




Questioning practice in EFL classroom interactions: From type to syntactical form

Hieronimus Canggung Darong* 

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus, Indonesia
hieronimusdarong@gmail.com*

* corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO

Received 2021-02-17
Revised 2021-03-15
Accepted 2021-08-04
Published 2021-08-25

Keywords

Questioning
Type
Syntactical form
Response

ABSTRACT

As the most prominent features uttered by EFL teachers in classroom interactions, questioning plays important roles to invite student responses. This study was an attempt to analyze questioning practice employed by EFL teachers in terms of ways or strategies namely contingency, convergence-divergence, and syntactical form in their interactions with students. Data were gathered from four purposefully chosen English teachers' questions employed during their interactions with students at a larger corpus project of UMSpEAKs (Universitas Negeri Malang Spoken English in Academic Contexts), thus, transcribed and analyzed following the principle of Conversation Analysis (CA). The Conversation Analysis revealed that the contingent questions differently appeared for each teacher. The most question type used to be contingent was a clarification. Besides, the teacher questions were mainly convergent and divergent by means of display questions that consistently evolved student contributions and enlarge the talks. Meanwhile, the most frequently occurring question- syntactical form was W-h questions and followed by yes-no question forms. The W-h questions having more syntactically complex utterances than yes/no questions were powerful and would prompt more students' responses. Meanwhile, yes/no questions were posed when the teachers felt that students have difficulty in answering or understanding the W-h and how/what about questions and invited short responses. Thus, contingency, convergence-divergence, and syntactical form that was differently constructed following the commodity exchange in the classroom discourse were very beneficial to invite student responses, discursively carry functions, and extend the classroom discourse.



This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



1. Introduction

Learning is not only an individual process but also a social process [1]. A meaningful learning occurs when individuals are engaged in social activities. This emphasizes the important role of others in the knowledge construction process [2]. In classroom settings, this theory confirms that meaningful learning might take place when teachers and students are tightly bound in some teaching activities. The activities are concerned with how they involve and interact to construct knowledge. As one of the communities where teachers and students are engaged with social process, classroom is a place where questioning serves a primary role to facilitate knowledge construction in question. In this regard, to make individuals deeply engaged and fully understand what to learn, both theories and practices, the questions should be uttered by both teacher and students their interactions. As such, the theories dealt with the nature of questioning while practices are concerned with techniques and ways of its employments during the interactions in the classroom.

EFL classroom teaching is one of the communities where knowledge construction takes place through the questioning act. It shapes type, scope, and quality of language learning and knowledge construction likely to occur. This verbal interaction is claimed as the frontline practice employed by both the teachers and learners during the teaching process [3], [4]. Although teaching activities, tasks, media, learning materials, and assignments might affect learning experiences, expectations for learner outcomes are routinely influenced by teacher questions [2]. Saying it differently, the talk occurs between a teacher and learners largely involves verbal interactions of questions and answers. In the meantime, Hill revealed that teachers at all education levels used their time more (two-thirds) on questioning activities [5]. The teacher cannot avoid using questions because it is very essential in developing a better learning process and is a key indicator of classroom interaction's intention and expectation [6]. In this regard, the questioning act is the most prominent feature and is the most basic technique employed in classroom interactions. The teacher questions are ways to shape the type of talks, mediate the learning of language and content, and trigger learners' contributions occurring in the classroom.

While it is regarded as the most routinely verbal interaction, the teacher might deviate from the nature of questioning itself. Boyd and Rubin noted that although teachers mostly engaged with various features of effective teacher-student dialogue, in which questioning is employed, the focus was more on the types and forms of question [7]. Along with the focus in question, some studies have found that display questions are regarded as simple in terms of provoking students' thinking process and yet are beneficial to check students' learning. Meanwhile, students' responses are restricted as they are given low-order thinking questions. On the other way around, high level questions facilitate more responses from students as they provoke high-order thinking level [2], [5], [8]–[12]. Since types of questions and thinking level are important aspects, teachers should be critical, resourceful and be sensitive for the response in their actual practices of questioning [13]–[24]. Likely, in Indonesian context, the studies have revealed that there is a tendency that teachers still enact the types of questions such as display and referential questions as the most strategy of scaffolding students' responses [25]–[27]. In addition, high and low order questions have been acknowledged to differently provoke students thinking level [28]. These findings have indicated that questioning types and complexity levels have been acknowledged as a lucid and robust aspect of determining students' response and thinking level.

However, questioning activity in classroom interactions does not deal only with the typology, students thinking level as highlighted by the mentioned previous studies, but also with the strategy used. As questioning has been argued as one of the most prominent features in classroom interactions [29], teachers' ways of questioning are required. As such, the responses generated from questioning types and its complexity level, help teachers realign their questioning strategy in response to the needs of students [30]. Meanwhile, different ways of questioning are necessary for being effective scaffolding tools and valuable inputs for students [8], [31]–[34]. This implicitly means that the choice of questioning types should facilitate students' learning and reflect the teacher's way to provide knowledge during teaching. Therefore, this study wants to examine the ways of teacher questioning activity employed by Indonesian EFL teachers in their interactions with the students of EFL classroom setting.

The agreement of Bloom and over 30 educators and psychologists to classify educational objectives in order to provide insights into curriculum development, learning and assessment in the mid-20th century was the appearance of a questioning framework. The agreement was that teachers should be able to discern the students' changes in their learning experiences. The best way to understand if changes have occurred is to evaluate the outcome as assessed by particular student behaviours. Bloom argued that this classification system would be beneficial and offer educators with operational definitions of hierarchical thinking process (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, and evaluation) that could be observed and subsequently, assessed by teachers, most logically by questions [1].

In the meantime, social constructivist learning theory as coined by Vygotsky claimed that learning is not always an individual process but a social process in which knowledge construction may occur, [2]. In this case, learning does not solely take place within the individual and is more meaningful if it takes place when individuals are engaged in social activities. The activities are concerned with how an individual involves and interacts in a certain community where knowledge construction occurred. With respect to the community, the language classroom is regarded as one of the communities where

individuals can learn and get knowledge through activities and classroom talks during teaching and learning. Both activities and classroom talk, are beneficial for scope, quality of learning, and knowledge construction. As such, they are mostly facilitated by verbal interactions between teachers and students. The teacher talks affect the types of talks that come about in a classroom. Meanwhile, student responses are helpful to mediate the learning of language and content, and ways teachers attract and drive students' contribution.

Regarding the classroom talk, Farrell & Mom found that 60 % of the total time used by the teachers in classroom interactions makes use of questioning act [35]. This means that the act of questioning is the most common and prominent feature of classroom interactions and the most basic technique of teacher talks to stimulate student thinking, involvement, and language production., [5], [8], [36]. Although task types, learning activities, textbooks and other media influence learning experiences and learner outcomes are always affected by teacher questioning behavior [2]. Thus, questioning is a principal indicator of classroom goals and expectations. Along with this line of argument, teachers' questioning has been regarded as an influential teaching act in classroom interactions. It is the most fundamental and the most discourse choice move teachers can use to ease students' participation and learning in the classroom. Through the use of effective questioning, students are helped to expand their knowledge and evolve thinking skills [6], [7], [37]. In addition, the questions posed in classroom interactions might extend classroom dialogue and trigger student participation. Well-constructed questions can stimulate students' thinking, language production, topic comprehension, and critical thinking and might be of benefit to assess learners' knowledge [5], [38]. Thus, having a good questioning is definitely required and is regarded as part of teaching skills. The skill of asking questions is concerned with question types along with ways to employ them.

Pushing the relation of questioning and students response further, there is a relation between variety of questions types, techniques follow-up questions, and patterns of questioning employed by the teachers in classroom interactions [17], [18]. Other studies put forward the types of questions and students' wait time to respond. In this respect, teachers should be critical in providing a good question, wait-time strategy and response sensitivity [11], [16], [24]. This makes sense as the impact of questions results not from whether the teacher knows the answer, but from how students interpret the teacher's intention behind the questions [39]. The previous research findings have shown that as teacher predominantly asks low order questions, wait-time is unnecessarily offered since quick responses are possibly provided [1], [2], [11]. On the contrary, high order questions necessarily need enough time to think and respond. They allow students to explore and expand their thinking process to respond. These findings have been corroborated by other studies arguing that display questions require few cognitive demands and invite short responses and referential questions usually evoke more responses and invite students to contribute something new to the class interactions [8], [9], [38]. Yet, aside from the types and levels, there is a need to consider the teachers' strategies in questioning. As such, the strategies should be employed in such a way that they can invite student responses. Thus, questions and responses are vital elements of classroom discourse. More importantly, students' responses should reflect how teachers' questions (strategies) are employed during the interactions.

2. Method

Since the topic in question is to enquire about the case of questioning in teacher-student interactions, the study requires the use of a descriptive qualitative paradigm employing a corpus study method. This present study is part of a larger corpus project of UMSpEAKs (Universitas Negeri Malang Spoken English in Academic Kontexts). Considering the nature of classroom communication, the most expected to be potential participants were the four English teachers along with their classes who were selected voluntarily. To gain the data, they were observed and recorded once during their interactions with the students. Additionally, the classes were designed to provide students with English skills, content and dialogic interactions supporting them to practice and say more in English.

Following the principles of Conversation Analysis (CA) the observed classroom interactions were transcribed within the conversation analysis convention which for the most part were adapted from Jefferson 1984 [18] by considering the classroom mainstream of IRE/F interactions pattern. Subsequently, data were analysed in terms of teachers' types and ways of questioning covering contingency, convergence-divergence, and syntactic form employed during the interactions. In order to counteract some of the feasible prejudices and attitudes built-in in this research study, the data were

triangulated. The data attained from observations were compared with the data obtained from reflective analysis of field notes and recording. Ultimately, for the sake of final analysis, all evidence was carefully cross-checked or verified to each other.

3. Results and Discussion

Questioning affects the way information is shaped. Since question serves multi-functions, verbal forms alone are insufficient to interpret what lies behind it. It should be partly dependent on context governing social relationships and the teachers' ways of employing it during the interactions. As it has been highlighted in the methodology section, to examine the teacher ways in employing questions, contingency, convergence-divergence, and syntactic form were respectively noted. Contingent question is a question dealing with three or more preceding utterances. Table 1 indicates that the contingent question that differently appeared for each teacher.

Table 1. Contingency of Questions

Type	Participants									
	T1		T2		T3		T4		T	
	T	Con	T	Con	T	Con	T	Con		
D	286	280 (98%)	68	63 (93%)	125	103 (82%)	25	22 (88%)	111	
Ref	25	23 (92%)	49	10 (20%)	52	24 (46%)	2	-	16	
C	9	9 (100%)	10	10 (100%)	43	43 (100%)	6	6 (100%)	23	
Req	5	3 (60%)	5	2 (40%)	16	13 (81%)	5	2 (40%)	6	

^a Note: D: Display; R: Referential; C: Clarification; R: Request; T: Total; T1: Teacher 1, T2: teacher 2; T3: Teacher 3; T4: Teacher 4; T5: Con: Contingency

Although question types as previously shown in Table 1 confirms that all the four types occupied in all the teachers' interactions, they were not definitely contingent. This confirms that each teacher had different classroom discourse moves reflecting the occurrence of contingent questions. Furthermore, the data (Table 1) show that the most frequent question type that was contingent was a clarification and followed by display questions. It is natural and makes sense that clarification is tightly contingent as it associated with the preceding utterances.

Table 2. Convergence and Divergence

Type	Convergence							
	T1		T2		T3		T4	
	T	C	T	C	T	C	T	C
D	286	279 (97%)	68	61 (90%)	125	96 (77%)	25	21 (84%)
Ref	25	21 (84%)	49	37 (76%)	52	42 (81%)	2	2 (100%)
C	9	9 (100%)	10	10 (100%)	43	43 (100%)	6	6 (100%)
Req	5	3 (60%)	5	3 (60%)	16	13 (81%)	5	5 (100%)
Type	Divergence							
	T1	Div	T2	Div	T3	Div	T4	Div
	D	286	7 (3%)	68	7 (10%)	125	29 (23%)	25
Ref	25	4 (16%)	49	12 (24%)	52	10 (19%)	2	-
C	9	-	10	-	43	-	6	-
Req	5	2 (40%)	5	2 (40%)	16	3 (19%)	3	-

^b Note: D: Display; R: Referential; C: Clarification; R: Request; T1: Teacher 1, T2: teacher 2; T3: Teacher 3; T4: Teacher 4; C: Convergence; Div: Divergence

Meanwhile, the display question needs to put to the point and might be a prickly issue of discussion in classroom discourse. In this respect, all the teachers set their classroom discourse by means of display questions in that dialogic exchange occurred. Although the type differently appeared in each teacher, it was, indeed, logical consequences of three or more conversation exchanges. Thus, the distinguishing characteristic of teacher questions that extended student talk and built a possible pattern of interactions was regarded to be their contingency on previous student utterances rather than whether they were open-ended or inquired about known information. In addition to noting whether a question

was contingent on previous contributions, coding for convergence - divergence was necessarily done to discern the teachers' ways of questioning.

Although teachers display questions consistently evolved and narrowed in on student contributions, the expectation that other teacher question types built upon and extended scope of discourse was fulfilled with differing degrees of consistency. Surprisingly, referential questions that should occur more in discussion lessons where more extended answers would be expected was absent in T4. In the meantime, the clarification question was similar in that it was absent in some teachers. As such both happened due to the discourse moves occurring in the class.

By and large, [Table 2](#) confirms that teacher questions were mostly convergent in all participants. This is due to the fact the most question type that frequently posed by the teachers was display question functioning to check students' understanding. Although divergence questions occurred less, they were very useful to extend the talks. They were posed as the teachers enlarged the discussion and yet, referring still on students' previous contributions. The teachers posed questions intentionally to invite student responses which opened up on an aspect of what was being talked. Thus, convergence and divergence resulted from the teachers' contingent questions.

Regardless of noting the contingency and convergence-divergence, the analysis of teachers' ways in employing questions includes the consideration of the syntactic form of the teachers' questions.

Table 3. Syntactic Form

No	T	F	T1		T2		T3		T4		TN1-4
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	D	Y/N	68	24	3	4	25	20	8	32	104
		W-H	155	54	25	37	58	47	10	40	248
		D/FP	52	18	40	59	33	26	7	28	132
		H/W about	11	4	-	-	9	7	-	-	20
		TQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		TN	286	100	68	100	125	100	25	100	504
2	R	Y/N	19	76	19	39	18	34	-	-	56
		W-H	6	24	20	41	28	54	2	100	56
		D/FP	-	-	9	18	6	12	-	-	15
		H/W about	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1
		TQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		TN	25	100	49	100	52	100	2	100	128
3	C	Y/N	-	-	2	20	6	14	1	17	9
		W-H	-	-	1	10	1	2	-	-	2
		D/FP	9	100	7	70	36	84	5	83	57
		H/W about	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		TQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		TN	9	100	10	100	43	100	6	100	68
4	Req	Y/N	2	40	3	60	13	81	3	60	21
		W-H	1	20	1	20	-	-	-	-	2
		D/FP	2	40	1	20	2	13	2	40	7
		H/W about	-	-	-	-	1	6	-	-	1
		TQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		TN	5	100	5	100	16	100	5	100	31
731											

^c Note: T: Type; D: Display; R: Referential; C: Clarification; R: Request F: Form; Y/N: Yes/No question, W-H: W-H Question; D/FP: Declarative with final raise phrase; H/W about: How/what about question; TQ: Tag question; T1: Teacher 1, T2: teacher 2; T3: Teacher 3; T4: Teacher 4; N: Total number per form; TN: Total number of form per question type; TN 1-4: Total number for all the teachers.

An analytical look at the four transcripts showed that the long student response in this study occurred as W-h questions raised rather than yes/no ones. In addition, the high use of this form may be accounted for the degree of the formality and familiarity of the discourse. They were used for purposes of garnering knowledge about topics unfamiliar to teachers which in fact, were beneficial to enlarge or to extend the classroom discourse exchanges. Further, they also positively affect students' language ability by providing them grammatical structures in which new information is acquired. Meanwhile, the high use of yes/no questions may be justified by the reality that such questions

frequently seek simple student acceptance or even acknowledgment, attach attentiveness on a point in the conversation or interactively connect the teachers and the students. In this regard, yes/no questions are suitable for this, since responses to them required little in the way of new information given and were often themselves left no responses.

As questioning has been argued as one of the most prominent features in classroom interactions, a strategy is required [29]. The strategy deals with the way teacher selects the types and employs the questions. In response to the learners' needs, there is a close relation between questioning strategy, learning achievement, and the real practice of teaching and learning. Further, the relation strongly confirms that responses generated from questioning types, help teachers realign their teaching [30]. This implicitly means that the choice along with teacher ways of questioning facilitates learner's responses and learning attainment. Different ways of questioning are necessarily employed in such a way to carry the proper functions for language learners [5], [8], [36]. Data in Table 1 deal with an account of questions to be contingent responding to students' previous utterances. As such, contingent questions are the teacher responses wherein the content and often the form rely in some ways on the students' previous utterances and that their topics are co-referential with that of the preceding contribution. As noted by [31], [40], responding contingently to a co-participant should properly match and link, both form and content, with the previous utterances. Then, contingency relates to and appears closely to the immediately preceding utterance, carrying new information depending on the content and form.

In addition, the data indicate that those contingent questions differently appeared for each teacher. The most question type used to be contingent was a clarification. As the name suggests, the type refers to previous utterances to initiate a new topical idea or get back to a previous topical idea. In this respect, in terms of content, it might be referring to prior content or something stated in previous student contributions for which new proposition is uttered referring to its natural placement in interactions. And yet, it is disregarded as a clarification. Unlikely, the appearance of display questions shows something different. The transcript showed that when the talk was mainly text-based, display questions were securely contingent. In this case, the display questions are regarded as more directive and aim to elicit certain features or further, evolve the logic of thought. They were facilitating higher-level thinking in that they prompt the students to further vocalize or defend his or her contributions. The teachers kept pushing the students to give more information until they were able to launch themselves into an elaborated response by providing them back his or her own words, often rephrased or restated or clarified semantically for the student to respond. Pushing students to elaborate and produce the response is the function of these contingent display questions. Thus, teacher questions were in dialogue with and consequently contingent on students' contributions, discourse conditions, the scope and purposes of the immediate lesson, and building classroom norms and expectations.

In addition to noting whether a question was contingent on previous contributions, coding for convergence divergence was necessarily done to see whether teachers questions were raised to broaden the extent of the discourse (the response is not settled) or pinpoint a particular aspect (hoping for a specific, precise response). Data in Table 2 share the distribution of convergent and divergent questions. The table in question (Table 2) confirms that teacher questions were mainly convergent in all participants. Although, teacher display questions consistently evolved and narrowed in on student contributions, the expectation that teacher referential and request questions built upon, and extended scope of discourse was fulfilled with differing degrees of consistency. This might occur as the move of discourse or classroom talk, students' responses and many other aspects related to classroom talk. As to the data, they were frequently different, and yet they were constructed in such a way that they would enlarge the talks, despite the fact, still homed in on the topic. In this regard, when the talk was text-based, display questions were employed to broaden the talk half of the time. However, when the talk was text inspired, weaving external aspects, referential questions broadened the scope of talk and subsequently enlarged the discourse most of the time.

The data also confirmed that all participants posed more on display questions than other types. This happened as a great number of display questions posed by the teachers mainly functioned as confirmation of what had been explained in advance. In this respect, when the talk was mostly home in on text or topic being discussed, the questions were automatically convergent. Unlikely, the convergence by means of referential questions, took place as the teacher facilitated students to elaborate the topic being talked. The teachers allowed a range of responses and invited students to

contribute something new to the class interactions. This holds the potential condition to manage the scope of the discourse. Although questions for which the teachers had no answer, the teachers valued their ability to broaden discourse to newly contribute something to the class interactions. Beyond the teacher's agenda, these questions, thus, have the potential to shape the area of talks. Like contingency, clarification requests remained tightly convergent in all cases found in the discourse. This was due to the fact that the questions dealt with seeking to bring about an explanation or redefinition of preceding contribution. Although request questions were posed to have students performing certain actions, they were, in fact, tightly convergent as they home in on the aspect being talked. So, with a different degree, they were convergent to the topic being discussed.

Different from convergence questions occupying a great number of interactions, the divergence questions appeared less. Yet, the teachers were able to lead the students to have higher-level thinking by changing the discourse. The teachers opened on an aspect of what is being discussed. In the meantime, referential questions were proven as the most employed for each teacher (except T4). As previously stated, since the nature of clarification type definitely associates with convergent questions resulting from its contingency, it is not divergent at all. Lastly, although the request type (except T4) required the students to perform an action as its perlocutionary, for certain circumstances, it is divergent following the topic being discussed. The following extract (from T1's interactions) shows the contingency and convergence-divergence of the teacher's questions.

- T : *Look at your example. Which option should be deleted?*
 S : *B*
 T : *Do you think I could delete D? Does it fit to authentic assessment?*
 S : *No.. only A*
 T : *A or B?↓ ()*
 S : *D*
 T : *D ↑Really?*
 S : *yes.*
 T : *What about the other? Does it make sense?*
 S : *A and B*
 T : *Good. A and B. .. How many do you have to have here?*
 S : *four*
 T : *What about the supporting sentence? Can you open your book?*

The extract indicates that the teacher posed contingency questions mostly through clarification and display questions. The teacher clarified students' previous contributions or some preceding utterances. This extended the talk as the teacher provoked them by responding to student's responses by means of restating or rephrasing as the feedbacks. In the meantime, some questions were regarded as convergent as the teacher homes in on an aspect of what is being discussed (the option to delete) through the question "what about the other?", "does it make sense?" and divergent questions that open up an aspect of what is being discussed such as "how many do you have here?", "what about the supporting sentence?" and "can you open your book?" These convergence-divergence questions, thus, would enlarge the scope of discussion or classroom discourse.

To make it more specific, the analysis above provides three kinds of conversational actions constituting a question contingent on previous student contributions. First, formulating previous student contributions by repeating, paraphrasing, or summarizing the previous and to a certain extent, could be transforming the previous students' original ideas. Second, questioning and taking account of (dis)agreement with student ideas providing an implicit reason for holding up or opposing student ideas or viewpoints. Instead of saying such as acknowledgment tokens like "mm"), disagreement tokens like "no or not", and formulaic responses such as, "that's not great", "good" alone, the teacher posed questions which semantically referred to those as such. As noted by [21], [31], [33], forms are not regarded to be inadequate responses to co-participants to have mutual exchange during the interactions. The third is extending previous students' ideas. In this case, the teacher developed previous students' ideas by providing other convergent (How many do you have here? and what about the supporting sentence? and divergent question (can you open your book?)

Thus, contingency and convergence-divergence of questions were beneficial to extend the talk, enlarge the classroom discourse and reflect the teacher's ways to discursively construct the classroom talk. In this study, teachers' questions provide a collective, reciprocal, purposeful, cumulative, continuing contextual framework to provoke students' involvement along with the new knowledge they are encountering, in a large part, by contingent, convergent-divergent nature of questioning. These findings agree on [7], [8] and [21] suggesting that contingency on previous speaker contribution as a feature of interactional competence should be taken into account by the teachers. The students might construct a contingent response as the teachers were able to respond to the student(s) response(s) by giving proper questions. However, as noted by [41], regardless of the linguistic complexity and syntactical complexity, convergence- divergence questions were of benefit to promote the enlargement of classroom discourse and indirectly provoke students' thinking level. This means that contingency and convergence-divergence are insufficient to see the teacher question in classroom discourse. The syntactic form is still another aspect to examine.

Regarding the syntactic form, as shown in Table 3, it is interesting to see the relative proportion of the different syntactic types along with question types varying among the four teachers. There was a relative proportion of the different syntactic forms of questions varied among the four teachers. The most frequently occurring question- form for display question was W-h questions form and followed by yes-no question forms. The W-h questions were powerful because they would prompt longer and more syntactically complex utterances than yes/no questions. Meanwhile, yes/no questions were posed when the teachers felt that students have difficulty in answering or understanding the W-h and how/what about questions being asked. In the meantime, the use of other forms in other question types was beneficial to push the students to engage more in negotiation, provoke and facilitate responses as expected in W-h questions. The usefulness and simplicity of yes/no questions and declarative with the final raise in instruction should not be ignored. Like the display question, the four teachers used these two forms to elicit short answers, confirm information, and engage the slow learners and to trigger students' comprehension and understanding when they failed to answer W-h and how/about questions. As such, those forms are of great importance to invite student responses, involve them actively in the process of interactions and could extend the talks.

Saying it differently, Table 3 shows that there was a tendency for teachers to pose more W-h questions forms to employ their display questions. This finding was not surprising because the classroom is the most important setting for using W-h questions and teachers utilized them to expand learners' knowledge, and actively engage students in classroom sessions. At the same time, other forms such as yes-no and declarative with final raise (not definitely request type) were posed when they felt that students encounter difficulty in answering or understanding the W-h and how/what about questions being asked. This mirrors the findings of [13], [14], [18], [20]–[24], [39], [42] revealing that questions might be more effective if they met syntactical and linguistic complexity in their use. Then, different from other types, the use of yes-no and declarative final raise form were mostly in request type and have the students to perform an action as the perlocutionary force of the questions. In this regard, the type and syntax of questions should be considered in questioning. Although, to some extent and more often, they are determined by many factors such as teaching goals, content and students' background and knowledge, both are beneficial and influential to invite students' response. And yet, learning expectations might deviate from the course.

By and large, the most syntactical form of questions appeared was W-h questions. All the teachers employed this form at most. Employing Wh-questions might embody the development of the students' vocabulary and verbal reasoning skills, thus, force them to articulate in more complex responses [42]. Yet, more significant than the proposed explanations for the findings shown here, is that the evidence providing for the existence of form/function mappings of questions. To support [14], [42] [23], and [15] noting that the teachers embodied particular syntactic forms more often than others depending on the pragmatic and/or social function, this present study has shown evidence the teachers used particular syntactic forms with a consideration of both pragmatic and/or social function of their questions and their eligibility in the structure of conversation (discourse moves). In this regard, the syntactical form of questions might be regarded as the way to carry a particular function or illocutionary act of questioning following the classroom interactions moves. Thus, teachers' ways of questioning can be realized by employing a particular syntactical form which can facilitate various questioning functions. As such, the forms should be constructed in such a way that they, naturally, go with the structure of interactions.

4. Conclusion

Different ways of questioning indicate the functions thereby, the responses. Ways of questioning are strategies for conveying certain kinds of intentions during teacher-students interactions. This implicitly means that questions were examined not only on its typology but also on contingency and convergence-divergence. Both are the teacher ways or strategies to invite student response, thereby extend the talks by relating questions to, both semantic and form of the previous student contributions and homing in on and opening up an aspect of what is being talked by repeating, paraphrasing, transforming, questioning, contesting, and extending student previous ideas by which questioning types were utilized in context. Meanwhile, different functions of questions are not only determined by different types of questions but also are determined by different question syntactical forms. What unites questions as a linguistic class has to do with their syntactic form and their placement such as contingency, convergence-divergence occurring in a particular discourse exchange. At this point, there is a correspondence between form and function. Therefore, the teacher questions were formed in such a way that they embodied particular functions. To say it differently, although a question had to be identified through its typology, classification of questions and the establishment of regular type itself routinely associate with syntactic form and functions. In the absence of both in question, there might be very difficult to uncover the classroom discourse moves. Employing a particular syntactical form is a way or strategy possessed by the teacher to make the questions more meaningful in carrying the functions.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for helpful ideas that improved this article considerably. I would like to thank the students and teachers who let me into their classrooms.

Declarations

- Author contribution** : The author confirms sole responsibility for the following: study conception and design, data collection, analysis and interpretation of results, and manuscript preparation.
- Funding statement** : The author received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article
- Conflict of interest** : The author declares no conflict of interest.
- Additional information** : No additional information is available for this paper.

References

- [1] Y. P. Robitaille and F. Lauderdale, "Teachers' Experiences Relative to Successful Questioning and Discussion Techniques," *Am. Int. J. Contemp. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 7–16, 2015, available at: [Google Scholar](#).
- [2] C. Maphosa and N. Wadesango, "Questioning ' Questioning ': Examining the Use of Questioning as an Interactive Teaching Tool in Higher Education," *J. Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 111–117, 2017, doi: [10.1080/0976691X.2016.11884889](#).
- [3] S.-Y. Choi and S. Li, "Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in a Child ESOL Classroom," *RELC J.*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 331–351, 2012, doi: [10.1177/0033688212463274](#).
- [4] D. Geoghegan, S. O. Neill, and S. Petersen, "Metalanguage : 'The Teacher Talk ' of Explicit Literacy Teaching in Practice," *Improv. Sch.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 119–129, 2013, doi: [10.1177/1365480213493707](#).
- [5] J. B. Hill, "Questioning Techniques : A Study of Instructional Practice Questioning Techniques : A Study of Instructional Practice," *Peabody J. Educ.*, vol. 91, no. 5, pp. 660–671, 2016, doi: [10.1080/0161956X.2016.1227190](#).
- [6] M. P. Boyd, "Relations Between Teacher Questioning and Student Talk in One Elementary ELL Classroom," *J. Lit. Res.*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 370–404, 2015, doi: [10.1177/1086296X16632451](#).
- [7] M. Boyd and D. Rubin, "How Contingent Questioning Promotes Extended Student Talk : A Function of Display Questions," *J. Lit. Res.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 141–169, 2006, doi: [10.1207/s15548430jlr3802_2](#).

- [8] M. Engin, "Questioning to Scaffold: An Exploration of Questions in Pre-Service Teacher Training Feedback Sessions," *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 39–54, 2013, doi: [10.1080/02619768.2012.678485](https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2012.678485).
- [9] S. Kao, G. Carkin, and L. Hsu, "Questioning Techniques for Promoting Language Learning with Students of Limited L2 Oral Proficiency in a Drama- Oriented Language Classroom," *Res. Drama Educ. J. Appl. Theatr. Perform.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 489–515, 2011, doi: [10.1080/13569783.2011.616399](https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.616399).
- [10] T. Stivers, "How We Manage Social Relationships Through Answers to Questions: The Case of Interjections," *Discourse Process.*, 2018, doi: [10.1080/0163853X.2018.1441214](https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2018.1441214).
- [11] T. Tofade, J. Elsner, and S. T. Haines, "Best Practice Strategies for Effective Use of Questions as a Teaching Tool," *Am. J. of Pharmaceutical Educ.*, vol. 77, no. 7, pp. 1–9, 2013, doi: [10.5688/ajpe777155](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe777155).
- [12] B. M. Wright, "Display and Referential Questions: Effects on Student Responses," *Nord. J. English Stud.* 15(4)160-189., vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 160–189, 2016, doi: [10.35360/njes.388](https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.388).
- [13] J. E. Barnett and A. L. Francis, "Using Higher Order Thinking Questions to Foster Critical Thinking: A Classroom Study," *An Int. J. Exp. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 201–211, 2012, doi: [10.1080/01443410.2011.638619](https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2011.638619).
- [14] A. F. Freed, "The form and function of questions in informal dyadic conversation," *J. Pragmat.*, vol. 21, pp. 621–644, 1994, doi: [10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90101-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90101-5).
- [15] H. Z. Waring, E. Reddington, D. Yu, and I. Clemente, "Going General: Responding to Yes – No Questions in Informational Webinars for Prospective Grant Applicants," *Discourse Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 307–327, 2018, doi: [10.1177/1750481318757762](https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481318757762).
- [16] K. White, "Asking Sacred Questions: Understanding Religion's Impact on Teacher Belief and Action," *Relig. Educ.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 40–59, 2010, doi: [10.1080/15507390903559103](https://doi.org/10.1080/15507390903559103).
- [17] C. M. Gilson, C. A. Little, A. N. Ruegg, and M. Bruce-davis, "An Investigation of Elementary Teachers' Use of Follow-Up Questions for Students at Different Reading Levels," 2014, doi: [10.1177/1932202X14532257](https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X14532257).
- [18] Y. Hosoda, "Teacher Deployment of 'oh' in Known-answer Question Sequences," *Classr. Discourse*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 58–84, 2015, doi: [10.1080/19463014.2015.1099111](https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2015.1099111).
- [19] L. Mcneil, "Using Talk to scaffold Referential questions for English Language Learners," *Teach. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 396–404, 2012, doi: [10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.005).
- [20] J. Ingram and V. Elliott, "A Critical Analysis of the Role of Wait Time in Classroom Interactions and the Effects on Student and Teacher Interactional Behaviours," *Cambridge J. Educ.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 37–53, 2015, doi: [10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365](https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365).
- [21] D. M. K. Lam, "What Counts as 'Responding'? Contingency on Previous Speaker Contribution as a Feature of Interactional Competence," *Lang. Test.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 377–401, 2018, doi: [10.1177/0265532218758126](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218758126).
- [22] A. Taboada, S. Bianco, and V. Bowerman, "Text-Based Questioning: A Comprehension Strategy to Build English Language Learners' Content Knowledge," *Lit. Res. Instr. ISSN*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 87–109, 2012, doi: [10.1080/19388071.2010.522884](https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2010.522884).
- [23] S. H. Qashoa, "Effects of Teacher Question Types and Syntactic Structures on EFL Classroom Interaction," *Int. J. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 52–62, 2013.
- [24] V. Vaish, "Questioning and Oracy in a Reading Program," *Lang. Educ.*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 526–541, 2013, doi: [10.1080/09500782.2012.737334](https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.737334).
- [25] A. Rido, "What Do You See Here from This Picture?: Questioning Strategies of Master Teachers Indonesian Vocational English Classroom," *TEFLIN J.*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 193–211, 2017, doi: [10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i2/193-211](https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v28i2/193-211).
- [26] Sujariati, Q. Rahman, and M. Mahmud, "English Teacher's Questioning Strategies in EFL Classroom at SMAN 1 Bontomarannu," *ELT Worldw.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2016, doi: [10.26858/eltww.v3i1.1884](https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v3i1.1884).

- [27] D. A. Vebriyanto, "Teacher's Questioning in EFL Classroom Interaction," *J. Vis.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 279–303, 2015, doi: [10.21580/vjv4i21595](https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv4i21595).
- [28] D. Sunggingwati and H. T. M. Nguyen, "Teachers' Questioning in Reading Lessons : A Case Study in Indonesia," *Electron. J. Foreign Lang. Teach.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 80–95, 2013, available at: [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.com/).
- [29] R. L. Walsh and K. A. Hodge, "Are we asking the Right Questions ? An Analysis of Research on the Effect of Teachers' Questioning on Children's Language during Shared Book Reading with Young Children," *J. Early Child. Lit.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 264–294, 2018, doi: [10.1177/1468798416659124](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798416659124).
- [30] W. Ozuem and G. Lancaster, "Questioning: A Path to Student Learning Experience," *Educ. + Train.*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 474–491, 2015, doi: [10.1108/ET-04-2014-0039](https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-04-2014-0039).
- [31] Z. Gan, "Interaction in group oral assessment: A case study of higher- and lower-scoring students," *Lang. Test.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 585–602, 2010, doi: [10.1177/0265532210364049](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532210364049).
- [32] B. L. Moorhouse, "Adaptations to a Face-to-Face Initial Teacher Education Course ' Forced ' Online due to the COVID-19 pandemic," *J. Educ. Teach.*, no. April, pp. 1–3, 2020, doi: [10.1080/02607476.2020.1755205](https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1755205).
- [33] L. May, "Interactional Competence in a Paired Speaking Test : Features Salient to Raters," *Lang. Assess. Q.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 127–145, 2011, doi: [10.1080/15434303.2011.565845](https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2011.565845).
- [34] A. S. Salerno and A. K. Kibler, "Questions They Ask : Considering Teacher-inquiry Questions Posed by Pre-service English Teachers," *Educ. Action Res.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 399–415, 2015, doi: [10.1080/09650792.2015.1012174](https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2015.1012174).
- [35] T. S. C. Farrell and V. Mom, "Exploring Teacher Questions through Reflective Practice," *Reflective Pract. Int. Multidiscip. Perspect.*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 849–865, 2015, doi: [10.1080/14623943.2015.1095734](https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2015.1095734).
- [36] S. Kelly, A. M. Olney, P. Donnelly, M. Nystrand, and S. K. D. Mello, "Automatically Measuring Question Authenticity in Real-World Classrooms," *Educ. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 10, pp. 1–14, 2018, doi: [10.3102/0013189X18785613](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X18785613).
- [37] M. P. Boyd, D. L. Rubin, M. P. Boyd, and D. L. Rubin, "Elaborated Student Talk in an Elementary ESOL Classroom. National Council of Teachers of English Stable," *Res. Teach. English*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 495–530, 2002, available at: [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.com/).
- [38] E. Tavakoli and M. Davoudi, "Question Generation Behavior of Reflective Teachers," *Reflective Pract. Int. Multidiscip. Perspect.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 415–429, 2016, doi: [10.1080/14623943.2016.1169167](https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2016.1169167).
- [39] P. Chappell, "Engaging Learners: Conversation-or Dialogic-Driven Pedagogy?," *ELT J.*, vol. 68, no. January, pp. 1–11, 2014, doi: [10.1093/elt/cct040](https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct040).
- [40] R. Nitta and F. Nakatsuhara, "A Multifaceted Approach to Investigating Pre-task Planning Effects on Paired Oral Test Performance," *Lang. Test.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 147–175, 2014, doi: [10.1177/0265532213514401](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532213514401).
- [41] G. Hu and Y. Duan, "Questioning and Responding in the Classroom : A Cross-Disciplinary Study of the Effects of Instructional Mediums in Academic Subjects at a Chinese University," *Int. J. Biling. Educ. Biling.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2018, doi: [10.1080/13670050.2018.1493084](https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1493084).
- [42] S. Durrleman and J. Franck, "Syntactic Complexity in the Comprehension of Wh- Questions and Relative Clauses in Typical Language Development and Autism," *Appl. Psycholinguist.*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 1501–1527, 2016, doi: [10.1017/S0142716416000059](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716416000059).