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Abstract

Questioning is an important part of teachers' talk in the ESL/EFL classroom. However, while previous research abroad focuses mainly on questioning division and feedback, less has been written on students' expectations and attitudes towards questioning. Those related studies at home seem to be mainly concerned with present situation exploration. This paper explores teachers' questioning in English classrooms with respect to the seven aspects of questioning: types of questions, questioning strategies, the way questions are answered, answering opportunity, question distribution, wait time, and feedback. Through analysis on the results of a status quo investigation as well as an expectation questionnaire, which was given to 285 students, this paper attempts to describe the existing classroom questioning situation in college English teaching and students' expectations and attitudes towards questioning. By means of interview among the six expectation questionnaire participants, this paper also tries to make sense of the students' interpretation on the expectation survey results. In-depth analysis and discussion about the results are presented.
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1. Introduction

Questioning is one of the most common techniques used by teachers. Teachers' questions can be used to allow the learner to keep participating in the discourse and even modify it so that the language used becomes more comprehensible and personally relevant. Banbrook and Skehan (1989) and 424 Questions have been one of the focus of research attention in language classrooms for many years. Nunan (1991) 1924

Much has been discussed and written on questioning in our country, but most of the work seems to primarily concentrate on present questioning features, description and researchers' suggestions accordingly. There is scant discussion about students' expectations and attitudes towards questioning while these expectations might have the closest and most direct relationship with questioning effectiveness. The present study aims to explore the present questioning situation in our English classroom and more importantly, to explore students' attitudes towards questioning. This is probably not only of practical significance in providing a different direction for reflecting on questioning but also of theoretical importance to some degrees in enriching and broadening questioning study.

2. Previous studies

Questioning research abroad seems to focus mainly on developing taxonomies to describe teacher question types, investigating their respective functions in facilitating students' learning as well as studying
feedbacks Long & Sato 1983 refer to knowledge checking questions as display questions and those to which the teacher does not know the answer as referential questions. Brock’s study 1986 suggests that the use of referential questions increases the amount of learner output and such questions may be an important tool in the language classroom. Lee 2006 argues that display questions are central resources whereby language teachers and students organize their lessons and produce language pedagogy. Mackey & Philp 1998 focuses on one feature of interaction called recasts or corrective feedback. The results suggest that for more advanced learners interaction with intensive recasts may be more beneficial than interaction alone in facilitating an increase in production of targeted higher level morphosyntactic forms. There seems to be no investigation abroad about students’ attitudes towards questioning. The present study aims to address this topic.

Those related studies at home seem to be mainly concerned with present situation exploration. Xu 2003 finds that if teachers can make good use of questioning in class they will make their teaching more effective and he also suggests asking more referential questions to make the class more interactive. Zheng 2003 explores teachers’ questioning from the perspective of anxiety and finds that the more difficult the questions are the more anxious the students turn out random nomination keep students alert and arouse their anxiety. Fear of negative evaluation stimulates quite a few students to adopt avoidance behavior. Hu et al. 2004 conduct a survey on the questioning pattern of four college English teachers in Guangdong University of Foreign Studies focusing on types of questions wait time distribution of questions teacher feedback ways of answering questions and modification techniques. In Kong & Li paper 2007 a qualitative quantitative study is conducted to explore the similarities and differences of one teacher’s questions in two classes the modification strategies adopted by the teacher and the effect of different question types on students’ language output. Still all these studies at home fail to give answers to what the present one is going to focus on students’ expectations and attitudes towards questioning. So this research is expected to fill this gap.

3 Research questions

The present study through both qualitative and quantitative investigations attempts to find out some information about questioning in current English classrooms as well as students’ attitudes towards questioning. The investigatory items are adapted from Li 2006 and Zhu 2007 namely the features of teachers’ questioning behaviors, students’ expectations towards questioning and their assessment to the expectations. To be specific this study aims to answer the following two research questions.

Research question 1
What are teachers’ questioning features in English classroom?

Research question 2
What are students’ expectations for the English teachers’ classroom questioning and their interpretations of these expectations?

4 Methodology

The present study is to find out and describe the typical features of teachers’ questioning and students’ expectations to the English teachers’ classroom questioning as well as their interpretation on it so exploring any causality is not the objective of the study. As a result data will be collected using naturalistic inquiry Allwright & Bailey 1991 methods such as questionnaires and interviews. Students took part in the surveys of “questioning situation in English classroom” and “students’ expectations towards questioning in English classroom”. Students were interviewed about their interpretations on the expectation survey results. The different perspectives elicited by different methods combine to provide a truer picture of your teaching and your students’ learning. Genesee & Upshur 1996 266 Many of the most successful studies have employed multiple data collection procedures Ellis 1994 535.

4 Participants

The survey participants were 285 freshmen and sophomores from nine classes chosen at random from the author’s college including four English major classes and five non-English major classes. They were all native speakers of English and English was their primary foreign language. These students had
been studying English for at least seven years, their ages ranging from 20 to 23. Six students among the survey participants were selected as interviewees. In order to guarantee a broader representative sample, the six interviewees were selected evenly from the advanced, medium, and low levels.

4.2 Data collection

Participants were asked to answer multiple-choice questionnaires. All the questionnaires were written in Chinese in order to avoid misunderstanding by the participants. They were answered anonymously so students would be more open and honest. A pilot study was conducted where an interview among 20 students and six teachers was carried out in order to see whether some questions could be modified to produce better results. According to the proposals received from the pilot study and with the consultation of an English professor in the authors' college, the questionnaires were revised. The questionnaires consisted of seven items. Each item was made up of some sub-items. For example, “Types of Questions” was composed of display and referential questions whose definitions were given afterward in brackets, the former referring to knowledge checking questions and the latter being such questions which the teacher did not know the answer to. The author asked the English teachers of the nine classes to help organize the investigations.

The interview was conducted in Chinese because it provided more opportunity for participants to contribute meaningful and accurate descriptions in a limited time. Participants were told that their answers would be analyzed anonymously and only in research so that they would be more open and honest. The interview was recorded by audio.

4.3 Data analysis

Some questionnaires were excluded in the data analysis for different reasons. If participants’ answers were contradictory; for example, when one participant selected that the teacher mostly used display questions but the same participant again selected that the teacher mostly used referential questions, or if the sub-items to one item were either all chosen or all not chosen. Finally, data from 255 students was found to be valid. Two teachers were asked to do the statistics task and check each other’s result. If there was any inconsistency, they recalculated and decided the right percentage together. In this way a correct figure came out.

Two English teachers were in charge of converting the recorded materials of the interview into written language respectively. They checked each other’s transcriptions. If there was any inconsistency, they listened to the materials again and decided the right expressions together. In this way accuracy was guaranteed. But only typical and representative transcriptions were presented in the form of excerpts or summaries in 5.2 of this paper. As it was impossible and unnecessary to include in one paper those several thousands of transcriptions, many of which were either similar or the same expressions.

5. Results

5.1 Questioning features in English classroom

Major findings from students’ questionnaires concerning questioning in present English classroom were reported in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of different types</td>
<td>Display questions</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions</td>
<td>Referential questions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher questioning strategies</td>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prompting</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decomposition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The features of teachers questioning were analyzed in terms of frequency of different types of questions, teachers questioning strategies, different ways of answering questions, features of answering opportunity, features of question distribution in classroom, wait time and features of teachers feedback. Students' first choices over the above items were respectively: Display questions, Paraphrase, Nomination, Random choice, Random choice, About 10 seconds, and Praise and evaluation.

Students contended that their teachers had a tendency to ask a higher proportion of display questions. In present classrooms, teachers seem to use more topics to check learners' recall of previously presented information but fewer to generate discourse which more nearly resembles the normal conversation learners might experience outside of the classroom. However, students had preference on referential questions in the expectation survey result. But there is one problem that students' language foundation seems to determine which kinds of questions are used more frequently. There is possibly no point in asking too many referential questions among low-level learners.

Among questioning strategies, paraphrase was used most commonly, which was consistent with the result of students expectation investigation that learners preferred paraphrase. We do not mean that paraphrase should be applied all the time, but it is desirable to apply each approach properly so as to benefit learners as much as possible. For example, when most students fail to understand the questions asked, translation might as well be employed so as to make the questions understood directly.

On ways of answering questions, students deemed "Nomination" method was the most used, which was perhaps due to the fact that the teachers liked to nominate those high-proficiency students while "Volunteering" was the first choice in the expectation survey. So it might be our effort direction to reduce nomination and increase volunteering as nomination tends to cause students' stress and tension. Volunteers are usually those active students and proficient learners. And if volunteers answer most of the questions, those with poor language foundation will be denied more opportunities. Then the preferred way perhaps is to let students apply various ways of answering.

About the current condition of answering opportunity, the first choices were "Random choice" and "All the students" which indicated that teachers tried to give each student an equal opportunity and
which was also what students expected as their first two hopes were “All the students” and “Random choice” in the expectation survey results. But there also remains one problem that the inactive and low-level students could not answer even if they were given the opportunity to answer especially when the questions are difficult. Is it feasible to give easy display questions to those inactive weak learners and hard referential questions to active strong learners? Yes it is feasible. In so doing the weak learners can enjoy a sense of achievement while the strong are more competitive.

As far as question distribution was concerned teachers’ questions seemed to spread at random. This indicated that teachers gave every student in class an equal opportunity to participate in the questions. Teachers should avoid calling only those highest achieving students who might give the correct answer to the question in order to maintain the flow of class. At the same time teachers are supposed to ask more questions to underachievers especially those knowledge checking questions so that the whole class can make progress simultaneously.

With reference to wait time most students chose about 10 seconds. This showed when the students had classes their teachers allowed them suitable length of time after a question. Within too short a time it is hard for learners to comprehend and begin to respond. But waiting too long also causes the problem of wasting time and getting students annoyed.

We found “Praise and evaluation” approach was the most employed one which suggested teachers were cautious with using negative feedback. Positive feedback can give students confidence in learning as well as decrease their anxiety. We might as well consider using more. Giving explicit negative feedback would not only attack the student who is being criticized but also would affect other students which would eventually influence the whole classroom atmosphere. Therefore rare occurrence of explicit negative feedback is expected.

5 Students’ expectation towards teachers’ questioning

The questionnaire findings of students’ preference for teachers’ questioning were listed in Table 2.

Table 2 Students’ reference for questioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different types of questions</td>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>DQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning strategies</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways of answering questions</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering opportunity</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question distribution in classroom</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>About 10s</td>
<td>About 5s</td>
<td>About 3s</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers feedback</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Simple Praise</td>
<td>I  and C</td>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>Correcting Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the numbers are as a percentage. RQ = Referential questions, DQ = Display questions, Teacher S = Teacher self-answer SS = Students’ answers in 10 seconds, F = Praise and evaluation, E = Eliciting students self-correction, and C = Ignoring and correcting later.

Students’ first choices over the investigated items in the expectation survey were in order
Referential questions [Paraphrase] Volunteering [All Students] Random choice [About 10 seconds] and Praise and evaluation [The interviewees later expressed their interpretations and ideas about these survey results]

We found that students tended to appreciate referential questions more than display questions. The rationale of such a preference might be due to what was reported in EXCERPT 1 from the interview transcriptions. The original excerpt was in Chinese and the author translated it into English. The remaining interview excerpts were also translated.

EXCERPT 1
[Student 2]
Student 2: I like being asked referential questions. This kind of question encourages diverse student responses and requires students to engage in high-level thinking. And can train our spoken English. We can communicate with the teacher or other students right. In so doing, our communicative ability and learning enthusiasm get developed.

At the same time, another student expressed differently in the following excerpt.

EXCERPT 2
[Student 1]
Student 3: Display questions are also very necessary in class because these questions serve to facilitate the recall of information. We can learn the meaning and structure of the text. The language points. So, we hope teachers hold a good balance between two kinds of questions in class.

It could be judged that although students preferred referential questions, they thought display questions were necessary. So teachers are supposed to hold a certain balance between two kinds of questions in real class.

For the questioning strategies, a majority of students were fond of paraphrase strategy. One interviewed student told the researcher his interpretation in the following excerpt.

EXCERPT 3
[Student 1]
Student 1: When there are some difficulties in answering the present question, teachers rephrase by means of simple words, phrases and sentences. I think in this way, we go over old knowledge as well as learn new thing.

Despite this, the author proposes that in different circumstances, some strategies can be focused on rather than just concentrating on one the entire time. For example, if students with poor academic backgrounds fail to understand questions, teachers might as well apply translation to help those students directly understand and answer the questions because paraphrasing will make them even more complex and hard to answer.

Up to 63% of students preferred volunteers to answer questions. Students' assessments could be seen in Excerpt 4 [5].

EXCERPT 4
[Student 3]
Student 3: Volunteers should be asked to answer the question because they are so active and usually they have got ready for the answers. Why not let them?

EXCERPT 5
[Student 6]
Student 6: Volunteers get the opportunity to express ideas and construct knowledge by themselves. At the same time, classroom atmosphere gets activated. Students' courage trained and their self-confidence built up.

It seems appropriate for volunteers to answer. But if teachers always ask the volunteers to answer, the class will be dominated by them. Then how do we treat non-volunteers? This calls for our full attention.
because a class has both volunteers and non-volunteers generally.

In the aspect of answering opportunity and questioning distribution, students maintained that teachers should be equal and fair in distributing questions. They expected their teacher to pay attention to all the students. They even suggested that teachers should ask more questions to underachievers so that the whole class could make progress simultaneously. So teachers should avoid calling only those highest achieving students. For this purpose, teachers are required to have such information about students as proficiency level, personalities and individual cognitive styles so that teachers can ask right students right questions.

Nearly half of the students wanted the average wait time to be about 10 seconds. They gave some explanations in the following excerpts:

**EXCERPT 6**

Student 5: Five minutes is enough in my opinion within a short time it is hard for us to comprehend a question, consider the available information, formulate a meaningful answer and begin to respond. Waiting too long also causes the problem of wasting time and students to get annoyed.

**EXCERPT 7**

Student 4: I think the length of wait time could depend on the question difficulty. If students can answer quickly wait time can be short. But if students can think on the question utilizing time a wait of proper length should be provided.

It is reasonable that wait time is up to questions difficulty or easiness.

Up to 66% of the questionnaire participants demanded teachers' praise and evaluation feedback and only 33% wanted correcting errors.

Excerpt 8: 9 contained students' interpretations.

**EXCERPT 8**

Student 3: Feedback with explanation in details is more favorable because this type of feedback can not only explain to us why the answer is true or false but also increase motivation and build a supportive classroom climate.

**EXCERPT 9**

Student 4: I like feedback plus explanation. I hope teachers give feedback that can elaborate explain or justify our contributions. It is useful. Correcting errors often seems to cause students to be afraid of feeling like taking risks to respond to have esteem threatening influence or even to put learners on the defensive.

It could be inferred that learners preferred to receive teachers' positive feedback when they responded. Teachers should be cautious with using negative feedback.

The present study indicated that teachers ignored some of the students' expectations. For instance, they were unaware of students' expectations in terms of types of questions as well as ways students answer. It is hence necessary for teachers to analyze students' needs and to decide what most students expect. Only by then can teachers adjust their teaching performance in an attempt to maximize students' enthusiasm and participation in answering teachers' questions.

**6 Discussions**

This paper attempts to find out the existing situation about questioning in English teaching and students' expectations and attitudes towards questioning. This paper also tries to make sense of students'
Exploration of Teachers' Questioning in English Classrooms

Status Quo

Students' Expectations

Descriptions and comments on the expectation questionnaires outcomes. We get some multidimensional characteristics of English classroom questioning and some pedagogical implications. Firstly, teachers have higher frequency use of display than referential questions but students want more referential questions as referential questions are more beneficial to their language learning. Students express that display questions also useful.

It is generally believed that referential is more efficient. The use of referential questions increases the amount of leaner output creates a flow of information from students to teachers and generates discourse which more nearly resembles the normal conversation learners experience outside of the class. Brock 1986, Nunan 1987. However, Lee 2006 argues that display questions are central resources whereby language teachers and students organize their lessons and produce language pedagogy. So it is advisable that on the basis of learners' levels and lesson's purpose teachers need to increase the number of referential questions to a proper ratio.

Secondly, paraphrase is the most frequently employed technique of questioning strategies. Paraphrase is also expected to be the most effective technique. The interviewees believe that it is advantageous for students to think in the target language when teachers paraphrase questions with similar or easier words or phrases or sentence structures.

A study by White and Lightbown 1984 suggests that paraphrase is very effective which can make a question appropriately comprehensible and answerable within the learners' subject matter and L2 competence. But under different circumstances it seems preferable that different strategies can be focused on rather than just concentrating on one. As it has been mentioned that when most students fail to understand hard questions it is acceptable to employ translation. In such a situation, if teachers still stick to paraphrasing in English it will only make the questions even more complex and hard to answer.

Thirdly, most questions are answered by means of nomination while students present a preference to the volunteers answering questions because this method can direct students to think and answer questions individually and train their courage.

Volunteers answering questions already have the above-mentioned advantages. At first sight, it seems a favorable phenomenon however that is not the case if explored further. If the teachers always ask the volunteers to answer the class will be dominated by them and the non-volunteering students will lose chances to answer questions. He 2007 Teachers are called to pay attention to all the students in class and should be fair in distributing questions to high achievers, average students, and low achievers including volunteers and non-volunteers.

Fourthly, teachers mainly tend to let learners answer on the basis of random choice. Students favor questions that go to all the students or at random. In students' interpretation, by distributing response opportunities widely all learners are kept alert and given an opportunity to respond.

Teachers' attention zones should cover the whole territory of the classroom so that all the students will feel that they are treated equally and have the enthusiasm to answer the present question. Distributing response opportunities widely is a simple idea but difficult to implement. It requires careful monitoring of students and a great deal of a teacher's attention.

Fifthly, both the current condition and expectation questionnaires reveal “Random part” is the most useful distribution pattern. Students think that allocating questions to every direction rather than to certain districts can maximize students' enthusiasm and participation in answering teachers' questions.

Although teachers generally try to treat students fairly and give every student in the class an equal opportunity to participate in the lesson it is often hard to avoid interacting with some students more than others. This creates what is referred to as the teacher's action zone. Freiberg and Driscoll 2000:223 it is common that teachers have their own action zones when asking questions but do not forget the equality concept.

Sixthly, more than half of the students think that the mean wait time is about 10 seconds. The first
choice is also about 10 seconds in the expectation questionnaire. Students’ beliefs are that questions can not be pondered to a full extent and answered properly within too short a time, while some students tend to get upset during too long a time.

When wait time is increased to three to five seconds, the amount of student participation as well as the quality of that participation often increased. Long et al. (1984) cited in Richards (1996). Nevertheless, the research by Long and Crookes (1986) discovered that increased wait time did not lead to greater mastery of content by ESL students, cited in Nunan (1991). Perhaps a 10-second wait time is reasonable, which is also the length students appreciated more in the expectation survey.

Just as it is that a question difficulty or easiness might affect the length of wait time, which is discussed in 5(1) of the paper. We need to consider a question’s purpose. If it is to test whether students have good mastery of certain specific facts, it could be short; but if it is to go beyond recall of information and demonstrate a personal grasp of the material using explanation, summary, or elaboration, teachers need to give students more time in order to speak their opinion extensively.

Seventhly, praise plus evaluation is applied more than any other kinds of feedback. The first choice of praise and evaluation in the expectation questionnaire is: Students maintain that positive feedback with explanation provides them with not only motivating confidence but also the difference between right and wrong answers.

Positive feedback can give students confidence in learning, decrease their anxiety as well as convey certain information of where the mistakes lie. We might as well consider using this more. Providing students with proper assessment after their response is necessary. “For any sort of comment to be effective, reasons for the teacher’s approval or disapproval needed to be stated.” If not on the other hand, it fails to provide this kind of information. It could have entirely the opposite effect.” Williams (1994, p. 135, 136).

Giving explicit negative feedback would not only attack the student who is being criticized, lowering his learning enthusiasm but it may also affect other students which would eventually influence the whole classroom atmosphere. Therefore, it is desirable to be cautious about adopting negative feedback.

7 Conclusion

Combining qualitative and quantitative description and analysis, this paper explores teachers’ questioning in English classrooms and students’ expectations and attitudes towards questioning. Especially, exploration of students’ expectations will perhaps help to extend our horizons of thinking concerning questioning performance in a different perspective and thus improve our questioning skills. This study is carried out on a small scale in one school. Certainly, it is necessary to conduct more research further in different schools in order to arrive at a more convincing claim.

Note
1 For the questionnaires, please contact the author at xiazhanghong@hzvtc.net
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