

AN ANALYSIS TEACHER'S QUESTION IN ENGLISH LEARNING AT SECOND GRADE IN MTSN 3 KOTA PARIAMAN

Haniifatul Rifqa¹, Syahrul², Reflinda³, Melyann Melani⁴

UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi

haniifatulrifqa@gmail.com

Abstract

This research was due to some problems that was found in MTsN 3 Pariaman. First, most of the students did not response the teacher's question. Second, most of the students were passive in the classroom. Third, the students' did not answer the questions that require their critical thinking. This research aimed to find out the the type of question that asked by the teacher, the higher order thinking the teacher's question, and the lower order thinking the teacher's question. The researcher used qualitative research design. The key informants of this research are English teacher of eighth grade of MTsN 3 Pariaman. Mean while for the supporting informant, the researcher use snowball sampling. In this research, the researcher used 2 instruments which are observation and interview. The interview that was used was structured interview where the researcher prepares the question before conducting the interview. Based on the finding of the result, the researcher concluded that there are some types of questions that were asked by the teacher. First, question begin with "what". The "what" questions that were asked was mostly LOTS question since the students did not need to give critical or high thinking answer to solve the questions that were asked. Second, convergent question or questions that only require "yes" or "no" answer which frequently place an emphasis on the recollection of previously taught material rather than requiring pupils to engage in higher-level thinking in order to come up with an answer. Third, questions that he already know the answer. This was used to checking students' knowledge and monitor classroom management. Last, referential questions or question that the teacher does not know the answers, and require long syntactically complicated answers. This question was to give students the opportunity to freely express their thoughts and generate output in the target language.

Keywords: Teacher Questions; Learning

INTRODUCTION

Communication is one of the most important things in human life. Being able to communicate effectively is perhaps the most important of all life skills. It is what enables people to pass information to other people, and to understand what is said. Communication, at its simplest, is the act of transferring information from one place to another. This means that in communication there should be the giver and the receiver or the speaker and the listener or the writer and the reader.

Communication in the classroom put the teacher and the students as the participant. Usually, the teacher acts as the person who gives the information and the students as the participants who receive the information. However, there are times when these roles reversed. This interaction in the context of learning takes the form of discussions or lectures to convey learning material.

In the 2013 curriculum, learning interactions always involve questioning activity. Questioning is important aspects of classroom interaction. Questioning activity is strategy of collecting and understanding information about students' development, ability and competency (Putu Anom Didik Susantara & I Putu Ngurah Wage Myartawan, 2020). This means that the teacher can use the questioning activity to check her or his students' understanding about the learning material.

Furthermore, activity of teacher giving question to the students is beneficial for the students. This questioning activity in classroom is important to develop students' critical thinking, creative thinking ability, and higher level thinking skills (Hafizhah Zulkifli & Rosnani Hashim, 2019). This means that this activity is not only help the teacher to check her students' understanding, but it also help the students to develop their critical thinking, creative thinking ability, and higher level thinking skills.

There are two types of the teacher question. Kao state that there are two types of questions that are based on the nature of the interaction, namely referential questions and display questions. Display questions or also called pseudo are questions that usually require short and simple answers. This is used to check students' knowledge or to recall previous knowledge or information. Referential questions are the opposite of display or pseudo questions. Referential questions or also called original questions aim to obtain information unknown to the recipient (Kao, S.-M, 2012). It was obvious that the teacher mostly uses the display or pseudo questions since it is the type of the question that the teacher give in order to make the students recall the learning or to check their understanding about the

material. However, the referential is also used in the classroom even though not as much as the display question. For example, the referential question can be used in the classroom by the teacher by asking the students about their reason of being late, since the information is unknown for the teacher; it is categorized as the referential question.

Furthermore, the questions need to be asked according to the question level based on taxonomy bloom in order not to confuse the students. There are six levels of question according to the taxonomy bloom. They are remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating (Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R, 2021). It is importance for the teacher to ask the question by that order. It will confuse the students if at the start of the lesson the students were asked the analyzing or creating question.

Based on the preliminary reaserch on the MTsN 3 Pariaman conducted at the 12, 13, and 14 july 2021, the researcher found several problems related to the teachers question. First, from observation that most of the students did not response to the teacher's question. Most of the students seem to be passive in the classroom. The students response the question were the same one the researcher assumed them as the top students in the class. However, if they asked directly by teacher, they could answer the question even though not as good as the top students. Sometime they mixed the language in answering the teacher' question such as by using Bahasa mix with English or even Minang.

Second, the teacher did encourage the students to develop their vocabulary by asking questions, such as "what is durhakain English?" or "what is meaningless in Indonesia". From this fact, it can be said that the teacher did her role to make the student able to use English in meaningful way. However, rather than trying to answer the teacher's question by looking the meaning in the dictionary, the students preferred to wait the answer from the teacher. This was the proof that the students were passive in the classroom.

Third, most of the students' were not able answer the questions that required their critical thinking. For example, the teacher asked "From the text we just read, what should the main character do in order to avoid the conflict?" or "what moral value can we learn from the text". From these questions, almost all of the students could not answer. The teacher even repeated her question in Bahasa in order to make the students understand what she was asking, but the students still could not give their answer correctly. There are many possible reason why this problem happen, such as low level of students' vocabulary,

their understanding about the passage, or even their motivation toward the subject. This means that the students still could not fulfill their role according to the 2013 curriculum. In 2013 curriculum, the students are required to participate actively, constantly challenged to have the critical power, able to analyze and can solve his own problems (Muhammad NurWangid, 2014).

Based on the observation of the table above, the researcher is interested to conduct a study to analyze the teacher's question and the students' communication. This research is entitled "AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' QUESTION IN ENGLISH LEARNING".

METHODS

In this research, the researcher used qualitative research design. Gay pointed out qualitative research is a research is meant to understand the phenomena about what is felt by the research subject, for example: behavior, perception, motivation, action, and holistic with description way in words and language in natural context with use kinds of natural methods (L.R Gay, 2012). The purpose of the research is to identify and to explore the students' communication and the teacher's question in English learning in MTsN 3 Pariaman. The informant is a person who give the information (Margono, 1997). The key informants of this research are English teacher of eighth grade of MTsN 3 Pariaman. There was 5 class on the eighth grade students of MTsN 3 Pariaman. The total students of these five class was 184 students. This data was obtained from the teacher who taught in the eighth grade in the MTsN 3 Kota Pariaman. It would be show in the table below:

Table 1

No	Class	Students' totality
1	VIII 1	37
2	VIII 2	36
3	VIII 3	37
4	VIII 4	37
5	VIII 5	37
Total		184

From this table, the population from this research is 184 students that are the total of the students in eighth grade classes of the MTsN 3 Pariaman. From the data above, the research will use purposive sampling to determine the key informant. Purposive sampling, also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, is a form of non-probability sampling in which researchers rely on their own judgment when choosing members of the population to participate in their surveys. The key informant of this research is English teacher who teach eighth grade class in MTsN 3 Pariaman. Meanwhile for the supporting informant, the researcher use snowball sampling. Generally, snowball sampling is a gradual process, and time influences the selection of samples. Sampling usually continues until data saturation. In this research, the researcher used 2 instruments which was observation and interview.

There were two instruments that were used in this research. They were observation checklist and interview. In this section, the researcher will describe and analyze the findings by each instrument, which begin with the observation and then the interview.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the finding, the researcher observed that the teacher did ask all the type of question except the question to ensure the smooth flow of the teaching process. It means from 7 types of the teacher question, the English teacher of MTsN 3 Pariaman used 6 of them. They are questions that begin with “what”, questions that begin with “how” and “why”, questions from previous or current lesson that only require “yes” or “no” answer, question that related with the students behavior, questions that he already know the answer, and questions that he does not know the answers, and require long syntactically complicated answers.

It was known that the teacher asked two types of question which were HOTS and LOTS question. It was known that the teacher asked LOTS questions more than HOTS question. The teacher only asks HOTS question when the required competence obligate the students to do so. Higher order thinking skill / HOTS is very need now because one of the component on HOTS it is problem solving. Brookat, Moseley, and Thompson in Retnawati stated, “HOTS is one of the important components for an individual to be able to solve new problems in the 21st century (Heri Retnawati, 2018).” It means that high order thinking skill very need it someone in this day. Without the HOTS the people can

solve the problem but not clear enough. This means that the English teacher of MTsN 3 Pariaman need to ask more HOTS question.

There are several reasons why there are more LOTS questions than HOTS questions. First, LOTS questions are easier to ask and answer than HOTS questions. This is because HOTS questions require students to think critically and deeply about the subject matter, while LOTS questions only require students to remember and recite information. Second, LOTS questions are more common in classrooms, while HOTS questions are less common. This is because teachers often rely on LOTS questions to assess students' understanding of the material, while HOTS questions are more often used in discussions and debates. Third, HOTS questions are more difficult to answer than LOTS questions. This is because HOTS questions require students to apply their knowledge to new and unfamiliar situations, while LOTS questions only require students to remember and recite information..

This research support the research from KhaironNisaShafeei, Hanita Hassan, Fauziah Ismail & Azian Abdul Aziz, who found teachers tend to use display questions which is mainly LOTS rather than referential questions(HOTS) in their classrooms. Even though there were some referential questions identified from the data, the frequency for the referential question used was very small. This is the same with the current study finding which was known that the teacher asked LOTS questions more than HOTS question. The teacher only asks HOTS question when the required competence obligate the students to do so.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding of the result, the researcher concluded that there are some types of questions that were asked by the teacher. First, question begin with "what". The "what" questions that were asked was mostly LOTS question since the students did not need to give critical or high thinking answer to solve the questions that were asked. Second, convergent question or questions that only require "yes" or "no" answer which frequently place an emphasis on the recollection of previously taught material rather than requiring pupils to engage in higher-level thinking in order to come up with an answer. Third, questions that he already know the answer. This was used to checking students' knowledge and monitor classroom management. Last, referential questions or question that the teacher does not know the answers, and require long syntactically complicated answers.

This question was to give students the opportunity to freely express their thoughts and generate output in the target language. This means that the teacher already have one of the skills that teachers must have in teaching the 2013 curriculum is the skill to ask and answer questions from students. This is in line with the scientific approach where students are expected to be able to ask as many questions as possible from what they observe, feel and experience. If the students have not or no one asks, then the teacher must actively ask some questions to motivate them to think critically and solve the problems they face.

REFERENCES

- AlpaslanSahin. (2017). Teachers' Classroom Questions. Texas: Texas A&M University
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational outcomes: Complete edition, New York : Longman
- Chaudron. (1998). Second Language Classroom – Research on Teaching and Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Christopher Oluwatoyin. (2017). Effective Communication: Any Role In Classroom Teaching – Learning Process In Nigerian Schools. Nigeria: ObafemiAwolowo University
- Cohen and Manion. (2000). Research Methods In Education. London: Croom Helm
- David Krathwohl. (2002). Theory into Practise, Vol. 41, Number 4 autumn
- H. Douglas Brown. (1994). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents
- Hafizhah Zulkifli1 & RosnaniHashim. (2019). The Development of Questioning Skills through Hikmah (Wisdom) Pedagogy, (Malaysia: International Islamic University Malaysia
- J. Harmer. (2008). The Practices of English Language Teaching. (England: Person Educational. The 4th Edition.
- Jack C. Richards – Charles Lockhart. (1994). Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kao, S.-M. (2012). "Do You Understand?": An Analysis of Native and Non-native EFL Teachers' Questioning Patterns at a Taiwanese Cram School. Asian EFL Journal
- L.R Gay. (2012). Educational Research : competencies for analysis and application (tenth edition). New Jersey: Pearson Education, inc.
- Margono. (1997). Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan, Jakarta : rineka cipta
- Maria MurniAstuti. (2011). An Analysis Of Classroom Interaction In The English Teaching And Learning Process Of The Bilingual Class. Yogyakarta: UNY
- MatejaDagarin. (2011). Classroom interaction and communication strategies in learning English as a foreign language. Ljubljana, University of Ljubljana
- Muhammad NurWangid. (2014). Student-Centered Learning: Self-Regulated Learning, (Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University
- Mujahidin. (2013). The implementation of Inquiry-Based Method for the teaching of English at SMPN 1 Pilangkenceng, a published thesis of Graduate program at University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Peter W. Airasian and Michael K Russell. (2008). Classroom Assessment. New York: McGraw Hill

- Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2014). Kurikulum 2013: Pedoman Guru Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris
- Putu Anom Didik Susantara & I Putu Ngurah Wage Myartawan. (2020). An Analysis of Teacher Questions and Student Responses in the English Teaching-Learning Process, (Bali: Ganesha University of Education
- Sugiyono, (2009), Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D, Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sulaiman Qashoa. (2013). Effects Of Teacher Question Types And Syntactic Structures On Efl Classroom Interaction. UAE: University of Sharjah
- Sulaiman Qashoa. (2013). Effects Of Teacher Question Types And Syntactic Structures On Efl Classroom Interaction, (UAE: University of Sharjah
- Voigt, J. (1992). Negotiation of mathematics meaning in classroom processes: Social interaction and learning mathematics. In L. Steffe, P. Nesher, P. Cobb, G. Goldin, & B. Greer (Eds.), Theories of mathematical learning, Mahwah, NJ: LEA Inc. Publishers
- Wragg, E. C., & Brown, G. (2001). Questioning in the primary school. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- X. Ma. (2008). The Skills of Teacher's Questioning in English Classes". International Education Studies. Vol.1