

Comparison of Questions Used by Teachers with Expertise and Little Expertise in Elementary English Classes

Jang, Yeon-Hee

Daegu Igok Elementary School

Cho, Hyunhee*

Daegu National University of Education

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Dec 5 2017

Revised Dec 26 2017

Accepted Dec 27 2017

ABSTRACT

Teachers' pedagogical questions in a language classroom play a central role in students' language and cognitive development. The purpose of this study was to compare the questions used by teachers with expertise and little expertise in the 5th grade-level elementary English classes and find what types of questions were used in common, and whether and how they were used differently among the teachers. This study also attempted to discover whether different question types were used depending on students' levels of English.

Video-recorded English lessons of 3 excellent teachers and 3 general teachers were transcribed and analyzed according to the functional aspects and cognitive aspects of questions, adapted from Long & Sato (1983) and Cunningham (1987). The analysis of the data led to the finding that expert teachers used more referential questions, comprehension check questions, and confirmation check questions in the main pedagogical activities of the lesson than the teachers with little expertise. In terms of cognitive questions, memory questions and convergent questions were predominantly used by all the teachers. Lastly, the teachers' questions didn't reflect students' different levels of English ability. The findings of the study have suggestions for teacher education, teaching, and research.

Keywords:

teachers' pedagogical questions,
teacher expertise,
teacher education,
primary English teaching

* Corresponding author: choh718@naver.com

I. Introduction

Teacher's expertise has been understood in terms of teacher's knowledge about teaching and classroom. As one of the main discourses about teacher's knowledge, Elbaz (1983) counted knowledge of curriculum, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and knowledge of learners and their learning environment as essential component of teachers' knowledge. Shulman (1986) elaborated on Elbaz (1983) and divided pedagogical knowledge into general pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, and also included knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values and the philosophical and historical grounds of the knowledge. Clandinin & Connelly (1987) emphasized teacher's empirical knowledge based on their teaching experiences. These discourses about teacher's knowledge show that teacher's knowledge involves diverse and complex dimensions of teaching and classroom.

In a language classroom, an important part of teacher's knowledge consists of teacher's use of language, since language is both the medium and the goal of instruction. Teachers' language includes every utterance that teachers make in the classroom, such as instructions, explanations, and questions. Among them, teachers' questions are the most common form of teachers' talk (Ellis, 1993; Wilen, 1991). It can facilitate students' development of cognitive ability (Wilen, 1991) as well as language ability by prompting their verbal responses (Brock, 1986; Chaudron, 1998). While teachers' questions in English lessons received attention mainly in the 1980's and 1990's in the United States, it has been studied since the 2000's in the field of primary English education in South Korea (Kim, 2009; Kim, 2015; Kwon & Ok, 2010; Park, 2005). The reason for the popularity of the research on teachers' question in South Korea in the 2000's may be based on the emphasis on the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach, which is central in the 7th Reform of National Curriculum. CLT emphasizes teachers' strategic use of instructional talk including questioning that induces dialogic utterances from students. However, studies of teacher questions in Korean primary classroom contexts report that there are few questions that lead to authentic communication in classroom, while the questions intended for simple practice and recall of language learned occupy most part of the pedagogical questions (Cho, 2016; Kim, 2009; Kwon & Ok, 2010; Park, 2005). In this sense, a study that examines expert English teachers' use of questions is needed in order to understand whether they use different types of questions and how, if they do so.

Teachers with expertise are often referred as "excellent teachers" in South Korea, who are officially recognized through winning teaching competitions hosted by provincial offices of education. The teachers certified as "excellent" teachers have opportunities to share their teaching expertise and strategies by opening their classes to other teachers and providing instructional consultations to them. The excellent teacher is characterized by the

use of effective pedagogical and motivational skills and teaching materials in order to engage students in learning (Song & Chung, 2013; Ju & Ahn, 2015). Specific to English education, excellent teachers are also expected to have a good command of spoken English, which enables them to teach English in English (TEE). Except for Cho, Choi & Kim (2017) that examined an expert English teacher's instructional language, only a few existing studies on Korean English teachers' expertise address teachers' use of pedagogical questions (Song & Chung, 2013; Ju & Ahn, 2015). Since there is scarcity of research studies on excellent English teachers' use of questions, research needs to be done to discover what characteristics excellent teacher's questions show, and how they are different from general teachers with little expertise. Based on the awareness of the need for the study, this study aimed at comparing use of pedagogical questions between the teachers who do have expertise and who have little expertise in English teaching. Specific questions of the research were as follows:

- 1) What are the patterns of the types of questions used by the six primary teachers in their English classes?
- 2) Are there differences between the teachers with expertise and the teachers with little expertise in their use of questions? If so, what differences do they show?
- 3) Are there differences in the types of the teachers' questions depending on the levels of English proficiency of their class? If so, what are the differences?

II. Theory and Literature Review

Long & Sato (1983) pointed that in classrooms, interrogative sentence, declarative sentence, and imperative sentence are used most by the teacher. Among these, teachers' question plays a role of triggering a dialogue between the teacher and students and inducing forms and contents in students' utterances. In other words, teachers' questions serve as a guide not only for interaction between the teacher and students, but also for students' thinking process as well as for maintaining their interest in learning (Richards & Lockhart, 1996).

Teachers' questions have been classified from various perspectives. Guilford (1956) conceptualized questions as convergent questions and divergent questions, focusing on their impact on human intelligence. In the context of English class, Richards & Lockhart (1996) classified questions into procedural, convergent, and divergent questions based on Guilford's (1956) classification. A procedural question is used to proceed a lesson, mainly used at the beginning or ending of an instructional activity - for example, "Are you ready?", "Are you finished?", etc. Cunningham (1987) combined the classifications of Guilford

(1956) and Bloom (1956) to categorize teacher questions as factual recall questions, conceptual questions that include convergent and divergent questions, and evaluative questions.

Chaudron (1988) classified teacher's questions into display and referential questions according to their functions. Long & Sato (1983) classified teachers' questions into seven types and identified them as either echoic or epistemic questions. Echoic questions refer to the questions used to negotiate meaning between the speakers. It includes comprehension check question (i.e. used by the speaker to check whether the listener understands the speaker), clarification request question (i.e. used by the listener to ask the speaker to clarify what she or he has said), and confirmation check question (i.e. used by the listener to check if she or he has understood the speaker correctly). Epistemic questions include display questions, referential questions, expressive questions, and rhetorical questions. Expressive questions are used to convey the speaker's feelings or attitudes: Rhetorical question refers to a form of question that does not expect the answer of the listener.

Display question is often used in the traditional IRE (Cazden, 2001) classroom discourse structure, in which the teacher asks questions or give directions, followed by students' response, and closed by the teacher's evaluative response to students. Teachers' heavy dependence on display question does not give students enough chances to speak. On the other hand, referential question helps create an interactive communication among the teacher and students by giving students the opportunity to express their ideas and feelings. Referential question also encourages students to speak in longer and more complex sentences (Brock, 1986). In addition, relying solely on convergent questions, which focuses on the correctness of forms, meaning, and contents, tends to limit students' utterances to short and simple language forms (Cunningham, 1987). In contrast, divergent questions facilitate students' alternative and creative thinking rather than correct answers (Cunningham, 1987; Kang and Shin, 2011).

This study borrows Long & Sato's (1983) classic matrix of teacher question types unique to an L2 classroom and Cunningham's (1987) cognitive dimensions of teacher questions, in order to represent both functional and cognitive dimensions of teacher questions. Wilen's (1991) and Hills's (2012) identification of low order and high order questions are adapted and applied to show the levels of cognitive questions. <Table 1> shows the frame of analysis employed for this study.

<Table 1> Teacher Question Analysis System

Functional Question (Long & Sato, 1983)		Cognitive Question (Cunningham, 1987)	
Echoic question	comprehension check	Lower cognitive level ↓ Higher cognitive level	factual recall
	clarification request		convergent
	confirmation check		divergent
Epistemic question	display		evaluative
	referential		
	expressive		
	rhetorical		

Studies of English teachers' use of questions in Korea suggest that teachers' questions do not provide students with the opportunity to learn authentic communicative skills in English, arguing that teacher questions need to allow students to express their experiences and thoughts (Cho, 2016; Kim, 2009; Kim, 2015; Kwon & Ok, 2010; Park, 2005). Kim (2015) argued that divergent question should be increased in lessons with upper grade-level students considering their developmental level of cognitive ability.

There are studies that addressed teacher talk in an English classroom from the perspective of teacher education. Kim & Kim (2015) reported that analysis of teacher utterances including teacher questions was helpful in enhancing communication-oriented teaching skills in teacher training programs. Lee (2016) compared the utterances of pre-service teachers and in-service teachers and argued that pre-service teacher education should emphasize teachers' interaction with students. In addition, Cho et als. (2017) compared two teachers' utterances in classroom and found that the more professional teacher used more content-based feedback, scaffolding, and referential questions than the less professional teacher.

The existing studies provide an insight into teachers' talk and suggest common characteristics shared among teachers of similar degrees of expertise. However, focusing on teachers' questions and comparing them according to their degrees of expertise will provide teachers with an insight into better questioning strategies. In addition, adding contextual descriptions and interpretations to the descriptive analysis will employ benefits of quantitative and qualitative approach.

III. Research Design

A. Participant

Three teachers with expertise and three teachers with little expertise were selected as research participants of the study. In this study, the "excellent class" or "excellent lesson" refers to a lesson taught by a teacher who received the first-class award in the English teaching competition held by the provincial office of education, and "excellent teacher" refers to the teacher who taught the excellent class. "General lesson" refers to a lesson taught by a teacher with little expertise, who is called "general teacher" in this study. The "general teacher" was selected from the teachers who have less than 5 years of teaching experience and have no experience of being awarded in English teaching competitions. <Table 2> shows the information of the total 6 participants.

Regarding students' levels of English proficiency, teachers A, C, and E judged that their class had a moderate level of English ability. Teachers B, D and F rated the English ability level of their classes as mid-high to high. Therefore, in this study, the classes of the teachers A, C, and E and those of the teachers B, D, and F are compared as well to see if there are differences in teacher questioning according to the students' level of English proficiency.

<Table 2> Background information of the participant teachers

Years of English teaching/total years of teaching		Teacher education experience after graduating from college		Awards
General teachers	A	2/4	None	None
	B	2/3	None	
	C	1.5/4.5	90 hours distance learning	
Excellent teachers	D	6/16	120 hours advanced primary English teacher education program 1 month overseas English learning program for primary English teachers 6 months advanced English teacher education program at Korea National University of Education 180 hours TESOL qualification training	First-class award in teaching competition
	E	8/19	120 hours advanced primary English teacher education program 6 months advanced English teacher education program at Korea National University of Education Master's degree in Primary English education	

	F	5/13	120 hours advanced primary English teacher education program 180 hours TESOL qualification training 15 hours TEE self-training	
--	---	------	--	--

B. Data Collection

The video-recorded classes of the 6 participant teachers teaching 5th grade-level students comprised the data of this study. All the classes were the 2nd lesson of a unit, comprised of speaking and listening activities, making the data comparable with one another. Teachers with expertise and less expertise constructed their lessons in the same way: In activity 1, students listened to the texts and learned the main expressions. In activity 2, students practiced using the expressions learned in activity 1, usually in the form of answering the teacher's questions. In activity 3, students engaged in speaking activities in pairs or in groups. The lesson topic and the activities are presented in <Table 3>. All the classes were taught in English, with occasional use of the Korean language to help students understand the teacher.

<Table 3> Topics and activities of the participant teachers' classes

Teacher	Topic of the lesson unit		Lesson	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3
General teachers	A	Asking what friends want to do and answering the question	2 nd	Storytelling, listen & repeat	Whole group practice, conversation	conversation
	B	Asking and answering what different objects are	2 nd	Listen & comprehension, practice speaking	Listen & practice, conversation	conversation
	C	Asking and answering who is the owner of an object	2 nd	Listen & repeat	Practice using the apostrophe	conversation
Excellent teachers	D	Asking what are friends' favorite things and answering the question	3 rd	Listen & comprehension, writing minilesson	Practice speaking, conversation	Role play or singing
	E	Asking what friends want to do and answering the question	2 nd	Listen & speak	Practice using the colloquial abbreviation	conversation
	F	Asking and answering about daily life	2 nd	Storytelling, listen & speak	conversation	conversation

It needs to be mentioned that teacher D included a writing mini-lesson in activity 1, but it consisted of teacher's questions and students' answers rather than the teachers' lecture. Likewise, Teacher C and teacher E taught the use of apostrophe and colloquial abbreviations respectively in Activity 2, but the activities also consisted of teachers' questions and students' answers, showing the interaction patterns equivalent to the other lessons.

C. Analysis of Data

Classroom recording was transcribed, and all the teachers' questions were analyzed by the sentence or phrase that form a meaning unit. When the same questions were repeated in succession, only the first question was analyzed. The framework of analysis was based on Long & Sato's (1983) functional question matrix and Cunningham's (1987) cognitive question framework, as illustrated earlier in <Table 1>. Types of questions emerging from the analysis were included in order to fully represent the data. Accordingly, the question that induces student's utterance - prompt question - and the question related to the procedure of the lesson - procedural question - were added to the functional question. The term "factual recall" question was modified to "memory" question to reflect the characteristics of the contents of the primary English class better. All questions were double-checked in both categories, since the two categories present different aspects that questions have. In addition, the quantitative analysis was supplemented by qualitative data in order to provide contextualize discussions of the teachers' question use.

To ensure validity and reliability in the analysis process, one teacher worked with us together, negotiating different ideas and making judgments that represent the nature of questions best in particular lesson contexts. The analysis underwent many times of revisions in order to maintain consistency across the analysis of the 6 lessons.

In addition to obtaining their video-recorded lessons, we tried to interview the teachers in order to understand their knowledge and beliefs underlying their classes, but we were not able to get their consent. Therefore, this study tried to secure the credibility of research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) by going through several times of analyses and referring to the relevant literature.

IV. Finding and Discussion

This section presents findings from analysis of the 6 classes. The findings from the analysis of the main part of the lessons only will be presented and discussed, because the

way teachers proceeded introductory and closing parts of the lessons varied much from one another, making it irrelevant to look for patterns of question types used in those sessions.

A. Use of teacher questions in listening / speaking activities

1. Use of functional questions

a. Display questions

Display questions were used most frequently in all the 6 lessons (92 times), followed by comprehension check questions (67 times), confirmation check questions (30 times), and referential questions (29 times). Rhetorical questions, prompt questions, clarification request questions, and expressive questions showed little or no use (See <Table 4>). The dominant use of display questions reflect the arguments of the existing research that the purpose of teacher questions in English classroom appears to check students' understanding and knowledge of the language taught (Kim, 2009; Kwon & Ok, 2010; Park, 2005).

Considering individual teachers' use of display questions, the teachers with little expertise were found to use more display questions than teachers with expertise. Teacher C used display questions most of all the teachers (54.8%). Teacher B used them second most (48%), followed by teacher A (38.1%). The expert teachers showed less use of display questions, teacher D using 32.8%, teacher E using 25%, and teacher F using 22.9%.

The classes A, C, and E, of which student population has a moderate level of English proficiency, and classes B, D, and F, which have students of mid-high to high level of English proficiency, were compared to discover if there is difference in the use of display questions between the two groups of teachers. No pattern in the teachers' question use was found that could tell one group from the other. Therefore, it can be concluded the teachers' use of display questions did not reflect the students' English level of English proficiency.

<Table 4> Frequency of teachers' functional questions in listening/speaking activities

	Questions	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Functional Questions	comprehension check	4 (19%)	9 (18%)	4 (12.9%)	16 (27.6%)	23 (36%)	11 (31.4%)	67
	clarification request				2 (3.4%)			2
	confirmation check		3 (6%)	2 (6.5%)	10 (17.2%)	12 (18.8%)	3 (8.6%)	30
	referential			5 (16.1%)	7 (12.1%)	8 (12.5%)	9 (25.7%)	29

	display	8 (38.1%)	24 (48%)	17 (54.8%)	19 (32.8%)	16 (25%)	8 (22.9%)	92
	expressive				1 (1.7%)			1
	rhetorical		1 (2%)	1 (3.2%)		5 (7.8%)	2 (5.7%)	9
	prompt		4 (8%)	2 (6.5%)	2 (3.4%)		1 (2.9%)	9
	procedural	9 (42.9%)	9 (18%)		1 (1.7%)		1 (2.9%)	20
	Total	21	50	31	58	64	35	

b. Referential questions

The frequency of referential questions was 25.7% for teacher F, followed by teacher C (16.1%), teacher E (12.5%), and teacher D (12.1%). Teacher B did not use them at all. Except for teacher F who used referential questions little more than display questions (25.7% vs. 22.9%), teachers D and E used display questions twice or more than referential questions. Taken together, the results of the analysis show that even excellent teachers tended to use display questions more than referential questions. This is consistent with the classic findings of Long & Sato (1983) and Ekasingh (1991) that reported that display questions were used most frequently in ESL classrooms, while referential questions were not used much. The little use of referential questions may be due to primary students' difficulty in speaking with their limited English proficiency (MaNeil, 2012; Wu, 1993). However, considering Brock's (1986) and Brown's (1994) finding that language learners use a longer and more complex sentences in their responses to referential questions, English teachers teaching higher grade-level students need to develop strategies to implement referential questions.

Considering the relationship between the teachers' use of referential questions and the level of the students' English proficiency, it was teacher F only who used referential questions slightly more than display questions, while all the others used display questions far more than referential questions. In this respect, teachers' use of referential questions did not appear to reflect students' level of English ability.

To illustrate teacher F's use of referential questions in her lesson context, she used them in activity 2 and activity 3. Activity 2 consisted of students' conversation with their partners using the expressions they learned, and activity 3 consisted of students' talk in groups. The following shows an example of teacher F's use of referential question in activity 2.

T: You do not study?

S: Yes.

T: At all?

S: Yes.

T: Hag-won-eun? (What about academies?)

S: Hag-won-eun danyeoyo. (I do go to the academies.)

T: Geuleom hag-won sigan-eul jeog-eobwa. (Then write down the academy hours.)

(Teacher F)

In the above dialogue, teacher F was helping a student write by guiding him to think of his daily schedule. Teacher F's questions were not scripted but spontaneous as she communicated with the student. In other words, teacher F's questions in this example shows that her questions were not pre-planned with an expected correct answer but emerged from her talk with the student. This normally happens in a real-life conversation, the only difference between teacher F's conversation with the student and a conversation in a real life situation being that her questions had a pedagogical purpose.

Teachers A and B, who did not ask any referential questions, did speaking activities using picture cards. An excerpt from teacher A's class is provided as follows.

T: (Holding a pocket with cards in it) Who can take the card?

S1: (Picks up a card from the pocket.)

T: What do you want to do?

S1: I want to drink some juice.

(Teacher A)

The design of the activity, which is having students answer questions with answers already prepared in the pocket, appeared to shape the type of questions to be used by the teacher. Therefore, teachers' use of questions can be said to be influenced by the way how teachers structure speaking activities.

Teacher E taught the same communicative function as teacher A - talking about what one wants to do. She used referential questions second most frequently next to teacher F. Teacher E's referential question is illustrated in the excerpt below.

T: Ok, these are your dreams.

How old are you?

How old are you?

Ss: 12, 13 (Students tell their age.)

T: You are 13? 12?

Right.

Your dreams will come true.

(Teacher E)

Teacher E had students write down their dreams on a paper plane and say it as they flew it. The nature of the activity that allowed students to express their ideas affected the teacher's use of questions in turn.

Considering the examples of these two teachers teaching the same communicative expressions, the expert teachers appeared to construct a lesson in a way that creates more opportunity for authentic communication with students.

c. Comprehension check questions

The question that was used second most frequently after display question was comprehension check question. Teacher E used it more than the other teachers (36%), followed by teacher F (31.4%), teacher D (27.6%), teacher A (19%), teacher B (18%) and teacher C (12%). Like the use of display question, the use of comprehension check question reveals the difference between the excellent teachers and the general teachers: Expert teachers appeared to check students' understanding more than the teachers with little expertise. In other words, it discloses that the excellent teachers maintained more interactions with students, one of which form was checking their understanding. On the other hand, no difference in the teachers' use of comprehension check questions was found according to the English level of the classes.

It is interesting to note that teacher E and teacher C, who have the same lesson structure in which they taught mini-lessons followed by questions to check students' understanding, show contrast in their degree of using comprehension check questions: Teacher E used comprehension check questions most frequently of all the 6 teachers (23 times, 36%) while teacher C used least of them (4 times, 12.9%). Unlike teacher C who used comprehension questions during the main instruction only, Teacher E asked them after introducing the title of activity 2, "Today's English culture" and also after giving assignments as well. The 2 teachers' differences in using comprehension question in the same lesson structure suggest that the same lessons could involve diverse interactional patterns.

d. Confirmation check questions

The third most frequently used question was confirmation check question. Teacher E

(18.8%) and teacher D (17.2%) used confirmation check question more than the other teachers. Teacher F (8.6%), teacher C (6.5%) and teacher B (6%) followed teacher E and D in their use of confirmation check question. Teacher A did not use it at all. It shows that confirmation question was used more by excellent teachers than general teachers. No difference according to the English proficiency level of the class was found.

To take an example of the use of confirmation check question, teacher E asked the question most often during students' speaking activities. For example, when she saw students mumbling in a low voice, she listened and asked them, "You want to ...?" or "I want to be a ...?" to check her understanding of the students and encourage them to speak more confidently. Confirmation check question appeared to promote interaction between the teacher and students through teachers' response to student's answer. In this respect, excellent teachers who used more confirmation check questions can be said to be more active in making meaning negotiations with their students.

e. Other questions

Questions other than the ones discussed above took a marginal place in the classes, so they will be discussed together in this section. Procedural question was used by teacher A most frequently (42.9%), followed by teacher B (18%). It was used once by teacher F and D. Teacher C and E did not use it. Procedural questions does not show any difference according to the English proficiency level of the class. The procedural questions commonly used by the teachers were, to take an example, "And next?" and "Are you done?", which played a role of making smooth transitions through lesson activities. The fact that teacher A asked procedural question many times suggests that she may have been concerned about or had some difficulty with managing the class.

Rhetorical question was used more by teacher E and F (7.8% and 5.7%, respectively). Teacher C and teacher B used 3.2% and 2%, respectively, and teacher D did not use any. No patterns between the frequency of the teachers' use and the level of students' English proficiency were found. The fact that teacher E and teacher F used more rhetorical questions than the rest of the teachers suggests that expert teachers used more various types of questions. To take an example of teacher E, she asked herself "What is a casual word?" right after introducing the word "casual word" to her students. Teachers' use of rhetorical questions may indirectly help students with their language acquisition by modeling a variety of questions.

Regarding prompt question, which is used to guide students' utterance, teacher B used 8%, teacher C used 6.5%, teacher D used 3.4%, and teacher F used 2.9%. It is interesting to note that prompt question showed a tendency to be used more by teachers with little expertise.

Clarification request question was not used by any teacher except for teacher D. This question is used as one of meaning negotiation strategies in conversations in real life, together with comprehension check question and confirmation check question. The reason for its little use may be that primary English lessons seldom have occasions in which teachers ask students to explain clearly what they said because lessons deal with basic and simple expressions. In all the 6 classes, clarification request question was used mostly when the teacher asked students to repeat their answers in order to give them feedback about pronunciation or linguistic form, etc, or to have students speak louder, like the example below illustrates.

T: What time do you have breakfast?

S1: I have breakfast at 7:30.

T: I cannot hear. What did you say?

(Teacher D)

In order to induce more interactive dialogic interactions with students, it is necessary for teachers to develop clarification request question strategies appropriate to the language level of the primary English learners. By encouraging students to speak more focusing on the meaning rather than on the form of their utterances, students will gradually learn to express more ideas in English and elaborate on them.

Expressive question is a type of question in which the teacher talks about his or her thoughts or feelings. Like rhetorical question, it does not always demand students' answer. Only teacher D used this question once, as a follow-up of students' response ("Yeah, it's a little bit difficult, is not it?"). It needs to be noted that teacher D used all types of questions except for the rhetorical one. This may suggest that teacher D included diverse ways of interactions by asking diverse types of questions. To put it another way, the scarcity of expressive questions in the 6 classes implies that teachers can engage in more genuine exchange of ideas and feelings with students by using expressive questions.

2. Use of cognitive questions

The sum of the cognitive questions of all teachers shows that convergent question was used 140 times, memory question was used 113 times, divergent question was used 5 times, and evaluative question was used once. <Table 5> analyzes the frequency of the use of cognitive questions among teachers.

<Table 5> Frequency of teachers' cognitive questions in listening/speaking activities

	Questions	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Cognitive Questions	memory	13 (61.9%)	24 (48%)	7 (22.6%)	24 (41.4%)	31 (48.4%)	14 (40%)	113
	convergent	8 (38.1%)	25 (50%)	24 (77.4%)	31 (53.4%)	31 (48.4%)	21 (60%)	140
	divergent		1 (2%)		2 (3.4%)	2 (3.1%)		5
	evaluative				1 (1.7%)			1
	Total	21	50	31	58	64	35	

Convergent question took one half to two-thirds of questions in 4 classes. It also took nearly half of Teacher E's questions (48.4%) and 38.1% of teacher A's questions. The result of the analysis does not show anything related to the level of the English proficiency of the class. It is not related to the teachers' degree of expertise, either.

Convergent questions in elementary English lessons are mostly used to have students speak based on the language form they have learned. The fact that both convergent question and display question took predominant place in all the teachers' question use suggests that the convergent question was often asked in the form of display question.

Memory question also showed high rate of use, taking up nearly half to two-thirds of teachers' questions in 3 classes. Seeing that convergent question and memory question take up most of the questions in all the classes, it can be said that teachers' questions in the classes appeared to be either of the 2 question types most of the time. Anyways, the dominant use of memory questions and convergent questions means that teachers' questions are mainly centered on checking students' memory and understanding of correct knowledge. This finding is consistent with Kim (2015) that found teachers' dependence on low convergent questions – i.e. that checks students' knowledge. Memory question, like convergent question, did not reveal any difference between the two groups of teachers and the levels of English proficiency of the classes, either.

Divergent and evaluative questions were rarely used. Even though divergent questions and evaluative questions may be challenging to beginning English learners, higher grade-level students need the types of questions that decrease the disparity between their cognitive level and their English ability (Kim, 1985). Considering the benefit of divergent questions on the development of language ability (Kang & Shin, 2011) as well as creative thinking

ability, these types of questions are worthy to be integrated in the English classroom.

V. Conclusion and Suggestions

The purpose of this study was to examine the patterns of the types of questions used by the teachers with expertise and little expertise and to find and interpret differences in their use of questions. In addition, this study also attempted to find if the teachers' use of questions reflected the level of English proficiency of their classes. It was found from the study that referential questions, comprehension check questions, and confirmation check questions were used more by excellent teachers in the lesson that was focused on aural language instruction. In the case of cognitive questions, all the teachers showed a tendency to use convergent and memory questions only. Although divergent questions were used only a few times, they were used by two teachers with expertise.

Considering that the referential question not only stimulates language learners to express their ideas and feelings but also further engages them in learning (Brock, 1986), it is necessary to develop referential questions that are appropriate for students' level of language ability and cognitive level. Teachers need to scaffold students' understanding of the referential questions especially in a classroom of beginning learners (McNeil, 2012; Wu, 1993), using strategies such as paraphrasing the questions asked or giving students a longer wait time (Wu, 1993). In addition, providing a supportive classroom environment where students are not afraid to make mistakes or errors in speaking will encourage students to experiment with language and express their ideas and feelings in response to referential questions (Ellis, 1993).

From the analysis of the data, it was discovered that the way teachers organize a lesson may influence their use of questions, which was discussed in the case of teacher F who used referential questions more than display questions, unlike the rest of the teachers. Teacher F's case suggests that teachers are more likely to ask referential questions during the instructional activities that invite students' authentic language use. On the other hand, it was also discovered that lessons with the same communicative function and topic (teacher A and teacher E) or the same lesson structure (teacher C and teacher E) involved different patterns of question use. These contradictory findings from comparing individual teachers point that teachers' question should not be regarded as a fixed method but is variable and fluid, depending on the teachers' choice and decision.

The finding that confirmation check question and comprehension check question were used more by the excellent teachers indicate that expert teachers make more meaningful interaction with students. In respect of cognitive questions, convergent and memory questions accounted for most of teacher questions, whereas divergent and evaluative

questions were rarely used. As with the use of referential questions, divergent questions need to be offered in ways to optimize students' zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978), which would be made possible by teachers' scaffolded questioning strategies and establishment of safe and encouraging classroom environment.

Regarding teachers' question use in relation to the students' level of English proficiency, it appeared that teachers' questions did not reflect students' English ability. Further study needs to investigate teachers' use of questions in classes of different levels of English ability more closely and find effective teacher questioning strategies according to diverse student groups.

This study has limitations that it analyzed video recordings of classrooms only. A study that can incorporate observation of the classroom as well as interview with the teachers to find their perception, belief system, as well as knowledge system would be able to provide a holistic understanding of their expertise. Another limitation of this study is that it examined teachers' questions without considering the context in which they were offered. Analyzing students' talk in interaction with the teacher's questions would offer a better understanding of the role teachers' questions took in particular events of a lesson.

Based on the findings of this study, this study suggests that teacher education program include developing teachers' ability to ask good questions that guides students through their path of learning. Teacher education programs need to provide pre-service and in-service teachers with opportunities to develop their ability to create ZPD with students by making strategic uses of questions. To add, more empirical studies, using both quantitative and qualitative methods, need to be conducted to enrich the discourses about pedagogical questions.

References

- Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*. NY: Longman.
- Brock, C. A. (1986). The effects of referential questions on ESL classroom discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 47-58.
- Cho, H. (2016). Dialogic Space in I-R-E Discourse: Teacher Talk during Storytelling in Elementary English Classrooms. *Primary English Education*, 21(2), 289-313.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as

- "personal" in studies of the personal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19, 487-500
- Cunningham, R. T. (1987). What kind of question is that? In W. Wilen (ed.), *Questions, questioning techniques, and effective teaching* (pp.67-94). Washington D.C.: National Education Association.
- Ekasingh, S. (1991). *Teacher talk: The language of non-native teachers in Thai EFL classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.
- Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 43-71.
- Ellis, K. (1993). *Teacher Questioning Behavior and Student Learning: What Research Says to Teachers*. Paper presented at the 64th Annual Meeting of Western States Communication Association. Albuquerque, NH.
- Guilford, J. P. (1956). The structure of intellect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 53, 267-293.
- Jo, K., Choi., H., & Kim. K. (2017). An analysis of teacher talk of two primary English teachers with different degrees of teaching professionalism. *Foreign Language Education*, 24(2), 207-232.
- Ju, S. O. & Ahn, K. (2015). A case study of expert elementary English teachers' professional development. *Primary English Education*, 21(2), 261-188.
- Kang, H.-J. & Shin, J. C. (2011). A study on the effects of using the teacher's divergent questions in the primary English lessons. *The Journal of Studies in Language*, 27(2), 247-266.
- Kim, J.-S. (2015). On the direction of analyzing and designing questioning types in primary English classroom discourse. *The Journal of Korea Elementary Education*, 26(1), 21-37.
- Kim, Y.-M. (2009). The analysis of teacher's questioning in elementary English classroom. *The New Studies of English Language & Literature*, 43, 185-211.
- Kim, Y. & Kim, J. (2015). An analysis of the effects of elementary English teachers' intensive training using COLT. *Teacher Education Research*, 54(3), 370-380.
- Kwon, Y. H., & Ok, W.-K. (2010). A Qualitative Study of Teacher Questioning Behaviors in Elementary English Classrooms. *Studies in Linguistics*, 17, 1-21.
- Lee, S. (2016). A comparison of teacher talks and student talks in pre-service and in-service elementary English teachers' classes. *Primary English Education*, 22(2), 117-138.
- Lincoln, YS. & Guba, EG. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Long, M., & Sato, C. (1983). Classroom foreigner talk discourse: Forms and functions of teachers' questions. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*(pp. 268-285). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- McNeil, L. (2012). Using talk to scaffold referential questions for English language

- learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(3), 396-404.
- Park, K.-N. (2005). An analysis of teacher talk in primary EFL classrooms. *Foreign Languages Education*, 12(3), 323-353.
- Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Research*, 15(3), 4-14.
- Song, M. & Chung, H. Y. (2013). The characteristics of good English instruction perceived by elementary teachers. *Journal of Education Studies*, 44(2), 1-19.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilen, W. W. (1991). *Questioning skills, for teachers. What research says to the teacher*. Washington D. C.: National Education Association.
- Wu, K. Y. (1993). Classroom interaction and teacher questions revisited. *RELC Journal*, 24, 49-68.

Author

Jang, Yoen-Hee

Daegu Igok Elementary School, 1st author
jyhs333@naver.com

Cho, Hyunhee

Daegu National University of Education, corresponding author
choh718@naver.com