

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the results of the data collection through videotaping, classroom observations, questionnaire for students, and interview for teacher. The structure of the analysis is divided into findings and discussion sections. The data analyzed in three main parts which are types of classroom teachers' questions, the functions of those questions, and students' responses toward teachers' questions.

#### **A. Research Finding**

##### **1. The Type of Question**

The types of teachers' questions were classified into two main parts, which were display question and referential question. Based on the classification, the researcher then found out which type of questions used at the most. Whether it was display or referential question. Each type of question was presented in the table of questions' list, which was categorized based on the form of the question and followed by an explanation about the content of the questions.

##### **a. Display Questions**

According to Long and Sato's (1983) types of questions consist of two main sections which are display and referential questions. Display questions refer to ones that teachers know the answer and which are designed to elicit or display particular structures. In contrast,

referential questions refer to questions that teachers do not know the answers, and can provide various kinds of subjective information.

Each section was coded into eight sub-sections. They were complete verbal questions, incomplete verbal questions, single word questions, phrase questions, complete pronominal questions, incomplete pronominal questions, Indonesian questions, and Indonesian-English mixed questions. Table 4.1 illustrated the summary of the findings.

Table 4.1: Type of Display Questions

No.	Type of Questions	Number of Questions	Percentage (%)
1.	Complete verbal questions	7	2.04%
2.	Incomplete verbal questions	17	4.96%
3.	Single-word questions	58	16.91%
4.	Phrase questions	57	16.62%
5.	Complete pronominal questions	24	7%
6.	Incomplete pronominal questions	29	8.45%
7.	Indonesian-English mixed questions (source-target language mixed question)	73	21.28%
8.	Pure Indonesian questions (pure source language)	79	23.03%

#### 1) Complete Verbal Questions

The results from the observations and the videotaped transcripts show that overall there were 343 display questions asked in four classes. From the number of those questions, there were 7 (2.04%) complete verbal questions asked by the teachers.

In XI MIA class, there were 2 complete verbal questions posed to the students. One question asked to check students' knowledge. The question *Now give example for formal, Rizky?* One other question was asked to check the students' memory on the format of layout in an invitation. It could be seen in the question *up your hand if you six?* Both of the complete verbal questions asked here were done to elicit already known information related to the subject matter.

For XI IIS-1 class, the results showed that the teacher only asked 1 complete verbal question. The question just asked to check students' knowledge as in *give example for formal, Nafisah?* and for XI-IIS-2 class, the teacher asked two complete verbal questions. In this class the questions were asked for check students' knowledge and to repeat the example. The question was *give example for formal*. The questions asked with same redaction but add the word *first* and by different student *give example for formal, first?* The word *first* in the end of sentence was to repeat the example that was mentioned by the other student.

So, all the questions were asked in three classes served the same purposes as lead-in parts to the lesson, to check students' knowledge on the topic being discussed, to remember the topic, and to direct students' attention to classroom activities.

## 2) Incomplete Verbal Questions

The table 4.1 illustrated that from 343 display questions asked by the teacher, there was 17 (4.96%) incomplete verbal questions. Incomplete verbal questions were the questions that asked as the continuation of complete verbal question. Those questions were posed in all classes, 3 questions in XI MIA class, 4 questions in XI IIS-1, and 7 questions in XI IIS-2. The questions were to mentioned the other example and repeat the example. But in XI MIA class, there was a question to check students' understanding *anybody know?* When asking these questions, the teacher raised her intonation and the students knew that the sentence the teacher mentioned required an answer.

## 3) Single-Word Questions

Referring to Table 4.1, one-word questions were found 58 (16.91%) times asked by the teacher. It was found 15 times in XI MIA class, 6 times in XI IIS-1 class, and 34 times in XI IIS-2 class. All the questions were in the word *then?*, *or?*, *and?*, *cardinal number*, *ordinal number*, and word or term about material like *address?* *date?*. These questions served the same purpose which was to gain students' oral answers they were discussing the lesson.

In asking such questions, the teacher raised her intonation to signal that she was asking questions to the students. By doing this,

she expected answer form the students. Naturally, the students knew that when the teacher said those words, she required responses from the students. Thus even one single word which was said by raising intonation can be considered as a question since it also requires an answer.

#### 4) Phrase Questions

The term phrase question was used to cover questions which had more than one word but did not have a subject and verb or any question words like “who”, “what”, “how”, “when”, and “where”. Some of these questions consisted of two words, and some others had three or more. When asking these questions, the teacher raised her intonation to signal that she was questioning the students. Overall, there were 57 (16.67%) phrase questions posed to the students during the lesson time.

All the questions were asked in the middle of the lesson to check students’ understanding and to check students’ memory about the lesson. In XI MIA class, there were 29 questions asked in the form of a phrase. The questions were asked about layout of invitation, the example of invitation, complete the information like *two thousand and?*. The other questions, asked with cardinal number, ordinal number and temporal conjunction. For example, *Number three? The third? the last*. There were 9 questions in XI

IIS-1. The questions were only asked with temporal conjunction and a phrase that need to identify into part of invitation as in *in Gedung Kartini?* And in XI IIS-2, the questions asked same with in XI MIA and XI IIS-1 those were with cardinal number, ordinal number and temporal conjunction. But there was a question with a phrase that mean by teacher to translate the phrase from English to Indonesia that was *birthday party?*

#### 5) Complete Pronominal Questions

The table 4.1 illustrated that for complete pronominal question, there were 24 (7%) questions asked were almost same in all classes. There were 14 questions posed in XI MIA class. In this class was the most complete pronominal questions asked by the teacher. in the XI IIS-1 were 3 just three questions. And in XI IIS-2 were 7 questions. The questions served as a lead-in part of the lesson, check students' understanding and to review the previous week's lesson. The example *what is invitation? How many type of invitation? Where is the date?*

#### 6) Incomplete Pronominal Questions

The results for the incomplete pronominal questions showed that there were 29 (8.45%) questions asked during the six observations. The questions were the most asked in XI MIA class that were 16 questions. In the lesson, the teacher asked some

questions to check students' understanding of certain English words into Indonesian. For example, *invitation in Indonesia is?* The other questions were to identify a phrase or a sentence into the layout of invitation as in *for request of the pleasure of your company is? Board of director is?* By saying the phrase with a raising intonation, the teacher expected the students to understand that what she really meant was *What is the layout of invitation for 'board of director'?* And then, the others were to review the last week meeting.

The result in XI IIS-1 showed that there were 8 incomplete pronominal questions posed to students. There were questions still conveyed to check students' understanding by asking the certain English word then to transfer the meaning into Indonesia as in *In Indonesia, invitation is? Farewell party is?* The other question was by asking the layout of invitation, the example of invitation and the others to review the previous week's lesson.

And in XI IIS-2, only 5 questions posed by the teacher. The questions posed had same purposes with the other class. But the teacher in this class just conveyed the incomplete pronominal question to check students' understanding by asking the meaning of invitation and how many type of invitation. Then the other questions as in the other class that was to review the material on the last meeting.

## 7) Indonesian-English Mixed Questions

The results of the videotaped transcription several that while teaching, the teacher many times mixed her language in asking questions. It happened in all classes. There were 73 questions (21.28%). In XI MIA class, there were 13 questions asked by the teacher. The questions that asked in this class were to identify the layout of invitation and the body of invitation, the teacher usually used word *termasuk?* in the end of questions. The other questions posed to asked the students to re-mention the body of invitation as in *kalau body-nya?*, before the teacher was asked the student to re-mention the overall of invitation layout. The teacher also asked the questions to re-mention the example of invitation as in *kalau informal?*, before the teacher asked the students to re-mentioned the example of formal invitation. And there were two questions that asked the students to comprehend the meaning of invitation by their own language. This question asked in the target language and then followed by the source language.

In the XI IIS-1 class were 27 questions and in the XI IIS-2 were 33 questions posed by mixing the target and the source language. The questions posed in these classes, the teacher asked to transfer the meaning from in English to Indonesian. For example, *wedding itu Bahasa kitanya?* Other questions were to identify type, layout, and body of invitation. Example, *Halloween party itu*



*termasuk? wedding party termasuk? Cordially...termasuk? Dinner termasuk? And the others were to asked the students to re-mention the example, layout and body of invitation as in *untuk informal? Layout dalam satu undangan apa saja? Sekarang yang body-nya, yang pertama?**

To briefly summarize, all the Indonesian-English mixed questions or Source-target language mixed question in these three classes were to check students' understanding, to review the last week lesson and to focusing their attention on the lesson.

#### 8) Pure Indonesian Questions

The questioning session also occurred in pure Indonesian language. In six times class observations, this type was the most frequently asked by teacher there were 79 (23.03%) questions asked by using pure Indonesian language. overall the questions asked by the teacher to check students' understanding.

In XI MIA class, there were just 6 pure Indonesian questions. Here, the type of question asked by the teacher was to asked student to identify layout and body of invitation as in *gedung kartini termasuk?*, and a question asked to give the meaning of invitation as in *undangan itu ada mengajak, ada mengundang, ada?* Before asked this question, the teacher asked to the students the function of invitation.

In XI IIS-1 class, there were 29 questions. The questions were dominated by phrase that ordinal number question but in the Indonesian like *yang kedua? yang ketiga?*. The teacher posed the questions to asked the students to re-mention the layout and body of invitation, and a question was asked to identify the body of invitation.

And in XI-IIS-2 class, there were 47 questions. The questions were also dominated by phrase question that was ordinal number and cardinal number like in XI IIS-1, the teacher asked the questions used Indonesian. The questions like in XI IIS-1 too which were asked to students to re-mention the example, layout, body of invitation. And also, the questions were asked to the student to identify the body and the example of invitation as in *berikutnya Sultan Hotel Ball Room? Family party, dimana?* In this class were the most frequently asked by the teacher because the teacher often to point a student and then point to others students to mentioned one by one the example, layout or body of invitation. And also, just in this class the teacher asked many pure Indonesian questions to review the last week lesson.

Thus, in the whole lesson, the teacher asked a lot of questions which served many different purposes by using pure English, mixed English and Indonesian, and then pure Indonesian. However, in general, whether the teacher mixed the language or

used full English when asking the students, the goal was to check students' understanding and knowledge of the subject matter and to elicit already known information acquired by the students.

b. Referential Questions

It had been stated before that a referential question was one which had no right or wrong answer because it invited students to draw answers from their experiences and viewpoints. Teachers used referential questions because they did not know the answers and let the students provide the information (Tsui, 1995, as cited in Yang, 2010). Ellis (1994) also added that referential questions were "genuinely information-seeking".

The results from the six classroom observations and six videotaping sessions in class XI MIA, XI IIS-1 and XI IIS-2 show that display questions were the most frequently asked in the classroom. There were too few referential questions asked by the teacher during the lesson those were 97 questions. Here, an analysis of referential questions is presented in the table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Type of Referential Questions

No.	Type of Questions	Number of Questions	Percentage (%)
1.	Complete verbal questions	27	27.55%
2.	Incomplete verbal questions	22	22.45%
3.	Single-word questions	6	6.12%
4.	Phrase questions	3	3.06%

5.	Complete pronominal questions	5	5.10%
6.	Incomplete pronominal questions	3	3.06%
7.	Indonesian-English mixed questions (Source-target language mixed question)	11	12.24%
8.	Pure Indonesian language (pure source language questions)	21	20.41%

### 1) Complete Verbal Questions and Incomplete Verbal Questions

The result of this research showed that the verbal questions were the most frequently asked for the referential questions. The questions were 27 questions for complete verbal and 22 questions for incomplete verbal questions. All of these questions were dominated by yes or no questions. But just in XI MIA class, a question for asked the opinion from the students that was *Do you have any idea for the picture?* The other questions were for elicit information like *have you learned about invitation? Have you ever received wedding invitation?* And also, to check students' understanding as in *do you understand? Any question?*

### 2) Single-Word Questions and Phrase Questions

The single word questions asked 6 questions and phrase question just 3 questions. The both of these questions just asked in XI MIA class and once single-word question in XI IIS-2 class. The questions were asked as the continuation of the questions before. The questions asked the opinion from the students. For example, *In*

*taufiq house? At?* This was meant by teacher that she asked where the place and time of invitation which they made together in whiteboard as an example.

### 3) Complete Pronominal Questions and Incomplete Pronominal Questions

The pronominal questions also were few asked. Complete pronominal questions were asked just 3 times and incomplete pronominal questions were asked 5 times. These questions just asked in XI MIA class like single-word and phrase questions. The Complete pronominal questions were to offered students to read the invitations as in *Who want to read in front of class?* And for incomplete pronominal questions, the teacher asked as the continuation from the question before and the questions were to asked opinion from the students like the single-word and phrase questions. And there was a question *no body want?* which to ensure the questions before that to offered the students to read the example of invitation.

### 4) Indonesian-English Mixed Questions

Like display questions the teacher also asked the students with mixed the Indonesian and English. The questions were asked 12 times in three classes, 8 times in XI MIA class, once in XI IIS-1 and 3 times in XI IIS-2. Mostly the questions just to re-mentioned from English to Indonesian. The questions in XI MIA and XI IIS-2

were to elicit the information as in *have you ever seen? Pernahkah kalian melihat?* and to asked the opinion from the students as in *Undangan apa dulu? What kind of invitation?* And in XI IIS-1 just to elicit information from the students that was *Pernahkah kalian menerima wedding invitation?* And also, a question asked in XI MIA class was to offer the students to read the invitation in front of class. The question was *Who want to read in front of class? siapa yg ingin mmbaca di depan?*

#### 5) Pure Indonesian Questions

In this research Indonesian-English Mixed questions found 20 times for referential questions. In XI MIA class found 6 questions, in XI IIS-1 class found 5 questions and in XI IIS-2 class found 9 questions. The questions were asked to elicit information as in *pernahkah kalian menerima undangan? Sudahkah?* and asked opinion from students when their make invitation together as an example. The questions that asked the students' opinion were as continuation of the questions before as in *Jam berapa? Dimana?* And also, there was a question in XI MIA class *Siapa yang ingin kertas?* Which the teacher offered the paper for the students that need the paper more when they were asked to made an invitation card.

## 2. Functions of the Questions

Table 4.3 showed the questioning functions to answer the research question number 2. According to the classification of Brown and Wragg, 1993, and Nunan and Lamb, 1996, the teacher's questions function as a tool to arouse interest and curiosity concerning a topic, to focus attention on a particular issue or concept, to develop an active approach to learning, to stimulate pupils to ask questions of themselves and others, to check learners' understanding, to elicit information, and to control the classrooms.

Table 4.3: Functions of Questions

No	Functions of Questions
1.	Check learners' understanding
2.	Focus attention on a particular issue or concept
3.	Control the classroom
4.	Arouse interest and curiosity concerning a topic
5.	Elicit information
6.	Develop an active approach to learning
7.	Stimulate students to ask questions of themselves and others

\*Taken from Brown and Wragg, 1993.

Here, the researcher analyzed the functions of teachers' questions based on the types of questions. There were the functions of display questions and the functions of referential questions. The first analysis in this section starts from the functions of display questions.

### a. Functions of Display Questions

This section discussed about function of asking display question. In this research, the researcher found the functions of

questions as check students' understanding, focus attention on a particular issue or concept, and stimulate students to ask of themselves.

The function of a display question was presented in the table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Functions of Display Questions

No.	Function of Questions	Number of Questions	Percentage (%)
1.	Check students' understanding	273	80.06%
2.	Focus attention on a particular issue or concept	66	19.35%
3.	Stimulate students to ask questions of themselves and others	2	0.59%

1) Focus attention on a particular issue or concept

Since display questions were ones in which the asker already knows the answer, the first function of a display question was to focus students' attention. In the lesson, the teacher asked the students to give attention. The table 4.4 showed that the teacher asked 63 questions, 16 questions in XI MIA, 24 questions in XI IIS-1 and 26 questions in XI IIS-2. The questions were started by asked the meaning of invitation as in *what is invitation in Indonesia?* Then teacher asked many questions to focus the students' attention by asking the question that relate to the material that were the type of invitation, the examples of invitation, the layout and then the body of invitation. For example, *how many type of invitation? for formal? For body, number one?* The



questions asked just to focusing students' attention because the answers were in their book.

## 2) Checking Learners' Understanding

Beside to focusing students' attention on the lesson, the display questions in my research function were to check students understanding. The understanding was related to the subject matter, of what was being learned about a certain topic. Many of the teachers' questions served this function. In the table 4.4, the teacher asked 273 questions in three classes, in XI MIA were asked 84 questions, 65 questions in XI IIS-1, and 124 questions in XI IIS-2. The questions asked after the teacher explained the material. In XI MIA class, the teacher first asked to identify the layout and body of invitation in an example in their book. *Ini? (point the sentence in an invitation card in the book)* the sentence also was in the students' books. Then the teacher asked to identify the layout and body of invitation in other invitation card as in *Mr. and Mrs. Pujiyanto, termasuk (include in)?* After that teacher asked students to evaluating the lesson that they have learned by asking the meaning of invitation as in *what is invitations? Invitation in Indonesia is?* Then teacher asked the type of invitation *how many type of invitation?* the teacher then asked to re-mention the examples, layout and body of invitations that were mentioned before.

While in XI IIS-1 class, first, the teacher asked to identify the example of invitation to formal or informal as in *Birthday party, formal or informal?* Then teacher explained the layout of invitation and interspersed with questions that asked the students to identify the salutation of invitation which was in their invitation card as in *Maha Suci Allah... termasuk? (Holy Allah almighty..., include in?) Kalau winda yang mana?(while winda, which one?)* Then the teacher continued explain the body of invitation, and after that the students asked to identify the body in example of invitation card as in *cordially... termasuk (include in)? the wedding ceremony of their daughter, termasuk(include in).* Then students asked to evaluating the lesson like in XI MIA class.

And in XI IIS-2 class, the teacher asked the meaning of formal and informal *kalua formal sama dengan?(if formal the meaning is?)* Then identified the example like in XI IIS-1 class as in *Halloween party, which one?* before continued the lesson the teacher immediately asked to evaluating the lesson by asking type of invitation and asked to re-mention the example of invitation that mentioned before as in *how many kinds of invitation? give example for formal?* After that the teacher explained the layout and asked to re-mention the layout of invitation as in *yang kedua ada?(the second is?)* before, the teacher had mentioned the first that was *address.* The teacher then continued to explain the body of

invitation and then the teacher erased the whiteboard and asked students to close their books, then the teacher asked to re-mention the layout and body of invitation. Continued by asked students to identify an example of invitation card into the layout and body of invitation as in *the board of director, termasuk (include in)? The Dinner, termasuk (include in)?* after all part of invitation were identified the teacher asked many questions to the students to evaluating the lesson like in XI MIA and IIS-1 class. And on the next meeting in three classes asked to reviewed the lesson by asking questions from the meaning of invitation until the body of invitations.

3) Stimulate students to ask questions of themselves and others

The next function of display question that found in this research was stimulate students to ask questions. This was just happened in XI IIS-2 class. This found when the teacher asked the questions *Halloween party termasuk disinikah atau disinikah? (Halloween party include in here or here?) (point to word formal or informal in whiteboard)* and *Independence day termasuk yang mana? (include in which one?)*. when the teacher asking these questions, the students asked the questions about the meaning of Halloween and Independence Day.

## b. Functions of Referential Questions

While the function of asking referential question. In this research, the researcher found the functions of questions as arouse interest and curiosity concerning a topic, elicit information, check students' understanding, control the classroom, and develop an active approach to learning. The function of a display question is presented in the table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Functions of Referential Questions

No.	Function of Questions	Number of Questions	Percentage (%)
1.	Arouse interest and curiosity concerning a topic	21	21.43%
2.	Elicit information	21	21.43%
3.	Check Students' Understanding	15	15.31%
4.	Control the classroom	7	7.14%
5.	Develop an active approach to learning	34	34.69%

### 1) Arouse interest and curiosity concerning a topic

The first function found in this research was to arouse interest and curiosity concerning a topic. the table 4.5 show that there were 21 questions, 13 questions in XI MIA class and 4 questions in each class for XI IIS-1 and XI IIS-2 class. The questions were asked by the teacher at the beginning of the lesson to draw students' interest and make them curious about what would be learned that day. They were like brainstorming questions before

leading students to the main lesson. The teacher began by asking them about their experience about invitation whether they ever gave or received an invitation from someone as in *do you have invited someone with invitation? have you ever received wedding invitation?*

## 2) Elicit information

As proposed by Brown and Wragg (1993), referential questions were genuinely information seeking. In this research found 21 questions in three classes. There were 7 questions each class. As stated by Long and Sato (1984, in Ellis, 2012:122), referential questions are asked to gain information about situations, events, actions, purposes, relationships, or properties. The questions that found in this research just for to gain information their actions and properties as in *have you finished write on your book? Do you have invitation card? Yang tidak punya pensil siapa? (Who doesn't have a pencil?)*.

## 3) Check Students' Understanding

Beside display questions had function to check students' understanding, the researcher found same function for referential questions in this research. But these questions directly were asked to students about their understanding. The questions just required yes or no answer as in *do you understand? Any questions? have you got it?* The questions found 6 questions in XI MIA, 6 questions

in XI IIS-1 and 4 questions in XI IIS-2, totally 16 questions in three classes.

#### 4) Control the classroom

The function of controlling the classroom were found once in XI MIA class, once in XI IIS-1 and 5 times in XI IIS-2. In class XI MIA, the question asked to a student who not gave attention and looked sleepy. While in XI IIS-1, the question was asked to a student who were daydreaming. Then in XI IIS-2, the questions posed to students who gave no attention to the lesson caused by doing something and looked sleepy or less spirit. The questions were *Abdurrahman, have you finished (the student was eating something, not focus on lesson)? Alwi, are you okay (the student looked sleepy)? are you sleepy?* The teacher asked these questions to attracted the students' attention back on the lesson. When the students answered yes for questions *are you sleepy?*, the teacher asked them to stand up to relieve drowsiness.

#### 5) Develop an active approach to learning

This function was the most frequently asked by the teacher. There were 24 times in XI MIA class, 4 times in XI IIS-1 and 6 times in XI IIS-2. In XI MIA class, the questions were asked the students to read the invitation in front of class and to asked their opinion when they made an example of invitation together. whereas

in XI IIS-1 and XI IIS-2, there were just asked students' opinion when they made an example of invitation together like in MIA class. For example, the questions were *undangan apa dulu (first, what kind of invitation)? what kind of invitation? for address, for ...?* The questions were asked by the teacher to made students active in the classroom.

Nunan and Lamb (1996) stated that in referring to language teaching, teachers ask questions mainly to check learners' understanding, to elicit information, and to control the classroom. Above all these, checking learners' understanding was the most preferable function that occurred in the English classroom. It was to check whether or not the learners understood the issues or concepts learned through particular topics in the classroom.

Moreover, the results from the teacher' questionnaire showed questioning functions based on the order of importance. The teacher ordered its importance from to check whether students grasp the language points, lead to the topic, attract them to think or pay attention to the language points, up to improve students' communication, provided opportunities to speak, control the classroom discipline. Checking whether the students grasp the language points was by asking them to answer particular questions related to the topic. In fact, even though the students gave the correct answer, they did not answer it grammatically correct. They

just answered it using one or two words. Then, the teacher could not measure whether or not they grasped the language points, because overall the students' responses toward every question consisted only of one or two words. They did not produce longer answers as what was expected because the teacher asked too many display rather than referential questions.

### 3. Students' Responses toward Teachers' Questions

Students' responses were analyzed based on the number of words they produced, the way they responded, and the correctness of their answers.

#### a. Number of Words Students Produced

In previous research done by Brock (1986) and Ernest (1994) showed a positive correlation between asking referential questions and students' production of the target language but a negative correlation between asking display questions and the length of students' responses. The results from the research about students' responses toward teachers' questions were based on the number of words they produced to answer the teachers' questions. They were also seen from whether they gave the expected answer or not. The result is presented in the table 4.6.



Table 4.6: Number of Words Students Produced

Number of Words Students Produced	Display Questions		Referential Questions	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
One word	229	58.57%	59	15.09%
Two words	51	13.04%	12	3.07%
Three words	13	3.32%	1	0.26%
Four words	10	2.56%	0	0%
More than four words	14	3.58%	2	0.51%

From Table 4.6, it can be found that for one word responses, there were 229 (58.09%) display questions, and 59 (15.09%) referential question. For two words responses, there were 51 (13.04%) display questions asked by the teacher, and 12 (3.07%) referential questions. For three words responses, there were 13 (3.32%) display questions, and 1 (0.26%) referential questions. For four words responses, there were 10 (2.56%) display questions asked by the teacher. There were no referential questions asked by the teacher that produced four word responses from the students. And for more than four words responses, there were 14 (3.58%) display questions, and 2 (0.51%) referential questions.

Thus, this research revealed that when teacher asked both display and referential questions, the students gave only short answers. The longest response given by the students was in *What is invitation?* It was answered with *a formal invitation is an invitation*

*that follows a dignified form, tone or style in agreement with established norms, customs or values.* Another long response was given by the students as in *date and day?* It was answered with *Monday, at seventeen of December two thousand and seventeen.* It happened when they made an example of invitation together. The others long responses were given by the students when the teacher asked to re-mention the example of invitation as in *example for informal?* It was answered by *birthday party, farewell party, thanksgiving* and when the teacher asked re-mention the body of invitation as *in and then for body?* It was followed by the answer *who, reason, date, time, place, RSVP.* The others responses, the most were answered by one word or two words. For example, *how many kinds of invitation?* It was answered by *two, what is it?* was answered by *formal and informal.*

b. Ways of Responding

These results disproved the finding that a teacher is likely to limit the questions to a limited few (Richards, J. & Lockhart, 1994). Through the classroom observations, the researcher could find the teacher directed the questions to nearly all the students in the class. There were 78% of the students who admitted that their teachers distributed the questions to most of the students. It was generally considered desirable to distribute questions among all students to keep them engaged in interactions and keep them alert to respond. This

result might implied that the EFL classroom investigated was beneficial to second learning in this aspect.

Generally, in English classrooms, teachers let students answer their questions in four ways: 1) nominating; 2) chorus-answering; 3) volunteering; and 4) teacher self-answering.

Table 4.7: Way of Responding

Ways of Responding	Display Questions		Referential Questions	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Nominating	144	43.77%	6	7.23%
Chorus-answering	151	45.90%	58	69.88%
Volunteering	30	9.12%	18	21.69%
T.Self-answering	4	1.22%	1	1.20%

From table 4.7, it could be seen that chorus answering was more frequent than other ways. This could get support from the questionnaire. Students felt more secure if they answered a teacher's question in-chorus. By doing this, they were not afraid of making a mistake. The other preference was volunteering. On the surface, it was a good phenomenon, but because the volunteers were those who were active or with better English proficiency, it would obstruct other students' development. Teacher always preferred nominating. But too much nominating would make students more passive. Sometimes, in order to save time, teacher often answered the questions by herself. But in this way, students would become more dependent on teachers.

They expected to receive information passively instead of thinking about them actively. In addition, the classroom atmosphere would be blunt. So how teacher used various question patterns properly to prompt language learning was still a question that all teachers should pay attention to as well as to be studied.

The results from the questionnaires (Question -- which way do you like to answer the questions) indicated the students' favorite way to answer questions involved in this research: 64.58% of students (62 persons) preferred to answer questions in chorus; 19.79% of students (19 persons) liked to be called by their teachers; and 15.63% (15 persons) liked to be volunteers. These results showed a large number of students preferred to answer in chorus and a few of them liked to be called or answer voluntarily .

c. Correctness

Table 4.8: Correctness

Students Responses	Display Questions		Referential Questions	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Correct answer	304	89.15%	76	77.55%
Incorrect answer	8	2.35%	0	0%
No answer	29	8.50%	24	22.45%

Meanwhile, when referring to the correctness of students' answers, the students mostly produced correct answers or intended answers as what the teacher expected. There were only 8 incorrect answers they gave. Five incorrect answers were found in MIA class,

one incorrect answer was found in IIS-1 class and 2 incorrect answers were found in IIS-2 class. There were also 100 questions that did not get responses from students. The data showed that when the students could not answer sometimes the teacher rephrased and asked them again by using Indonesian, as in *have you ever received wedding invitation?* when the students did not give the respond, she asked them again using Indonesian *pernahkah kalian menerima undangan pernikahan?* Then the students responded by saying *yes*. The other questions that students could not answer, the teacher tried to stimulate them to answer the questions as in *what is the second?* When a student was asked to re-mention the example of formal invitation, the student did not give the response, the teacher then gave a clue *yang ada opening-nya?(there is a word 'opening'?)* then the students remembered and answered *opening of a school*. And if a student could not answer or not give the response, the teacher asked the questions to another student.

The first incorrect answer was found in MIA class in the question *what is the second?* The question was asked the students to mention the next layout of invitation, but the student who was asked by teacher did not focus on the lesson so the student gave the incorrect answer. The second incorrect answer was for question *ini? (this?)* when the teacher pointing on a sentence in an example of invitation, the sentence was salutation of invitation but the students answered

*address*, but before the teacher asked to answered the question, the other students answered the correct answer *salutation*. The next incorrect answer was for question *how many kinds of invitation?* some students gave incorrect answer *four*, the students taught the teacher asked the layout of invitation. Then two incorrect answer when the teacher asked to mention the number of body in invitation *for body, how many?* Some students answered *five* and the other was *six*, then the teacher asked again *five or six?* But some students still answered *five*. The next incorrect answer was found in IIS-1 class in question *farewell Bahasa kitanya (in our language)?* a student answer *baseruan (thanksgiving)*. Then in IIS-2 class, two incorrect answers were in questions about the examples of invitation. first, when a student was asked to re-mention the example of formal invitation, the student gave the example of informal invitation. And the next was the opposite.

To briefly summarize the results, for the students' responses toward the teachers' questions, in six meetings, most of the students' responses were very brief when display and referential questions were asked. Longer responses of four words could only be found in a few questions.

d. Wait-Time

As literature proves, wait-time enables pupils to think and participate in EFL classrooms. According to this research, students

were not given more seconds to think and answer the questions of their teacher. The following table 4.9 showed how many seconds were given to answer most of the questions.

Table 4.9 Wait-Time

Time	Number of Questions	Percentage
1 second	212	46.39%
2 seconds	129	28.23%
3 seconds	61	13.35%
4 seconds	17	3.72%
5 seconds	19	4.16%
>5 seconds	19	4.16%

The table 4.9 suggested that 212 (46.39%) questions were given one seconds to be answered by the students. 129 (28.23%) of the observed questions were given two seconds, 61 (13.35) questions were given three seconds, 17 (3.72%) questions were given four seconds, 19 (4.16%) questions were given five seconds and 19 (4.16%) questions were given more than five seconds to be answered by the students.

It was believed that one could learn more from having more seconds to respond to higher order questions than lower order ones. As has been indicated before, almost all the teachers' questions were display questions at the level of comprehension and knowledge questions. These types of questions might not required more than 1 or 2 seconds. However, more time might be given to low proficient students to think and answer questions. On top of that, the teacher

might asked higher level questions like referential questions and gave more time to their students in order to make them think and respond to questions.

One of the question asked in the questionnaire were related to the amount of time should be given that the students could think of the answer. The answer were vary, 5 (%) students answered 5 second to think, 8 (%) students wanted 10 second to think, 15 (%) students wanted more than 10 second to think of their answer. The other of the students stated that it depends on the difficulty of the question. Mostly, the students said that the amount of time the teacher always gave to them to think was depends on the difficulty of the question. Their answer was supported by the result from video tape, the teacher was vary in giving time to think. The average time given to the students was 1 and 2 second. And mostly, students taught that the more time they are given, the better their performance will be.

## **B. DISCUSSION**

It was not surprising to see a lot of questions asked by the teachers, since questioning was a key tool for instructing and evaluating in classrooms. This was supported by Nhlapo (1998) who claim that the big amount of a teacher's time was taken up by asking questions, and that almost 60% of classroom time was spent in a question and answer session.

It could be seen from the result of the questionnaire in question--- does your teacher frequently ask question, most students said yes. They admitted



that their English teacher always asked them question. This supported the obtained data from video-tape that the teachers did ask a lot of questions during their teaching time. Meanwhile, when the students were asked about the difficulty of teacher question, mostly said that the difficulty should be equal to their level of knowledge. They stated that it was normal to ask such question that in the same level as their understanding. Only few students stated that the question should be below or higher than their level. Thus, the teacher should took into account the students' level of knowledge in asking questions.

#### 1. Type of Question

Research question one revealed that in the lessons observed in this research, there was a tendency for the teacher to employ more display questions (77.78%) than referential questions (22.22%). The finding supported the conclusion made by Long& Sato (1983). In Long & Sato's study, they found that teacher used more display than referential questions in the classroom. Therefore, Long & Sato drew a conclusion that the second language classroom offered very few opportunities for the learner to practice genuine communicative used of the target language. That was why Pica & Long (1986) drew a similar conclusion that when teachers posed too many display questions, there would be less negotiation of meaning in classroom settings and as a result, there would be less target language output.

However, Freeman & Larsen (2000:129) stated that the goal of most methods used so far is for students to learn to communicate in the target language. Students might produce sentences accurately in a lesson, but they could not use them appropriately when genuinely communicating outside of the classroom. Relating to asking display questions, this phenomenon happened when students could answer all teachers' questions correctly. They just gave the intended answer related to the lesson. No other verbal responses that the students gave to promote real English communication in the classroom.

“True communication is purposeful” (Freeman and Larsen 2000:129). This meant, the teacher could evaluate whether or not her purpose had been achieved based upon the information she received from her students. If the students did not have the opportunity to provide the teacher with such feedback, then the interaction and communication were not happening. It was found in the data that the teacher only asked such rhetorical questions to the students. When the teacher asks “What is the example of informal invitation?” and the students' answer is “birthday party” then the exchange of information was not really communication, even though they used English in doing so.

It was inferred from the obtained data that display questions required short answers containing small pieces of information, for example at the word level, for word pronunciation and meaning, and for comprehension checks. It served to facilitate the recall of information and

check the understanding of knowledge rather than to generate students' ideas and classroom communication. "Display questions tend to elicit short answers, learners supply the information for didactic purposes only, they would have less communicative involvement in producing a display response, and thus less motivational drive for using the target language." (Chaudron, 1988:126).

It is generally believed that referential questions tend to generate longer responses from students than display questions (Nunan, 1991). Brock (1986) found that the learners responded with significantly longer and more syntactically complex utterances to referential questions than to display questions. When teachers used referential questions, students were more likely to produce complex target language structures and their output was more likely to be produced in naturalistic settings. Learners would attain a much higher proficiency. Therefore, teachers were expected to employ more referential questions.

However, in the current research, this was not the case. In the lesson, display questions resulted in a much longer response time than referential questions. There were a number of reasons for this result. First, referential questions might have been too advanced for these particular students, since they did not get much exposure to English outside the classroom. Second, the students simply did not understand the questions or they did not even realize that they had been asked a question. The third reason was, for the teacher, by asking display questions they could easily

check students' understanding of the texts. Referential questions needed students to think and discuss which would take a lot of time. However, because of teaching schedules, the teacher could not spend much time on class discussions. The fourth was for students, she just wanted to answer questions correctly. Display questions had exact answers that they could easily find in books or previous memory. Maybe students were used to answering display questions. Meanwhile, referential questions did not have an exact answer, which would take them a lot of time to think and discuss. Students might be lazy to use their minds to think.

Therefore, the case was eliciting language from the learners. It was not merely about asking display or referential questions to get learners to speak, it was about getting them to speak by using the target language. Additionally, in terms of question types, this research suggests that display questions play important roles in enhancing psychological support and facilitating the cognitive process for EFL learners at the intermediate stage. Meanwhile, in relation to students' engagement in the learning process, the research revealed that most of the students did participate in classroom activities such as responding to teacher question and working in group. Since students' engagement requires motivation (Barkley 2010), it could be seen that students had great motivation in learning English through the topic being discussed.

In addition to that, when such display question was related to the criteria of good questioning proposed by Clark and Starr (1991) it could be

said that that question was effective considering the way it was asked, it was adaptable to the students' age, and it was also appropriate to its purpose. A successful question should be asked definitely in simple, clear, and straightforward English that the students can understand. In all questions being asked, the teacher used simple English that the students can easily understand what she means. It was proved when the students mostly can answer the questions correctly.

Another criteria good question was adapted to learners' ages, abilities, and interests. There was no good point in embarrassing or frustrating students by asking those questions that they could not answer. In here, the teacher's questions were balanced with students' ages and abilities in using English. The teacher did not ask thought provoking questions that made students struggling to think of the answer. All questions were on the lesson the students had learnt before.

One last criterion was the questions that appropriate to its purpose. In asking display question, the purpose was to elicit language and knowledge from students. Display questions were used to check students understanding about the lesson. The students mostly used English in responding to teachers' questions. They answered the questions as the realization of their knowledge on the lesson or the topic they had studied.

## 2. Function of Question

As for research question two, the results showed that seven functions were found in this research, and they were consistent with the literature reviewed by the researchers. These seven functions which emerged from the data in this research were mostly in line with the function categories presented by Nunan and Lamb (1996) and others. It was also found that there was some relationship between the types and the functions of teacher questions. For example, display questions could not be used to elicit information from the students. This was because display question was one which the questioner knew the answer (Brenda, 2016: 161). Teachers asked display question not because they were interested in their answer, but because they wanted to get their students to display their knowledge of the language (Lightbown and Spada, 1999).

According to Richard & Lockhart (1994:185), questions might “encourage students to think and focus on the content of the lesson”. Questions could enable teachers to check students’ understanding and mastery of grammar and the content of texts. In a word, enhancing students’ language learning was one of the important functions of teacher questioning. This research also concluded that the main aim of teachers’ questioning was to improve students’ language learning.

### 3. Students' Responses

For the research question three, the results of this research revealed that the used of either display or referential questions did not really provoke students to give long answers by using the target language. The longest answer from the students was twenty two words. Other responses were in the range of one up to three words. The reason is that the display and referential questions asked by the teacher in the whole class teaching portion of this research were generally to check students' understanding of the lesson and elicit brief information.

It was worth mentioning that the questions asked did not determine the number of student responses but the way the teacher raised the questions and responses to the students' answers. Therefore, the researcher taught that the teacher question types were useful in EFL classrooms. It would be risky to generalize the idea that display questions were useless and they elicit only short answers, or referential ones were useful for language learning and they produced long answers. Instead, their use should be determined by students' levels, lesson objectives, and student learning strategies.

Regarding the way students respond to the teachers' questions, chorus responses were the most frequent way of responding that occurred during the observations. The teacher asked questions first and chorus responses followed. Despite the fact that chorus responses facilitated

teachers to check whether their students have understood the lesson or not, it could not be taken as a testifying device of their lessons. That was because the teacher could not know whether their students acquired a certain content of the lesson or not.

Teacher could allow the whole class to provide responses or chorus answers for different purposes. One of the main purposes was to encourage students to practice a new language without being fearful of making mistakes. The other was to save time. By getting students to answer in-chorus, a teacher could get more time to continue the lesson.

It was clearly seen from the result of video-tape that in every question being asked, the most of students always answer the question. But different result obtained from the questionnaire. In question—how often do you answer the question, mostly the students said that they ‘sometimes’ answer the question. Only a few of them said that always answer the question.

As for question—when you cannot answer teacher’s question, what do you think you teacher should do?, the answer was surprising because mostly the students said that the teacher should ask the other friends. This was supported in the real practice of teaching, the teacher often nominated or pointed certain students to answer her question. She also distributed the question to the whole class, and the students answered in-chorus. When they were asked about the wrong answer, the students gave two answers.



Some students hoped the teacher to immediately correct their mistake when they gave the wrong answer and some other preferred the teacher to give no response to the incorrect answer.

Additionally, according to the data obtained from the observation, just 1.33% of the total questions were answered by the teacher herself. The teachers answered their questions because they did not want to give more time to their students to think and answer. However, in this way, students will become more dependent on the teacher. They would expect to receive information passively instead of thinking about it actively. Besides, when giving students some time to think of the answer, the silence tend to break up the flow of the lesson. Students' attention got distracted and it was hard to pick up the pace again once it was lost (Nunan& Lamb 2000).

Another relevant issue in this research was the distribution of questions. Though it was good to distribute questions among all students rather than limit them to a select few, some students still more likely to be called to speak than others. They would learn more if they were actively engaged in discussion than if they sat passively. It would help them keep attentive in the lesson.