What Aspects of Questions Do Teachers Give Attention To?

Hieronimus Canggung Darong[a], A.Effendi Kadarisman[b], Yazid Basthomi[c], Nunung Suryati[d], Maria Hidayati[e], Erna Mena Niman[f], [a,b,c,d,e,f]Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia, Email: [a]hieronimusdarong@gmail.com, [b]effendi.kadarisman@gmail.com, [c]ybasthomi@um.ac.id, [d]nsuryati02@gmail.com, [e]maria.hidayati.fs@um.ac.id, [f]ernaniman79@gmail.com

The purpose of this study was to examine question types, forms, functions and strategies employed by Indonesian English teachers in classroom interactions. Four Indonesian teachers were observed, audio-recorded and analysed following the principle of Conservation Analysis (CA). The analysis revealed a correspondence between the forms and functions of questions. Meanwhile, the use of a particular pragmatic strategy was beneficial to invite students' responses which subsequently managed the flow of conservation. As one of the defining characteristics of an effective English teacher is his or her ability to use language both pedagogically and pragmatically, this study can provide practical insights into how questioning can be developed as a communicative act.

Key words: *Question type, form, function, and strategy.*

Introduction

Although learning materials, tasks and activities influence learning experiences, expectations for learner responses are routinely determined by teacher questioning (Maphosa & Wadesango, 2017). This issue may pose challenges for some teachers as it depicts methods of managing classroom discourse. The challenge does not only stem from how teachers select question types, but also from their dealings with forms, functions and strategies. Zemel and Koschmann (2011) state that problems in the response may occur not because the response is wrong, but due to a misunderstanding of the question.

Previous studies note that a particular type of teacher question can affect a student's response and verbal communication (Engin, 2013; Hill, 2016; Kao et al., 2015), as well as his or her thinking order and learning achievement (Maphosa & Wadesango, 2017; Stivers, 2018;

Tofade, Elsner, & Haines, 2013; Walsh & Hodge, 2018; Wright, 2016). As typology and its syntactical level of complexity are important aspects in questioning, teachers should therefore be critical in providing questions and display sensitivity towards the given response (Gilson, Little, Ruegg, *et al.*, 2014; Hosoda, 2015; Ingram & Elliott, 2015; Lam, 2018; Taboada, Bianco, & Bowerman, 2012). As noted by Durrleman and Franck (2016) and Hu and Duan (2018), however, types of questions may only promote higher-order thinking and subsequent learner achievement if learners encounter certain criteria that adheres to higher difficulty of discourse and syntactical complexity of questioning. In this sense, the syntactic form of a question should be considered in order to promote its learning benefits.

Concerning the function and strategy, the widely used interactional feature of teacher questioning has the potential to function as a corrective stratey of meaning negotiation in classroom situations (Wright, 2016; Palma, 2014). In addition, questioning activities can check and diagnose learning, assessment strategy (Jiang, 2014) and teaching technique, providing some inputs and facilitating learners' language production skills (Eckerth, 2009; Saito & Hanzawa, 2016; Vaish, 2013; White, 2010). The question cannot stand alone, however, and should rather be received and responded to as part of an interaction and subsequently understood in light of expected classroom interactions (Boyd, 2015). In this regard, function and strategy must not be separated from the reoccurring condition of classroom interaction.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted concerning questioning as the most common teaching tool and practice for corrective feedback and assessment. Despite this extensive literature, a gap exists in the research surrounding a specific focus on type, form, function and strategy of questioning activities in EFL classroom settings. This paper is drawn from a wider study examining the practices of teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Indonesian universities. This is a sensitive issue as it generally contributes to the creation of interactive classroom situations. The present study therefore seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the types of questions raised by Indonesian teachers?
2. What are the forms and functions of questions posed by Indonesian teachers?
3. What are the strategies employed by Indonesian teachers in questioning?

Literature Review

Bloom's taxonomy provides insights for teachers to determine questioning types based on cognitive dimensions. In line with Bloom's thinking domains, questions can be is categorised into lower or higher question types. Lower-type questions are concerned with simple recall or memorisation and comprehension checking. Such questions are solely designed to check students' knowledge. Higher-type questions deal with students' requirements to utilise learned

information and concepts to clarify, compare, infer and draw conclusions through applicative, evaluative and speculative methods (Hill, 2016). These two types differently promote students' thinking order skills and learning achievements, though both can encourage critical thinking. This promotion of higher-order thinking and improved achievements may only occur if students encounter certain criteria of the difficulty of discourse and syntactical complexity of questioning (Durrleman & Franck, 2016; Hu and Duan, 2018). This notion has been corroborated by recent findings revealing that the complexity of a teacher's voicing of a question determines the students' cognitive response levels (Stivers, 2018). More specifically, it was found that the more complex a question is, the more complex and high-level a student's thinking is in terms of his or her language skills (Harvey & Light, 2015).

Questions are also categorised into display and referential questions. Previous studies found that display questions, also termed as closed questions, correspond to the lower thinking level as they place few cognitive demands on students and require only brief answers. The purpose of such questions is to display students' knowledge of the topic being discussed. This type is predominantly used at a different level of education and usually elicits a very restricted student response. Conversely, referential questions, or opened questions, correspond to high order thinking as they require new contributions to a topic and allow for a range of responses and interactions (Engin, 2013; Kao *et al*., 2011; Tavakoli & Davoudi, 2016; Wright, 2016).

In terms of function, teacher questioning can be also divided into three main categories, namely diagnostic, instructional and motivational (Qashoa, 2013). Diagnostic questioning deals with classroom queries which allow the teacher to find out what the students know and how they think about the topic under discussion. This method allows teachers to evaluate the current states of students' thinking. Instructional questions enable teachers to encourage students to learn new material and relate it to previously studied topics. Lastly, motivational questioning is used to engage students in the lesson and to challenge their thinking.

Further, Freed (1994) purposed the taxonomy of the questioning function, which constitutes four categories. First, the context of factual information which is external to the conversation consists of public information questions, social information questions, social invitations and deictic information questions. Second, seeking information about the talk or conversation consists of clarification, repetition and confirmation questions. Third, seeking open-ended information about the verbal and social relationship between the speaker and listener include conversational focus questions, shared information questions, phatic information questions, and questions that ask for elaboration. Fourth, questions that function as a reflection of the speaker's expressive style and that contain information already known to the speaker or of unavailable information include didactic questions, rhetorical questions, questions used for humour, self-directed questions and questions used in reported speech. These four categories function as applicable tools to classroom discourse.

Researchers generally agree that questioning strategies and students' responses are interrelated. The responses generated from questions help educators realign their teaching techniques and interactional features in response to learners' needs (Ozuem & Lancaster, 2015). In this regard, the choice of questioning and its function must provoke responses and should reflect teachers' methods in eliciting discussion. Engin (2013) and Kelly, et al., (2018) assert that questioning strategy is necessary to function as an effective scaffolding tool and meaningful input for language learners. As such, strategies should be properly implemented to invite learners to understand and respond to spoken questions. Further, Palma (2014) points out that the questioning strategy can actively place students within the meaning negotiation process. Wright (2016) echoes this view by saying that verbal questioning tends to be connected with input and output. Meanwhile, Ellis (2009) mentions that the most notably accepted corrective strategies made by classroom teachers include recasts, elicitation, repetition and clarification requests. Ellis regards these as strategies rather than techniques in the meaning negotiation process.

In another study, questions were found to employ a particular function for the interlocutors and should be spoken in a reliable manner within an identifiable context (Zhu, 2012). Further, external and internal modification devices were found whose functions can be to either mitigate or aggravate. The former strategy of mitigating deals with modifiers that occur in the immediate context of questioning and that are optionally provided to indirectly modify a question's purpose. In other words, these modifiers are pre-sequences or enquirers that precede a proposition in order to ensure that the utterance is within the teacher's limits. The latter strategy of aggravating is concerned with the use of downgraders which are set out through syntactic and lexical forms to mitigate the intention of the speaker. However, these findings only pinpoint the traditional perspective which considers that a question is a request to supply unknown information.

Other studies accentuate modalities such as can, could, will and would in interrogative forms. These terms are used to indirectly soften the utterance and are considered more polite than declarative statements in the request (Taguchi, 2012; Roever & Al-gahtani, 2015; Tajeddin & Pezeshki, 2014)). These findings are corroborated by (Yazdanfar and Bonyadi, 2016; Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016)), who state that a question's subject matter, the way it is spoken and even the decision to speak are indicators of the agents' (teacher and students') social relationship. By deploying modality, questions as a specific language form may soften the impact of a request as Face Threatening Acts (FTAs).

Although researchers generally believe that good questioning strategy can affect the intended message, questions are not only about information. Studies discuss the multiplicity of meanings that can be attached to questions. In classroom interactions, for instance, the teacher's questions

may not only be employed to enquire for information or to inform an experience, but may also be used to impose the teacher's influence on his or her students.

Method

Purposefully chosen Indonesian English teachers of the English department at Universitas Negeri Malang were observed and audio-recorded in this case study. While being a direct non-participant observer, any single utterance containing teachers' questions and students' responses were noted to support the recorded data. All observed interactions of four Indonesian English teachers with their students were fully transcribed by using conversation analysis conventions which were mostly adapted from Jefferson (Hosoda, 2015). These transcripts were then examined, and certain episodes were selected for further analysis. Selection was conducted according to the transcripts' contributions in providing valuable information regarding the types, forms, functions and teacher strategies as the focus of this study. In this respect, 'episode' is defined as being made up of sequences that, individually and cumulatively, contribute to the achievement of an activity or task goal (Canch and Renandya, 2017). As existing coding schemes did not seem appropriate for student responses in the current study, the researchers devised their own and focused only on verbal responses.

The Conversation Analysis (CA) approach was employed for this study's data analysis. Additionally, Blum-Kulka and Olshtain's framework (1984) and Freed's taxonomy of question functions were used as necessary. The application of CA principles and the mentioned framework for data analysis allow for the examination of the teachers' questions (including their types, forms and functions) and their teaching strategies, along with students' verbal responses. Through these analysis tools, the examination could be conducted with a neutral perspective anchored in what was observable during teacher-student interactions. As such, the analysis considered the classroom as a dynamic environment that was constantly shaped by how the four Indonesian English teachers raised questions and how the students provided verbal responses in sequences. The data was triangulated from three sources, namely in-depth classroom observations, audio-taping and reflective analysis of field notes. This enabled the possible prejudices and attitudes inherent in this research activity to be counteracted.

Results

All teacher questions in the study were coded as either display, authentic, clarification request or procedural. The table below in Appendix 1 deals with the types of questions employed by the teachers. From the table, it can be seen that display, or closed, questions dominated classroom discourse with 272 out of 329 questions, or 83%, in the display category. Referential, or open, questions appeared less frequently with only 37 questions, or 11%. These were queries in which the teacher did not know the answer and which allowed for multiple acceptable

answers. The appearance of referential questions during the session was a logical consequence of topic elaboration and was intended to extend the discourse. Clarification questions were employed 13 times, equating to 4% of the total. These questions sought to explain or redefine the preceding contribution. Finally, the least frequent question was the request type, appearing in only 7 instances and making up 2% of the 329 total questions. As the name suggests, these request questions were intended to have the students perform an act, and referred to a preparatory condition such as willingness, ability or possibility to perform the act.

The second teacher observed in the classroom employed display questions that mostly occurred in the discussion. The teacher's 115 questions consisted of 84 display questions (73%) and 15 referential questions (13%). These questions were likely employed mainly to check and confirm students' understanding of the topic being discussed. Meanwhile, referential questions were used as the teacher weaved external information into learning instruction. The last two types of questions were quite similar in terms of number and percentage. Both appeared 8 times (7%) to clarify and request students' contributions and acts regarding the topic of discourse.

Findings from the third teacher's class were similar to the first session with display and open questions being most frequently used. Of the 132 total number of questions asked by the teacher, 68 were categorised as display and closed questions (51%), and 49 were classed as referential and open questions (37%). The decreasing number of questions was influenced by the learning focus of the second participant surrounding the syntactical pattern of the sentences. Similar again to the first teacher, clarification questions appeared in 10 instances and equated to about 8% of the total. In this regard, the teacher used such questions to clarify students' contributions or preceding utterances, as well as for relating directions or behaviours. Meanwhile, the teacher employed request questions expressing query preparatory conditions to ask the students to perform certain actions.

Students in the second teacher's class were offered many display questions to share information when asked to present a paper. This session was used for two groups of presentations, an activity that stifled a prevalence of such questions during the discussion. Of the resultant 156 questions in this activity, 111 display questions dominated the interactions (71%) and 16 referential questions (10%) were necessarily employed to seek information regarding the students' presentations. In this regard, these questions evolved the discussions and discerned the extent of students' preparation for their presentations. Due to the high number of ideas and points that required clarification, 23 questions (15%) were asked by the teacher regarding these presentations. Additionally, 6 request questions made up 4% of the total and were employed in efforts to engage students in perlocutionary acts.

In addition to question types, the functions of questions being asked must also be considered as shown in the Appendix 2 table. This analysis was based on the five syntactic forms of

questions along with four broad functional categories, namely external, relational, talk and expressive. Several notes can be drawn from the form-function mappings in the Appendix 2 table. First, it is not surprising that one kind of syntactic form serves more than one function following the discourse exchanges. It then logically follows that the total number of forms does not match with the total number of functions. The four syntactical forms of questions raised by the teachers were employed to gain further information regarding the conservation and to seek open-ended information about the verbal and social relationship between teachers and students. These questions also functioned as a reflection of the teachers' expressive style containing information already known to the teachers or pertaining to unavailable information.

Second, the most syntactical form of questions appeared was W-H questions, which were employed by the majority of the observed teachers. As W-H questions invite more complex verbal responses, such inquiries can evolve a student's vocabulary and verbal reasoning skills. Third, when the teachers required information about the immediate conversational context, one might predict that they would use declarative phrases with a final rising intonation since they are searching for information which is recycled from previous utterances (Freed, 1994). This form appeared less than the yes-no and W-H questions, however, and was interestingly not used for the external functional category. It therefore makes sense that many of these questions were literally declarative utterances drawn from earlier parts of the conversation, repeated or paraphrased with rising intonations to ask for certain ideas or information.

During the study, how-what questions were raised slightly less than other forms, totalling 41 between all the observed teachers. Shown above to be predominantly used as talk questions (except in the fourth teacher's class), more were used as relational and expressive functional category questions while the external functional category was only used by the first teacher. Finally, the absence of tag-questions that occurred for all teachers was unsurprising as the correlations found for tag-questions may be of limited significance, given no number in the data was found for the use of another expression, such as "right expression". More important than the proposed explanations for the findings shown here, however, is the clear information found for the existence of form and function mappings of questions.

The expressive function of requesting information may be regarded as the question prototype. Questioning strategy must therefore be analysed in this study through the Blum-Kulka and Olshtain framework (1984). The table in Appendix 3 delineates teachers' strategies of questioning, particularly in the form of requests. These findings indicate that while direct interrogative questioning generally maintained a high position of teachers' chosen strategies, they did not provoke sufficient student responses. As shown in the table below, this strategy resulted in the teachers themselves providing the responses, thus substantiating the need for further reflection of the strategy itself. As information requesting delineates the illocutionary force of the question, students were less inclined to give responses. Direct interrogation in this

class was therefore of no benefit to the classroom's discourse, with the teacher's power and status definitely determining the force of the questioning act. The use of other modification devices may, however, have invited higher numbers of student responses. Such devices could include the use of mitigation or aggravation to soften the impact of request as a Face Threatening Act (FTA) (Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, 1984). These were optional clauses, however, resulting in some teachers going straight forward to the question while indirectly modifying the illocutionary force. In this sense, such devices invited students' responses and lead to interactive classroom discourse.

Discussion

Several important points can be explained regarding the data presented above. First, the use of display questions was found to be meaningful and contributed to learners' responses. Such responses were often restricted, though the topic under discussion was kept open. While not always the case, the use of display questions can extend discourse, influence patterns of interaction and provided valuable input for students. This result is consistent with previous studies on classroom language subjects in which teachers predominantly used display and comprehension questions (Hu & Duan, 2018).

Second, during teacher-student classroom interactions, it was obvious that while some forms of questions elicited responses, others were followed by improper answers and still others elicited no responses at all. In this sense, the questions constructed a learning environment in terms of managing the flow of discourse regardless of the presence or absence of a response. The agreement is, therefore, that questions function as the teacher's intention during conversation.

Third, results of this study suggest that regardless of type, questions can be classified according to their syntactic forms and functions, or the speaker's intentions. Observations indicated that in addition to different syntactic form characterising the different functions questions, the use of the different strategies also suggested different functions. Freed (1994) notes a correspondence between form and function, pointing out that both the taxonomic classification of questions and the establishment of regular form and function mappings can be conducted if questions are examined through their syntactic and prosodic forms. Freed cites Schegloff in claiming that what unites questions as a linguistic class has little to do with their syntactic form, but is rather a result of their placement in a particular discourse exchange. In this study, a particular form of question served more than one function during teacher-student interactions. This mirrors previous studies which show that questions associated with what is said (form) serve multiple functions in the context of the conversation (Roever & Al-gahtani, 2015; Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016). Likely, the meanings (illocutionary acts) given to questions are judged by distinctive pragmatic and social functions of questions and their syntactic form as

they are used in the interaction (Saito & Hanzawa, 2016 Maphosa and Wadesongo (2016) and Hu and Duan (2018).

It can therefore be concluded that although questions had to be identified through their syntactic and prosodic forms, classification of questions and the establishment of the form itself routinely associate with functions and context where they occur. Moreover, as language is context-sensitive, the absence of such context may lead to difficulties in determining the intended meaning of an utterance. In this sense, the question should be linguistically and contextually coherent. This notion was observed in the present study as a strategic element that makes questions more meaningful in carrying functions. This supports the previous studies (Palma, 2014; Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016) noting that strategy would be beneficial in employing the functions of questions.

Fourth, moving ahead to the effect of questioning, different modes of questioning were found to indicate questions' functions in terms of determining responses. In this study, modes of questioning are strategies for conveying certain kinds of intentions during teacher-student interactions. The data suggests that teacher strategy influences students' responses. The use of direct interrogation was found to elicit no response from the students, leaving the teachers to answer the questions themselves. This finding supports Schegloff's claims that what unites questions as a linguistic class has little to do with their syntactic form but is rather a result of their placement in conversational sequences. In this sense, questions should, accordingly, be examined along with the interlocutors' responses as part of adjacency pairs while still paying attention to the correspondence between the form and function with the inclusion of contextual strategy. The illocutionary force of teachers' questions might then be misunderstood by the students. This strengthens the ideas put forward by Freed (1994), Zemel and Koschmann (2011) and Taguchi (2012), who suggest that the problem of understanding how questions work in conversation is not resolved by not obliging question forms nor by trying to enact a prima facie function to different question types outside of their context, but rather by correctly interpreting their intended context.

Following the frameworks of House and Kasper (1981) and Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), those questions which modified the illocutionary act of the questions were able to invite students' responses. In this respect, the teachers used both external modification (an adjunct to the head) and internal devices to soften the force of questions. While these modification devices invited responses, in some cases the use of direct interrogative methods left no responses. Consequently, when teachers spoke certain words, they were concerned not only with types but also with strategy used to carry the intended meaning of their utterances. The problem should therefore be resolved by employing a proper strategy (Yazdanfar and Bonyadi, 2016; Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016; Walsh & Hodge, 2018). Further, the research found that essential aspects of teachers' interpersonal interactions had the potential to either prevent or enable an

effective classroom environment. In the speech act theory, there is a skewness that a speaker (the teacher) has an illocutionary effect on interlocutors when the meaning of an utterance is conventionally associated with producing that effect. In this respect, a teacher's method of raising the questioning utterance plays a crucial role in placing classroom interaction as a social institution and action.

Another interesting finding of the study focused on the idea of interpersonal normativity, or being responsible and autonomous. In the researchers' views, the Blum-Kulka and Olshtain framework (1984) of modification devices fail to account for the human capacity to create interpersonal normative relationships, which can be regarded as crucial for cooperation. As noted by Carassa and Colombetti (2015), these normative relationships may be inter-subjectively created by two or more agents without relying on pre-existing group-level norms. This connection binds the agents, in this case teachers and students, who jointly construct it. The presupposition that classes are loosely structured and devoid of power relationships to emphasise equality and partnership requires further investigation. This presupposition might be seen only as the context of interaction model (IRF) which is not feasible and is still debatable to a certain setting. Moreover, the power does not solely rely on authority but also on the illocutionary force of the utterances carrying the speaker's intentions. In order for such intentions and the delivered message to be properly understood, therefore, a cooperation must exist between teachers and students.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Given the important role of questioning acts in classroom interactions, it seems reasonable to suggest that teachers should not only be concerned with question types but also with their form, function and strategy. As questioning activities are mostly used as interactive teaching and assessment tools, the aspects mentioned above must be considered in EFL teacher classroom situations. In doing so, teachers can enhance their interactions with students by paying attention to the correspondence between form and function, and by subsequently providing some linguistic examples for students through the proper strategy used. Indeed, effective English teaching not only requires highly proficient language use but also the ability to create conducive learning environments through such language. Further, teachers must utilise linguistic skills to scaffold student learning by engaging students in both pragmatically and pedagogically meaningful interactions (Canh & Renandya, 2017). As the questioning activity is the most basic technique in teaching, there is therefore a need to consider the types, forms, functions and strategies employed in such activities.

Limitations present in the study should also be taken into account for further research. First, as this study only investigated teachers' questioning acts at university level, there is no guarantee that the results will be similar at other levels. The inclusion of other variables, such as teachers'

knowledge and backgrounds, the learning materials used, the number of participants and the selected data collection instruments may also present challenges for further research. Finally, the social aspects of interpersonal normativity of the classroom agents found in this study should be further examined for clarification. This study therefore recommends the inclusion of more participants and more instruments in a wider area of analysis in future research on the topic of question types, forms and functions in the classroom.

Appendix 1. Types of questions

No	Types	T 1			T 2			T 3			T 4		
		T	%	SR	T	%	R	T	%	R		%	R
1	Display	272	83	268	84	73	82	68	51	51	111	71	108
2	Referential	37	11	15	15	13	4	49	37	18	16	10	7
3	Clarification	13	4	4	8	7	3	10	8	4	23	15	9
4	Request	7	2	3	8	7	3	5	4	1	6	4	2
T		329	100		115	100		132	100		156	100	

T1,… Teacher 1,2,3, and 4; T: Total;; SR: Student Response

Appendix 2. Mapping form onto function

KFo		T 1				T 2			T 3			T 2		
		T/Fo	F	T/F	%	T/Fo	T/F	%	T/Fo	T/F	%	T/Fo	T/F	%
1	Yes/No Question	115	Ext	6		50	6		57	3		83	8	
			Ta	86	28		27	39		48	29		56	47
			Rel	76			24			10			44	
			Exp	63			7			3			7	
			T	231			64			64			115	
2	WH-Questions	156	Ext	5		59	6		47	12		75	6	
			Ta	142	52		40	47		37	47		42	47
			Rel	146			22			25			55	
			Exp	130			9			30			11	
			T	423			77			104			114	
3	D/F	14	Ext	-		10	-		1	-		19	-	
			Ta	33	11		11	9		25	45		7	5
			Rel	27			1			10			5	
			Exp	29			2			10			1	
			T	89			14			45			13	
4		23	Ext	2		4	-		13	-		1	-	

	H/What about		Ta	25	9		4	5		6	4		-	1
			Rel	25			4			1			1	
			Exp	20			-			1			1	
			T	72			8			8			2	
5	TQ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Function				815	100		164	100		221	100		244	100

T1,…: Teacher 1,2,3,4; KFo: Kinds of Form; T/Fo: Total per Form; F; Function; T/F: Total per Function; DF: T: Total; Declarative/Final Phrase↑; TQ: Tag question

Appendix 3. Teacher strategy

Teacher	Category	T	SsR		SR		TR		NR	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
T 1	Direct Interrogative	172	12	7	79	46	36	21	45	26
	Embedded if clause	3	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
	Consultative device	35	0	0	35	100	0	0	0	0
	Downtoner	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	Hedge	4	0	0	4	100	0	0	0	0
	Politeness markers	21	5	24	16	76	0	0	0	0
	Grounder	3	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
	Sweetener	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	Disarmer	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
T		241								
T 2	Direct Interrogative	170	6	4	94	55	52	31	18	10
	Embedded ifClause	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	ConsultativeDevice	51	3	6	48	100	0	0	0	0
	Downtoner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hedge	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
	Politeness Markers	15	3	20	12	80	0	0	0	0
	Grounder	4	0	0	4	100	0	0	0	0
	Sweetener	5	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0
	Disarmer	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
	Total	250								
T 3	Direct Interrogative	160	3	2	93	58	18	11	46	29
	Embedded ifClause	12	0	0	12	100	0	0	0	0
	ConsultativeDevice	35	5	14	30	86	0	0	0	0
	Downtoner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hedge	6	0	0	6	100	0	0	0	0

	Politeness Markers	6	2	33	4	67	0	0	0	0
	Grounder	4	0	0	4	100	0	0	0	0
	Sweetener	3	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
	Disarmer	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
	Total	225								
T 4	Direct Interrogative	141	4	3	91	65	3	2	43	30
	Embedded ifClause	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
	ConsultativeDevice	54	0	0	54	100	0	0	0	0
	Downtoner	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hedge	3	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
	Politeness Markers	18	4	22	14	78	0	0	0	0
	Grounder	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
	Sweetener	4	0	0	4	100	0	0	0	0
	Disarmer	3	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0
	Total	224								

T: Total; SsR: Students' Response; SR: Student Response; TR: Teacher Response; NR: No Response

REFERENCES

Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, *5*, 196–214. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-4-4-9

Boyd, M. P. (2015). Relations Between Teacher Questioning and Student Talk in One Elementary ELL Classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *47*(3), 370–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16632451

Canh, L. Van, & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers ' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use : A Conversation Analysis Study. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935

Carassa, A., & Colombetti, M. (2015). Interpersonal Communication as Social Action. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, *45*(4–5), 407–423. https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393115580265

Durrleman, S., & Franck, J. (2016). Syntactic Complexity in the Comprehension of Wh-Questions and Relative Clauses in Typical Language Development and Autism. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *37*(6), 1501–1527. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716416000059

Eckerth, J. (2009). Negotiated Interaction in the L2 Classroom. *Language Teaching*, *42*(1), 109–130. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005442

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1), 3–18.

Engin, M. (2013). Questioning to Scaffold : An Exploration of Questions in Pre-Service Teacher Training Feedback Sessions. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(1), 39–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2012.678485

Eshghinejad, S., & Moini, M. R. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging : Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher-Student, *2016*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016632288

Freed, A. F. (1994). The form and function of questions in informal dyadic conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *21*, 621–644.

Gilson, C. M., Little, C. A., Ruegg, A. N., & Bruce-davis, M. (2014). An Investigation of Elementary Teachers ' Use of Follow-Up Questions for Students at Different Reading Levels. https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202X14532257

Harvey, S., & Light, R. L. (2015). Questioning for Learning in Game-based Approaches to Teaching and Coaching. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, *6*(2), 175–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/18377122.2015.1051268

Hill, J. B. (2016). Questioning Techniques : A Study of Instructional Practice Questioning Techniques : A Study of Instructional Practice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *91*(5), 660–671. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1227190

Hosoda, Y. (2015). Teacher Deployment of ' oh ' in Known-answer Question Sequences. *Classroom Discourse*, *7*(1), 58–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2015.1099111

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in English and German. *In: Coulmas F (Ed) Conversational Routine. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 157 – 86.*, 157–186.

Hu, G., & Duan, Y. (2018). Questioning and Responding in the Classroom : A Cross-Disciplinary Study of the Effects of Instructional Mediums in Academic Subjects at a Chinese University. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1493084

Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2015). A Critical Analysis of the Role of Wait Time in Classroom Interactions and the Effects on Student and Teacher Interactional Behaviours. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *46*(1), 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365

Jiang, Y. (2014). Exploring Teacher Questioning as a Formative Assessment Strategy. *RELC Journal*, *45*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214546962

Kao, S., Carkin, G., & Hsu, L. (2011). Questioning Techniques for Promoting Language Learning with Students of Limited L2 Oral Proficiency in a Drama- Oriented Language Classroom. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16*(4), 489–515. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.616399

Kelly, S., Olney, A. M., Donnelly, P., Nystrand, M., & Mello, S. K. D. (2018). Automatically Measuring Question Authenticity in Real-World Classrooms. *Educational Research*, *20*(10), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X18785613

Lam, D. M. K. (2018). What Counts as " Responding "? Contingency on PreviousSspeaker Contribution as a Feature of Interactional Competence. *Language Testing*, *35*(3), 377–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218758126

Maphosa, C., & Wadesango, N. (2017). Questioning ' Questioning ': Examining the Use of Questioning as an Interactive Teaching Tool in Higher Education. *Journal of Communication*, *7*(1), 111–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/0976691X.2016.11884889

Ozuem, W., & Lancaster, G. (2015). Questioning: A Path to Student Learning Experience. *Education + Training*, *57*(5), 474–491.

Palma, G. (2014). A Classroom View of Negotiation of Meaning with EFL Adult Mexican Pupils. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014535941

Qashoa, S. H. (2013). Effects of Teacher Question Types and Syntactic Structures on EFL Classroom Interaction. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, *7*(1), 52–62.

Roever, C., & Al-gahtani, S. (2015). The Development of ESL Proficiency and Pragmatic Performance. *ELT Journal;*, *69*(4), 395–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv032

Saito, K., & Hanzawa, K. (2016). The Role of Input in Second Language Oral Ability Development in Foreign Language Classrooms : A Longitudinal Study. *Language Teaching Research*, *22*(4), 398–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816679030

Stivers, T. (2018). How We Manage Social Relationships Through Answers to Questions :

The   Case   of   Interjections.   *Discourse   Processes*. https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2018.1441214

Taboada, A., Bianco, S., & Bowerman, V. (2012). Text-Based Questioning : A Comprehension Strategy to Build English Language Learners ' Content Knowledge. *Literacy Research and Instruction ISSN:*, *51*(2), 87–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2010.522884

Taguchi, N. (2012). The Effects of Practice Modality on Pragmatic Development in L2 Chinese. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12123.x

Tajeddin, Z., & Pezeshki, M. (2014). Acquisition of Politeness Markers in an EFL Context : Impact of Input Enhancement and Output Tasks. *RELC Journal*, *45*(3), 269–286. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214555357

Tavakoli, E., & Davoudi, M. (2016). Question Generation Behavior of Reflective Teachers. *Reflective Practice International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *17*(4), 415–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2016.1169167

Tofade, T., Elsner, J., & Haines, S. T. (2013). Best Practice Strategies for Effective Use of Questions as a Teaching Tool. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *77*(7), 1–9.

Vaish, V. (2013). Questioning and Oracy in a Reading Program. *Language and Education*, *27*(6), 526–541. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.737334

Virgin, R. (2015). Customize Learning with Student-generated Guiding Questions. *The Clearing House*, *88*(3), 96–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2015.1032193

Walsh, R. L., & Hodge, K. A. (2018). 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. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, *18*(2), 264–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798416659124

White, K. (2010). Asking Sacred Questions : Understanding Religion ' s Impact on Teacher Belief and Action. *Religion & Education, 37*(1), 40–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/15507390903559103

Wright, B. M. (2016). Display and Referential Questions : Effects on Student Responses. *Nordic Journal of English Studies 15(4):160-189.*, *15*(4), 160–189.

Yazdanfar, S., & Bonyadi, A. (2016). Request Strategies in Everyday Interactions of Persian and English Speakers. *SAGE Open*, (October-December), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016679473

Zemel, A., & Koschmann, T. (2011). Pursuing a Question : Reinitiating IRE Sequences as a Method of Instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(2), 475–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.08.022

Zhu, W. (2012). Polite Requestive Strategies in Emails : An Investigation of Pragmatic Competence of Chinese EFL Learners. *RELC Journal*, *43*(2), 217–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212449936