questions, statements, and commands. In classroom practices, the teacher used more frequently display questions than referential questions.

As observed, there appears to be a direct relationship between the question modification made by teachers with the quantity and quality of the student's responses. With the question modifications, the study found relatively ample evidences that the observed teachers were able to help the students elicit the intended responses in the process of comprehending a reading text. Thus, it is recommended that teachers achieve a high degree of sensitivity and awareness to use questions in the most effective manner.

TEACHERS' QUESTIONING STRATEGIES IN READING COMPREHENSION COURSES FOR EFL

By:

Masduki

Lecturer of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Malang, East Java,
Indonesia

masdki@yahoo.com

I. BACKGROUND

A traditional approach to reading describes reading comprehension as a matter of simply extracting information from the text. This view has changed in the light of the studies especially in the first language reading. Goodman's (1987) Psycholinguistic Model and Schema Theory brought an interactive perspective to reading theory. Following this approach, reading is a more complex process in which the reader combines the textual information with his/her background knowledge. In addition to Psycholinguistic Model and Schema Theory, another recent approach to reading is the Interactive Model proposed by Eskey (1998: 155). In this model, interaction has been handled from two perspectives; one is the interaction between the reader and the text, and the other is the interaction between the lower and higher levels of reading process. Drawing on these conceptions, the Interactive Model views reading as "a kind of dialog" between the reader and the text. This occurs when the reader has both linguistic and content schema. Thus, the reader's prior background of the content is believed to be able to facilitate his/her processing the text.

In addition to Eskey (1998), Nuttal (1982: 98) also argues that fluent reading results from the simultaneous interaction between the higher and the lower level skills of reading. Lower level skills are known as identification skills such as recognizing words and sentences necessary for decoding and extracting explicit information. Higher level skills require more cognitive effort including reading between the lines to find the implicit information, understanding the writer's point of view and making interpretation. Hence, fluent reading and good comprehension occur only when these skills operate together.

In Indonesia, only a limited number of studies on the issue have reached the intellectual level or the cognitive process dimensions involved in the teachers' questions posed in classrooms. It was Sunggingwati (2001) who conducted a study comparing the questions for Senior High School students available in textbooks published by three biggest Indonesian textbook publishers in 1994-1999. She found that the newer editions had, in two or three cases, almost doubled the number of knowledge-based questions compared to the earlier editions. No more than 10 percent of the six hundred sampled questions could be classified as application-level or above. Sunggingwati's research findings can, perhaps, explain the phenomena why students' score is low on the higher-thinking level. If the higher cognitive level becomes the national concern, the use of higher-level questions in classroom must receive sufficient attention. Hence, teachers have to be well-informed for that purpose.

Reviewing the studies on teacher questions, it is also worth to have a look at a study that is conducted in an English classroom setting. In a recent study, Shomoosy (2004: 13) investigates the effect of teachers' questioning behavior on students' responses. The qualitative-quantitative study is conducted as a classroom research. Focusing on two question types, display and referential, it explored the students' responses as the interactive effects of the questions that were observed through non-participant observation. Four reading comprehension classes in Tehran universities were observed by the investigator.

The need to observe EFL teacher questions and the practice of generating effective questions in EFL reading classrooms is important for a number of practical and theoretical reasons. Practically, in Indonesia, there seems to be increasing interests in improving teachers' ability to generate questions in a teaching and learning context. Seminar, workshops, and training programs are held to equip teachers with abilities to generate questions to enhance the effectiveness of teaching-learning processes for which they are responsible. This phenomenon has also occurred in the university efforts in the last few years through the implementation of the Applied Approach.

Besides, the foreign language teaching in Indonesia is mainly directed to equip the students with communication skills with the emphasis on reading skills.-reading for information and studying. For some students reading activities in English can be complex psycholinguistic tasks because they have not yet mastered the medium for successful academic reading activities (Sadtono, 1995: 35). As a matter of fact, reading itself is a kind of a discussion-based lesson geared toward creating opportunities for students' conceptual and linguistic development (Goldenberg, 1991: 97). Thus, an attempt to provide them with some instructional help, such as questioning, is necessary.

Meanwhile, there are a number of theoretical reasons. First, questioning is a kind of teaching strategy that can serve several functions: 1) the act of asking questions helps teachers keep students actively involved in lessons, 2) while answering questions, students have the opportunity to openly express their ideas and thoughts, 3) questioning students enables other students to hear different explanations of the materials by their peers, 4) asking questions helps teachers to pace their lessons and moderate student behavior, and 5) questioning students helps teachers to evaluate student learning and revise their lessons as necessary (Brualdi, 1998: 144). Second, as stated by Allwright (1991: 203), the teacher is responsible to manage interaction for the sake of giving everyone the best possible opportunities for learning the language. Therefore, teachers need to optimize the function of classroom as a place to learn. Third, as stated before, it has already become a common belief that teacher questions play important roles in a language classroom interaction. The questions may generate learners' target language production or meaningful responses. They play an important role in focusing students' attention, encouraging oral responses, and evaluating learners' progress. Forth, reading comprehension lessons have traditionally centered on a passage of text followed by questions. However, the questions were usually designed to 'find out whether the students had understood', rather than to 'produce understanding' (Nuttall, 1982: 196). If Nuttall's assertion is perceived to be correct, then it can be argued that questions are devices for *testing* rather than *teaching*. As a matter of fact, as far as the teaching process is concerned, the need has been strong that

teachers should spend most of their time teaching rather than testing. This gives rise to concern about how teacher should make use of questions effectively to teach reading comprehension. Thus, observation on teacher questions and how they can The richness of the area of questioning and the widespread use of questions by teachers suggest that there is an area where teachers of EFL are expected to develop quite extensive pedagogical knowledge. Therefore, it is significant to conduct the research on this issue. With all of these considerations in mind, a study investigating the aspects that make teacher questions effective in Reading Comprehension courses is important.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of Questions

A question has been defined as a command or interrogative expression used to elicit information or a response, or to test knowledge (Brock, 1986: 16). The advantage of this definition is that not all questions are considered to be interrogatives (e.g. tell me how you make chocolate soup) and that not all interrogatives are considered as questions (e.g. How do you do?). However, one aspect of this definition, i.e. the potential use of questions as a means of measuring knowledge, is crucial to any discussion of patterns of question-asking in the classroom, because one of the remarkable differences of educational and non-educational settings is that in the latter case, people seldom ask questions to which they have already got the answers.

Quirk et al. (1985: 275) define question as a semantic class which is primarily used to seek information on a specific point. They have classified questions into three major classes: Yes-No questions, Wh-questions, and alternative or or-questions. This classification, is made according to the response expected, however, it seems that this is more of a syntactic nature.

Then, Lyons in Dijk (1977: 66-69) characterizes question as an utterance with a particular illocutionary force. He asserts that the difference between a question and a statement is that the former contains a feature of doubt, and that one of its felicity conditions is that the speaker should not know the answer to his question. This is not also a satisfactory definition. What Lyons (1977) and Quirk et al. (1985) have done is trying to offer a description which takes into account both syntactic form and discourse function.

Another definition of a question, in classroom settings, is suggested by Andre (1989: 36) as “a direction to a learner to examine instructional material or his memory of it and to produce some responses”. Under the above conceptions, it can be inferred that a question is not only a formal interrogatory sentences, but it also includes directive statements (imperatives). This conception of question is perceived to be appropriate because directive statements (imperatives) and formal interrogatory sentences can refer to equivalent cognitive and behavioral activities. Then, following the same conceptions, in this study, a question refers to both formal interrogatory sentences and directive statements (imperatives) which require overt responses from the student in reading classes.

Question Classifications

Many researchers have attempted to describe the types of question asked by teachers. To quantify their descriptions, some have found it helpful to develop sets of categories into which teachers' questions can be classified. At least 8 classification systems have been proposed (Bloom, 1956: 221; Pate & Bremer, 1987: 106-107).

Several systems such as Bloom's, and Pate's, consist of limited number of general categories which can be used to classify questions beyond or irrespective of context. This feature, according to Cotton (1988: 319), suggests some issues such as the different types of question emphasized in various school curricula or in traditional or new curricula. However, the classification system has a kind of limitation. Gall (1984: 217) asserts that the system are of limited utility if a researcher is interested in more detailed descriptions of questions asked in specific context.

Guszak's Reading-Comprehension Question-Response Inventory also serves the classification system. It suggests a specific classification system designed for the analysis of question that teachers ask in elementary school reading groups. The specification of the categories is typified by the 'recognition question' category, which includes questions requiring students to locate information from the reading context (e.g., "Find what Little Red Ridinghood says to the wolf." Since the information as the answer is clearly stated in the reading text, such question is a kind of a display question. In Schreiber's system for classifying social science questions, there are also a number of fairly curriculum-specific categories, such as: "Will you find Greenland on the globe?" and stating of judgment (e.g., "Do you think it is right to have censorship of the news?"

Most of the question-classification systems are composed almost entirely of categories based on type of cognitive process required to answer the questions. For example, in Bloom's Taxonomy, the question "What is your opinion of our present stance on the Vietnam War?" is classified an Evaluation question because it requires evaluative thinking, whereas "What assumptions does the author make in criticizing New Deal politics?" is classified an analysis question because it requires that students engage in analytic thinking.

In addition to the already mentioned classifications, in a simpler way, Holland and Shortal (1997: 219), Chaudron (1988: 164), and Hastings (2003: 36) have identified two types of questions that are broadly classified as *display* and *referential*. Following Nuttall's (1982: 162) and Chaudron's (1988: 164) definitions, display questions are those to which the answers are known and which are designed to elicit or display particular information, while referential questions are ones to which teachers or questioners, in naturalistic and classroom discourse, do not know the answers. Display questions are also referred to in the literature as fact, closed, direct, recall, and knowledge questions. They belong to lower cognitive questions which ask the student merely to recall verbatim or in his/her own words material previously read or taught by the teacher or questioner.

Meanwhile, referential questions are also called open-ended, interpretative, evaluative, inquiry, and synthesis questions. They belong to higher cognitive questions which ask the student to mentally manipulate bits of information previously learned to create an answer or to support an answer with logically reasoned evidence. Referential questions are likely characterized by the use of a question-word, such as: *why*, *which*, and *how*. In a question 'Why does he

stay there?’, the questioner requires information about the possible reasons with a range of possible responses.

The above review on question classification implies that investigation on teachers’ questions should, therefore, be directed to see not only the kinds of questions teachers ask, but also the types of questions which teachers should effectively use. If the teachers desire to evoke a response at a selected level of thinking, then, appropriate questions must be framed that will elicit proper cognitive level from the students. There appears to be a direct relationship between the types of questions asked by the teachers and the learners’ cognitive levels. If this assertion is valid, then, teachers must achieve a high degree of sensitivity and awareness to use questions in the most appropriate manner. Thus, with this in mind, it seems fruitful to identify questions which are effective for EFL classroom setting. This present study was conducted not only to identify the types of questions which teachers actually used in the language classrooms, but it was also directed to see how the teachers effectively used questions in Reading Comprehension classes. By so doing the effective questions along with the questioning strategies can be described. In this present study, an effective question is defined in terms of whether or not they evoke the students’ responses so that the students get engaged in the reading process

Criteria for Effective Questions/Questioning

As reviewed here, there have been only scattering of opinion articles, and these have ‘slightly’ emphasized the characteristics of effective questions. Such characteristics, for example, are confronted by Hussain (2003: 119) as follows: 1) questions asked must be according to the level of the learners, 2) questions with definite answers should be encouraged, 3) challenging questions that require learners to compare, evaluate, or draw inferences should be asked, 4) a question should not have a ‘trick’ or ‘catch’ to it, and 5) yes-no questions should be avoided.

Other concepts of effective questions are introduced by Slack (2004). Her explanation about effective questioning seems to be complementary to what has been suggested by Hussain (2003). Good questions, according to Slack (2004: 317), are: 1) purposeful (asked to achieve a specific purpose), 2) clear (students understand what is being asked), 3) brief (stated in as few words as possible), 4) thought-provoking (they stimulate thought and response), 6) limited in scope (only one or two points in chain of reasoning called for), and 7) adapted to the level of the class (tailored to the kinds of students in the class).

In addition to suggesting the characteristics of good questions, Slack (2004: 323) also recommends question types that should be avoided. These question types include the questions of: 1) yes-no, 2) elliptical and vague, and 3) guessing. *Yes-no* questions are avoided because they simply draw one word; *yes* or *no* responses (e.g. “*Does the square root of 9 equal 3?*”). *Elliptical and vague* questions give students no clue as to what is called for (e.g. “*What about the League of Nations?*”). Finally, *guessing* questions is better avoided because they encourage speculation rather than thought (e.g. “*How long do you think man has been on earth?*”).

Hussain’s (2003) and Slack’s (2004) ideas can serve the general guiding concepts to identify teachers’ effective questions. Hence, proper questioning will

take place, according to Slack (2004) when questions are: 1) logically and sequentially planned, 2) addressed to entire class and distributed widely, 3) posed in such a way that students have time to think, 4) balanced between fact and thought, 5) asked in a conversational tone, 6) not repeated, and 7) designed to elicit sustained responses.

Further, in order to have comprehensive views on effective questions, it is necessary to take into account some other explicit criteria that should be fulfilled by the teacher when providing the questions in the classroom. Ur (1996: 98-119) reminds the teacher to consider the criteria for the effective questioning. The criteria are namely: clarity, learning value, availability, extension, and teacher reaction. In the *first* criterion of effective questions, a question is required to be clear when being presented to the students. It is important in order that the learners immediately grasp not only what the question means but what kind of answer is required. Unless the questions are clear, it is impossible for the learners to respond to the teacher's questions. The *second* criterion for the effective questioning is that a question in the interactive classroom should contain learning values. The question should stimulate thinking and responses that will contribute to further learning of the target material. Or in other words, the questions should be not irrelevant, unhelpful, or merely time-filling. The *third* criterion is that a question should be interesting, challenging, and stimulating. It is needed to motivate the learners to respond. If the learners find the question is not interesting, challenging, and stimulating, it is possible that the learners will not respond to the question. The *fourth* criterion for the effective questioning that should be considered by the teacher is "availability". This means that the questions can be available not only to the more advanced, confident, or knowledgeable learners who are able to answer the questions but also to the most of members of the class. In this criterion, the time added by the teacher for a few seconds' time before accepting the responses can make the questions available to a significantly larger number of learners. The *fifth* criterion that should be considered by the teacher in the question should be extended. This is necessary for the question to invite and encourage the learner's extended and/or varied answer. The narrow question will not result in the learners' various responses. The *last* criterion for effective questions is the teacher reaction. In this criterion, the teacher needs to react positively to the students' answer which are helpful to make the learners sure that their response will be related to with respect, or to make the learners sure that they will not be put down or ridiculed if they say something inappropriate.

By considering all conceptions as reviewed in this section, there are some important points that can be summarized. First, effective questions basically evoke responses from the students. In order to evoke response, questions must fulfill the criteria of being good, such as: clear, brief, interesting, challenging (stimulating or encouraging etc.). These characteristics are bound to the type of questions; they can be drawn soon after the types of questions are identified. Second, good questions remain ineffective unless they are properly posed. In other words, not all types of questions are appropriately used in a teaching situation, and questions alone do not work best unless they are posed correctly. This is bound to the technique or strategies to pose questions.

In short, if the teachers desire to evoke a response at a selected level of thinking, then appropriate type of questions must be framed. In order to be effective, there appears to be a direct relationship between the types of questions asked by the teachers and the strategy to pose the questions. If this assertion is valid, then teachers must achieve a high degree of sensitivity and awareness to use questions in the most appropriate manner. Thus, observing effective questions in EFL classroom settings seems to be fruitful if it starts by identifying: 1) the types of questions and 2) the questioning strategy employed by the teachers along with the modification. In this present study, effective questions/questioning will be defined in terms of the criteria as already discussed in this section.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

The research project was executed by employing the qualitative study as a classroom research, focusing on the observation of teacher and students questions and their responses. The data in the forms of teachers' and students' utterances (questions) were obtained through non-participant observation. Two teachers teaching reading comprehension classes in the Language Center at Muhammadiyah University of Malang were selected as the research subjects to be observed. As the research also required the subjects' opinion and understanding of certain phenomena, it needed the data that were elicited using interview. This means that the data to handle were subjectively produced by the research subjects and subjectively and qualitatively interpreted by the present researcher. Since the analysis resides within the camp of qualitative type of research, in general, the present study can be labeled into qualitative.

In gathering data with observation, the researcher was equipped with field-notes and video-audio-tape recorders. The field-notes were used to write everything the researcher experienced and thought during the data collection and the video-audio-tape recorders were used to record the events in the field. The field-notes and video-audio-tape recorders were used because, in addition to his strengths, the researcher also had some limitations and weaknesses. First, his attention was limited. Second, he might not remember everything in a relatively long time. Therefore, he could only write short, important notes during the observations. To complete the field-notes, he replayed his video and audio tape recordings. Thus, the recordings were used to catch and record events that the researcher could not record himself during the observations.

In addition, to gather the data on the aspects that make EFL teacher questions effective, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews to both teachers and the students (research subjects). The results of the interviews with the research subjects served the data to complete and confirmed the data collected through observations. The questions in the interviews might be unfolding to get more detailed as the researcher wanted to understand better and to obtain deeper insight into the phenomena the researcher observed in the classroom.

IV. RESULTS

The analysis reveals the obvious types of questions posed by EFL teachers in reading comprehension courses. The types include display and referential

questions. Both display and referential questions that occurred in the classes were in the closed and open form. With the closed forms, the teachers required the students to provide only one correct answer. Meanwhile, with the open form, they wanted their students to give more than one right answer. The closed and open forms were found in interrogative with yes/no questions and wh-questions, commands, and statements. The statements consisted of a complete sentence and were added by raising intonation to show that the teacher asked a question. The forms of referential question was also found closed and open. The closed referential was found in interrogative with yes/no questions, wh-questions and statements. But, the teacher employed open referential questions in the forms of wh-questions, statements, and commands. In classroom practices, the teacher used display questions more frequently than referential questions.

Then, as far as the strategies are concerned, three different strategies were used by the teachers in posing questions in RC courses: translation, repetition, and pausing. The first questioning strategy employed by teachers in EFL reading classes is translation. The translation is either from the target language (English) to the student native language (Indonesian) or vice versa. The use of translation strategy indicated that the teachers wanted to emphasize and to make clearer about things they explained and described. The interviews with some student subjects touched an important issue on the use of translation to pose questions. The students acknowledged that translation also turned out to be the students' preference. This indicated that they wanted the L1 (Indonesian) equivalents on their teachers' English speech whenever they found it incomprehensible. This might also indicate that the students (mostly freshmen) had low proficiency in English. This finding supported the view that students' preference for L1 and the language dominance in the setting may influence teachers' preference for the communication strategies and the language used in the classrooms.

The second strategy employed by teachers in EFL reading classes is repetition. The teacher repeated the question to ask whether the student understand about the questions posed. The repetition strategy was intended not only to increase comprehensibility but also to maximize the opportunities for students to answer. The present study also documented a point worth highlighting pertaining to the repetition. That is, despite the existing debate among scholars on the use of repetition, repetition strategy was capable of ensuring and improving EFL students' engagement in a learning process. In the observed classes, there was sufficient evidence supporting this assertion. The findings attested some previous related studies which revealed that teacher's repetition strategy was effective for improving learners' engagement to find the intended response.

The third questioning strategy employed by the teacher is the employment of wait-time or pausing. The present study reveals that teachers employed relatively moderate period of pause. The observed teachers posed questions with the mean of wait-time of 3:69 seconds. With this in mind, in this research, many students volunteered to answer each question. With regard to the wait-time, the study also reveals that the wait-time pauses were very similar among question types.

Regarding the ways to pose effective questions, a number of modifications in the strategy of questioning were employed by the observed EFL teachers. For the purposes, the teachers employed probing and rephrasing modifications. Each has

its own pattern. For the probing there were two types of modification employed by the teachers. Those are sequencing the questions by: 1) focusing on subordinate category, and 2) focusing on an exemplification. In addition to probing, the other modification of the question is rephrasing. In the present study, rephrasing was found to have more than one modification, namely the modification of rephrased questions by: 1) using a clue that describes the attribute of the expected answer, 2) comparing or contrasting of the expected answer to something, and 3) rephrasing with alternative or choice questions.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study conceives the EFL teacher questions in reading comprehension courses. It focuses on describing two important aspects of teacher questions in terms of: 1) the types of EFL teacher questions, and 2) responses created by EFL teachers and students to make effective questions in Reading Comprehension courses. The conclusions suggesting some statements of relationship among those aspects were arranged in the following order.

1. The Types of Teacher Questions

With regard to the types of questions posed by the teachers, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- a) The range of the questions as observed shows that the two teachers who participated in the present study had a common tendency in asking more display questions. Contrastingly, there were relatively a few referential and interpretation questions. Display questions activate lower level skills and call for studying surface level meanings. Thus, it can be concluded that, having such a tendency, the teachers led their students to concentrate on surface level meanings and to practice lower level skills to a great extent in Reading Comprehension courses. For maximum comprehension, the questions should address display, referential or interpretative levels of information. In this way, the activation of both lower and higher level skills of interactive reading comprehension classes can be achieved.
- b) The present study documented student responses to different types of teacher-initiated questions in classrooms. As observed, students' responses to wh-questions appeared to be longer than that of their responses to yes/no questions. Thus, it can be concluded that: 1) the responses tended to have the relationship between teacher's question types and students' responses, and 2) the power of wh-questions was relatively strong; they could trigger longer and more syntactically complex utterances than yes/no questions.
- c) Display and referential questions were not employed in equal proportion by both teachers under the observation. This means that such a practice was a natural incidence since both teachers did not think alike and were not teaching in the same way. Every teacher had a particular way of teaching with their own strategies and techniques which can rarely be found in others.
- d) There was no rigid separation of cognitive process taking place during the reading, and a certain degree of flexible relations may characterize the processing of information during the reading processes. Consequently,

effective teacher questions may vary along with the possible combination of display and referential questions.

- e) The use of display questions was not separable from reading comprehension classes, and the results indicated that the occurrence of such questions outnumbered the occurrence of referential questions in general. This fact implies two interrelated angles. First, this type of display questions contains small pieces of information to be quickly verified by asking. Secondly, the nature of reading comprehension classes, where comprehension precedes production, demands that teachers make sure that all students have comprehended the reading, and this cannot be done unless teachers make use of comprehension checks using display questions to which a short and syntactically less complex answer is given.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom. An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnold, D. S. 1994. Question and response levels and lapse time intervals. *Journal of Experimental Education*: 43, 11-15.
- Ary, Donald, Lucy Cheser Jacobs, and Asghar Razavieh. 2002. *Introduction to Research in Education*. Sixth Edition. Belmont: Thomson Learning, Inc.
- Aschner, M.J. 1993. Asking Questions to Trigger Thinking. *NEA Journal*, 50: 44-46.
- Averbach, N.M. 1983. *Classroom Questions: What Kinds?* New York: Harper and Row.
- Bloom, B.S. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Cognitive Domain*. New York: Longman.
- Bogdan, Robert C. and Sari Knopp Biklen. 1998. *Qualitative Research in Education; An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. New York: Ally & Bacon.
- Borich, Gary D. 1988. *Effective Teaching Method*. Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Brock, C.A. 1986. *The Effects of Referential Questions on ESL Classroom Discourse*. *TESOL Quarterly* 20:47-59.
- Brown, Douglas H. 1988. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. and Edition. Anglewood Cliffs: Prentice-hall Inc.
- Chaudron, Craig. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Luis, Lawrence Manion, and Keith Morrison. 2002. *Research Methods in education*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cotton, K .2000. Classroom Questioning. School Improvement Research Series (SIRS). regional Educational Laboratory: <http://www.nwrel.org/sepd/sirs/3/cu5.html>.

- Dillon, J.T. 1984. Research on Questioning and Discussion. *Educational Leadership*. No. 4 vol. 42 (3): 50-56.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of second language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eskey, D. 1998. A New Technique for the Teaching of Reading to Advanced Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 4 (4): 75-96.
- Farooq, M. Umar. 1998. Analyzing Teachers' Questioning Strategies, Feedback, and Learners' Outcomes. *Journal of Aichi Women's Junior college*: 1-24
- Ferguson, S.W. 1993. Evaluating Reading Comprehension in EFL. *English Teaching Forum*. Vol. 35 No. 2: 30-35
- Fitzgerald, Jill. 1995. English as-a-Second Language Learners' Cognitive Reading Process. A Review of Research in the US. *Review of Educational Research*. Summer 1995. Vol. 65 No. 2: 145-190
- Gall, J.T. 1984. "Synthesis of Research on Teachers' Questioning." *Educational leadership* 42: 40-47.
- Gebhard, J. G. 1990. Interaction in a teaching practicum. In Richards, J. C. and D. Nunan. *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 118-131).
- Guba, E.G. and Y. Lincoln. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Hastings, Steven. 2003. Questioning: Teaching Ideas. *The Time Educational Supplement* <http://www.tes.co.uk>, accessed on March 25, 2006.
- Herber, Harold, and Joan Nelson Herber. 1993. *Teaching in Content Areas: with Reading, Writing and Reasoning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Huda, Nuril. 1992. *Characteristic of Teacher Talk in Foreign Language Setting*. TEFLIN Journal, 5 (1): 55-68
- Huda, Nuril. 1999. *Language Learning and Teaching: Issues and Trends*. Malang: IKIP Malang Press.
- Hunkin, R.1988. The Effects of Teachers' Questions on the Students' Response. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior Vol. 11*: <http://search.epnet.com/login.aspx>. Accessed on March 5, 2005.
- Hussain. C. Lewis. 2003. Effective Questioning. *The Educational Technology Journal Vol 7. No 3*: <http://questioning.org/Q7/toolkit2.html>. Accessed on April 25, 2006
- Hyman, G.S. 1989. Teachers' Questions and Student Understanding of Science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching Vol. 3*: 307-317.
- Kubota, Mikio. 1989. *Question-answering behaviors in ESL and EFL classes: similarities and differences*. Master's research paper, Georgetown University. <http://www.utexas.edu/academic/cte/questioning.html>. accessed on May 11 2006
- Littlewood, William. 1984. *Foreign and Second Language Learning. Language Acquisition Research and Its Implications for Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loban, W. 1993. Questions and Question-asking in Verbal Discourse: A cross-Disciplinary Review. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 5, 355-375.
- Long, M. H. 1981. Questions in Foreigner talk discourse. *Language Learning* 31, 135-157.
- Long, M.H. and Sato C.J. 1983. *Classroom Foreigner Talk Discourse: Forms and*

- function's of Teacher's Question.* Rowley: Newbury House.
- Lynch, Tony. 1991. Questioning roles in the classroom. *ELT Journal* 45(3):201-210.
- McKenzie, Jamie. 1999. Questions and Questioning: The Most Powerful Technologies of All. *From Now On The Educational Technology Journal Vol.9 No. 3 1999*.<http://fno.org/nov99/techquest.html> accessed on May 3, 2006.
- Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M., 1984. *Quantitative data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New methods*. London: Sage Publication, Ltd.
- Miller, C. 2005. Questioning Strategy. <http://www.seal.org/pubs.html> accessed on April 19, 2005.
- Moritoshi, Paul. 2004. "Teacher Questioning, Modification and Feedback Behaviors and their Implications for Learner Production. *Iowa Law Review. Vol. 87, No. 1: 67-78.*
- Orlich, C. Donald, 1998. *Teaching Strategies: A Guide to Better Instruction*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Quirk, J. S. 1985. *Questioning: A Classroom Teaching Skills*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Richards, J. C. and D. Nunan (eds.) 1990. *Second Language Teacher Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rumelhart, D.E., Lindsay P.H. 1980. A Process Model for Long term Memory. In Tulving, E. & Donaldson, W. (Eds). *Organization of Memory*. New York: Academic Press
- Sadtono, E. 1983. *Penguasaan Bahasa Inggris Dosen di Indonesia*. Professorship Speech, Fakultas Pasca Sarjana IKIP Malang.
- Shomoossi, Nematullah. 2004. *The Effect of Teachers' Questioning Behavior on EFL Classroom*. The Reading Matrix Vol. 4, No. 2: 96-102.
- Sirotnik, K.A. 1983. "What You See Is What You Get--Consistency, Persistency and mediocrity in Classrooms." *Educational Review: 16-31.*
- Slack, Jill B. 2004. Teaching Thinking through Effective Questioning. Workshop Paper. Southeast Comprehensive Assistance Center. <http://fno.org/nov99/techquest.html> accessed on March 5, 2004.
- Sunggingwati, Diah. 2001. *Reading Questions of Junior High School English Textbook*. Unpublished Thesis: Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Thomas, A. 1987. *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tollefson, James W. 1989. A System for Improving Teachers' Questions. *English Teaching Forum. XXVII (1): 6-9.*
- Wilens, W.W., 1989. "Questioning, Thinking, and Effective Citizenship." *Social Studies Record* 22: 4-6.