Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

STRATEGY OF GIVING WAITING TIME TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ASKED BY ARABIC LANGUAGE TEACHERS TO MADRASAH TSANAWIYAH STUDENTS

FAHRUROJI
Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia. Email: fahruroji@uninus.ac.id

ALFI MUFTIN
Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia. Email: alfimuftin_pais2_2020@uninus.ac.id

ARIPIN
Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia. Email: aripin_pais2_2020@uninus.ac.id

Abstract

This research discusses the provision of waiting time to answer questions given by inexperienced Arabic teachers and experienced Arabic teachers at the Madrasah Tsanawiyah level. Waiting time is classified into waiting time for questions that get an immediate response (waiting time I and waiting time II) and for questions that don't get an immediate response (waiting time I phase I-II and waiting time II). This research is a case study research with qualitative and quantitative approaches. The data was obtained from the results of class observations. The results showed that first, inexperienced teachers asked the types of questions to remember, understand, apply, and analyze. Experienced teachers ask the types of questions to remember, understand, apply, analyze, and evaluate. Second, the cognitive level of questions asked by inexperienced and experienced teachers only affects the length of waiting time for questions that get an immediate response. The cognitive level of the questions asked by the two teachers was not related to the length of waiting time I phase I-II and waiting time II for questions that did not immediately get a response. Third, the types of questions that facilitate student participation are the types of remembering, understanding, applying, and analyzing questions. Fourth, giving a waiting time of less than three seconds occupies the highest position, both for questions that get a direct response or an indirect response. Thus, it can be concluded that there is no difference in the use of question types and the provision of waiting time by inexperienced and experienced teachers.

Keywords: Giving Waiting Time, Arabic Teacher Questions, Arabic Language

INTRODUCTION

The use of questioning strategies and the provision of waiting times by teachers cannot be underestimated because these two things can affect the teaching and learning process in the classroom. In addition to a teacher's skills in using questioning strategies and providing waiting time to create an effective learning environment, long teaching experiences can also distinguish a teacher's effectiveness in teaching (The New Teacher Project, 2012). Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger (2006) stated that on average, a teacher who has several years of teaching experience is more effective than a new teacher. Ladd (2013) in his research states that on average experienced teachers are more effective in improving student learning outcomes than teachers who have little experience. However, Goldbold (1970) in his research on the relationship between experience and the use of

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

questions at the elementary school level did not show the effect of differences in teacher experience in asking questions.

Regarding the two most important educational goals, namely retention and transfer, teachers not only make students remember what they have learned (retention), but also teachers must make students understand and be able to use what they have learned (transferring) (Anderson & Krathwohl , 2001; Collins, 2014). In other words, teachers must also develop cognitive processes that go beyond the cognitive level of remembering to foster meaningful learning (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Therefore, teachers need to classify the categories of cognitive processes that must be taught. In addition to its role in classifying educational goals, Bloom's Taxonomy also plays a role in classifying questions in class (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). Related to this, this research focuses on the strategy of asking questions and giving waiting time by Arabic teachers who have different years of teaching experience in an Arabic class interaction as a strategy to facilitate student participation.

With regard to good questions, teachers should provide quality questions, even if in small numbers. However, what is happening today is that teachers ask too many questions without paying attention to their quality (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). If a teacher asks too many questions, these questions can be a barrier to an interactive learning process (Brown, 2001). Therefore, teachers should not only consider the quantity of questions, but also consider the quality of the questions.

If the teacher expects an interactive class, the teacher must be able to motivate students to be involved in a discussion in class. One way to do this is by asking effective questions. Critelli & Tritapoe (2010) explain that effective teachers will consider every level of cognitive processes to encourage students to make inferences, relationships, and applications from the information they get in class.

Types of questions based on cognitive processes that have been revised by Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) consist of six categories developed into 9 subcategories. Three categories of questions, namely remembering, understanding, and applying are included in the low cognitive level (Banks, 2012). Meanwhile, the other three categories of questions, namely analyzing, evaluating, and creating are included in the high cognitive level (Banks, 2012). The reasons for using Bloom's Taxonomy according to Armstrong (2015) are 1) teachers can benefit from setting teaching goals, planning and delivering appropriate instructions, 2) designing the validity of task assessments and strategies, 3) ensuring that instructions and task assessments and strategies are in line with the objectives teaching.

There are several strategies teachers can use to facilitate student participation and can help teachers improve the use of questions in the classroom. One of these strategies is the use of waiting time (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). In accordance with the statement of Critelli & Tritapoe (2010) waiting time is a factor that affects participation. Waiting time is a way of giving students sufficient time to process information and formulate answers.

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

The use of waiting time as a strategy to facilitate student participation can be divided into two waiting periods, namely waiting time I and waiting time II (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011; Cotton, 2001; Rowe, 1986). Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman (2011) explain that waiting time I is the average amount of time given by the teacher to wait after asking a question. This waiting time period lasts about one second. Furthermore, Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman (2011) state that if students cannot think quickly to respond in this period of time, teachers usually repeat questions, ask different questions, or call other students. Regarding the situation when students do not respond to teacher questions, Iksan and Daniel (2015) state that when students do not respond to teacher questions, waiting time I is divided into two phases, namely waiting time I phase I and waiting time I phase II. Phase I waiting time is the pause between the student's question and the teacher's reaction. Phase II waiting time is the pause between the teacher's reaction and the student's response.

Meanwhile, waiting time II is a pause given after students respond to questions. The average waiting time is 0.9 seconds. Usually, the provision of waiting time II is followed by the teacher's reaction or the teacher asks another question (Rowe, 1970; Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). However, the short time will affect the quality of students' answers. Therefore, by giving the time from one second to three or five seconds, significant changes can occur in the classroom (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011).

The use of questions and waiting times influence each other. Tobin (1987) shows the results of research from Boeck & Hillenmeyer (1979), Arnold, Atwood, & Rogers (1974), and Jones (1980) that longer waiting times are given for questions at higher cognitive levels. From some of the results of these studies, Tobin (1987) concluded that shorter waiting times were given for questions of remembering, recalling, repeating, or other exercise activities that require less time. However, teachers can use an average of between 3 and 5 seconds when questions are used to stimulate higher cognitive processes. Therefore, by increasing the waiting time, the teacher can improve the students' thinking process to a higher cognitive level. Regarding the use of questions at a certain cognitive level, one hypothesis from a study conducted by Godbold (1970) states that a teacher's teaching experience can be a factor that affects the number and cognitive level of questions that teachers ask. However, when viewed from the cognitive level of the questions asked, Godbold's research (1970) shows that there is no difference in the cognitive level of questions used by teachers who have teaching experience for two years or less and five years or more at the elementary and junior high school levels.

There are several studies that support and break the link between teaching experience and teacher performance in teaching. Ladd (2013) states that a teacher will become better according to the length of his teaching experience. Furthermore, Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger (2006) stated that teachers who have more experience are more effective than teachers who are new to teaching. Then, Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor (2006) stated that little by little teachers reach the peak of teaching in the third year or so. On the other hand, Sass, Hannaway, Xu, & Figlio (2010) stated that some inexperienced teachers are more effective than more experienced teachers. In line with Sass, Hannaway, Xu, & Figlio

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

(2010), Rice (2010) and The New Teacher Project (2012) state that experience can help a person in teaching, but teachers with longer experience are not always better because teacher performance varies all levels of their experience.

RESEARCH METHOD

The approach used in this research is a qualitative and quantitative approach. The subjects of this research are two Arabic language teachers who teach in class VIII. The first teacher (MA) is a teacher who has only six months of teaching experience. The second teacher (YW) is a teacher who has six years of teaching experience. These two teachers were selected based on convenience sampling or often called accidental or opportunity sampling (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The labeling of an inexperienced teacher is limited to teachers with less than three years of experience. This is determined by taking into account the statement of Clotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor (2006) that teachers reach peak teaching in the third year or so. Meanwhile, the labeling of experienced teachers is limited to teachers who have more than three years of teaching experience.

Collecting data in this study through observations of teachers who are conducting the teaching and learning process. During observation, researchers collect information manually and electronically (Nunan & Bailey, 2009). Manual data collection was carried out using field notes and class observation checklists. The form of field notes used in this study was adapted from Marshall & Rossman (1999), while the class observation checklist in this study replicated that of Lewis (1961). Meanwhile, electronic data collection is done using video recordings (Richard & Lockart, 1996). There are two data from this study, namely transcripts of video recordings and transcripts of audio recordings. Video recording transcripts focus on teacher questions and student answers as a form of participation, while audio recording transcripts focus on using waiting time.

Observations in this study were conducted four times for each teacher, so the total number of observations made was eight meetings. Observations were made only in the same two classes until the observation ended. The schedule of data collection through class observations was adjusted to the schedule of Arabic subjects delivered in each class, so that the first observation was carried out in the MA class. The teacher delivers one subject matter in two to four meetings. Teachers usually deliver material related to one genre in four meetings. In this study, four meetings were delivered to discuss one genre material, namely descriptive text. Descriptive text material was chosen because when data collection took place, the teacher was just starting to give this material to students. This study only focused on questions that were asked orally by the teacher and answered orally by the students. The questions that were given in writing were then discussed orally, and were not used as data in this study. This is done because this research is related to the provision of waiting time after the question is asked orally by the teacher.

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

The data analysis used in this research is analytic procedure (Marshall & Rossman, 1999), namely:

1. Organizing the data, the researcher analyzed the data from field notes and checklists. Then the researchers matched with data from video recordings. Researchers transferred the videotape to a computer for easy analysis. Then the video is carefully examined repeatedly.
2. The process of creating categories, themes, and patterns, the researcher identifies the categories that are important and fundamental to the meaning expressed by the participants. The researcher identified and classified the types of questions used by the teacher in the classroom. Classification is done based on Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Karthwohl, 2001). For the classification of waiting time, researchers convert video recordings into audio form using a wavepad. Wavepad is a software used for editing sound or other audio recordings. The purpose of using wavepad in this research is to make it easier to analyze waiting time accurately.
3. The researcher uses several codes to shorten the analyzed segment. Some of the codes used were adapted from Wu (1993), Thornbury (1996), and Mackey & Gass (2005).
4. The researcher examines the emerging understanding. The researcher must determine the extent to which the data are useful in providing a clear picture of the research question.
5. Look for alternative possible results that appear. Researchers must critically relate one data to another when finding categories and patterns in the data. At this stage, the researcher searches for, identifies, describes, and demonstrates the most plausible explanation among other explanations.
6. Researchers write reports. Writing reports is a staple of the analytical process. Written reports remain the main way to report research results.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings in this study answered four sub-topics of research questions, namely the types of questions asked by the teacher, the relationship between question types and waiting time, types of questions that facilitate student participation, and waiting times that facilitate student participation. Here is the discussion.

1. The Use of Question Types by Teachers Who Have Differences in Teaching Length

This study shows that based on the classification of Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) inexperienced teachers only ask types of questions at the level of remembering, understanding, applying, and analyzing. The type of evaluating and creating questions is not asked at all during the class interaction. Meanwhile, experienced teachers use

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

question types at the level of remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, and evaluating. The types of questions at the creative level are not asked at all during the class interaction. The following is a table of the percentage of use of question types by the two seventh grade Arabic teachers who have different teaching lengths.

Table 1. Percentage of Use of Question Types by Inexperienced Teachers and Experienced Teachers

Question Types	Inexperienced Teacher Question Types Experienced Teacher		Experienced Teacher Types	
Remembering	107	40.07%	214	59.61%
Understanding	129	48.31%	95	26.46%
Apply	27	10.11%	24	6.69%
Analyzing	4	1.50%	19	5.29%
Evaluating	0	0.00%	7	1.95%
Creating	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total (%)	267	100.00%	359	100.00%

One of the types of questions asked by inexperienced teachers during class interaction is understanding. The percentage of understanding question types is not much different from the remembering question type. Understanding is the type of question that has the highest percentage, which is 48.31%. Questions at the level of understanding are questions that are at a higher level than remembering. The purpose of education in the process of understanding is to foster transferability (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). The following is an example of using the understanding question type by less experienced teachers.

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

Example 1: Observation 1

T:	Ok. I'll give you an example. (T re-explains the narrative text by giving an example of the text that has been given to Ss at the previous meeting. T then gives an example of a descriptive text). What is the difference between descriptive and narrative? From what is described? Guess what?
S:	(Not responding)
T:	From yesterday we explained. Guess what?
S:	(Not responding)
T:	What?
S:	(Not responding)
T:	What's the difference with narrative? =
S3:	Narrative mah tells المدرسة the same...
T:	Ok, if narrative is not fiction, I'm sorry, if narrative is fiction. If it's descriptive? =
S4:	describe facts=

Based on example 1 above, the underlined questions are questions in the understanding category. In the process of understanding, students must demonstrate personal understanding of a material. This can be seen if the learner is able to interpret, is able to provide an overview using his own words, and is able to use his personal understanding in making comparisons (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). This opinion is in line with the opinion of Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) which explains that cognitive processes in the category of understanding include interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, concluding, comparing, and explaining. The questions in Example 1 above are asked when the teacher wants to check the students' understanding by making comparisons. The process of comparing involves the learner to detect similarities and differences between two or more objects. Anderson & Krathwohl (2001) explain that when students are given new information, they detect its association with familiar knowledge. In the case of example 1 above, the teacher provides new information, namely the definition, الكلمات/ and the general structure of a descriptive text. Next, the teacher asks the question "What is the difference between narrative and narrative?". The teacher only refers to the narrative text because the teacher explains back to the students by giving examples of the type of narrative text. Giving examples of narrative text aims to be compared with the descriptive text that is being delivered.

One type of question that experienced teachers ask is analysis. The type of question at the analyzing level has a percentage of 5.29%. Questions at the analyzing level are asked to identify the motives, reasons, or causes of a specific event (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2001). Analyze-level questions are asked when teachers want to develop the learner's ability to, for example, find evidence supporting the author's goals (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001).

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

Example 2: Observation 3

T	: *نعم, لماذا تختار كرة القدم؟* (T ask to S11)
S11	: *أه, لأن فى تلك اللعبة تحدث أشياء متوترة*
T	: *تحدث أشياء متوترة. طيب, وغيرها؟*
S11	: *كلا النادين فى ملعب كرة القدم يقدمان أفضل ما لديهما , حتى يهتف الجمهور.*
T	: *هذا فقط, هذا هو وصف جميل.*

Based on the example 2 above, the teacher asked the reason for the students to make a descriptive essay entitled Football Match. In this case, the learner determines the decision or purpose behind the communication (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Reasons like, " *اللعبة تحدث أشياء متوترة*" and " *كلا النادين فى ملعب كرة القدم يقدمان أفضل ما لديهما , حتى يهتف الجمهور*" point of view in determining the title "اللعبة القدم". In general, based on the results of observations that have been made, the two teachers asked several types of questions during class interaction. Inexperienced teachers ask questions from the cognitive level of remembering to the cognitive level of analyzing. Experienced teachers ask questions from the cognitive level of remembering to the cognitive level of evaluating. This type of evaluation question is only asked by experienced teachers. Inexperienced teachers don't ask questions of this type at all. Questions at the evaluating level are the types of questions with a low percentage, which is 1.97%. It can be said that the two teachers did not pay much attention to this type of question. The types of questions at the creative level were not asked at all by the two teachers. Therefore, it can be concluded that the two teachers asked a lot of questions that fall into the lower-level cognitive domain. Types of questions at a higher cognitive level (higher-level cognitive domain) are more often ignored during class interactions.

2. The relationship between the use of question types and the provision of waiting time by teachers who have different experiences

In this section, the researcher discusses the effect of using question types on the length of waiting time given by inexperienced and experienced teachers. Waiting time in this study includes waiting time I and waiting time II (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). Waiting time I is the pause after the teacher asks a question (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). If the student immediately takes over the speech after the teacher asks the question, the waiting time I in this case is 0 seconds. The number 0 seconds represents the definition without a pause (Iksan & Daniel, 2015). Meanwhile, waiting time II is a pause after students respond to questions. The provision of waiting time II is usually followed by the teacher's reaction (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). Just like waiting time I, waiting time II counts as 0 seconds if the teacher immediately takes over the speech after the student responds.

Waiting time I and waiting time II are also distinguished based on questions that directly get a response from students and questions that don't get a response from students. Waiting time I for questions that do not immediately get a response from students is divided into waiting time I phase I and waiting time I phase II (Ikhsan & Daniel, 2015).

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

This division is done to facilitate data analysis. In accordance with the statement of Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman (2011) that if the student does not answer the question within an average period of one second, the teacher usually reacts by repeating the question, repeating the word, or giving instructions with the aim of getting a response from the student. Therefore, this study also discusses questions that do not immediately get a response from students and analyzes the waiting time that the teacher gives when this question gets the student's answer.

In general, the waiting time given by inexperienced teachers and experienced teachers for questions that immediately get responses from students is not much different. The average waiting time I and II given are less than three seconds. The following is a table of the average waiting time given by the two teachers for each type of question that immediately received a response from students.

Table 2. Comparison of Average Waiting Time for Types of Questions that Get Responses Immediately from Students

Average Waiting Time (seconds)	Inexperienced Teacher			
	Remembering	Understanding	Applying	Analyzing
Waiting Time I	0.473	0.497	1.148	1.889
Waiting Time II	0.257	0.306	1.608	0.350
Average Waiting Time (seconds)	**Experienced Teacher**			
	Remembering	**Understanding**	**Applying**	**Analyzing**
Waiting Time I	0.333	0.453	1.061	1.121
Waiting Time II	0.217	0.168	0.117	0.203

Based on Table 2 above, the average waiting time I given for each type of question that immediately received a response from students increased. Inexperienced teachers give waiting time I for the type of recall question with an average of 0.473 seconds, understand 0.497 seconds, apply 1.148 seconds, and analyze 1.889 seconds. Experienced teachers give waiting time I for the type of remembering questions with an average of 0.333 seconds, understanding 0.453 seconds, applying 1.061 seconds, and analyzing 1.121 seconds. Tobin (1987) shows the results of research from Boeck & Hillenmeyer (1979), Arnold, Atwood, & Rogers (1974), and Jones (1980) that longer waiting times are given after asking questions at a higher cognitive level. When questions are needed to stimulate cognitive processes at a higher level, teachers can take an average of three to five seconds (Tobin, 1987). However, in this study, the average waiting time for the analyzing type did not reach an average of three to five seconds. This type of question has received responses from students in less than three seconds. Meanwhile, the average waiting time II given by inexperienced and experienced teachers is less than the average waiting time I. The following is an example of a waiting time that immediately gets a response from a learner for an apply question type. This question is asked by an inexperienced teacher during the class interaction.

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

Example 3: Observation 6

Teacher/ Student	Conversation	Waiting Time I (second)	Waiting Time I (second)
T	(T: Ask the students one by one to present in front of the class. After finishing, T: asked some questions) Yes, Rizki. قلت لي أن لديك خطًا ، هل يمكنك وصف شكل خطك؟ بالنسبة للون أو أنواع الخط مثل السياحات أو أسماء الحسنى ، كيف تبدو خطك؟	5.541	
S1	أه... الخط ... أه... مستطيل ... ناعم ... أحمر وأزرق ، ثم ... الصلاة.		0.724
T	الصلاة. اي نوع من الصلاة؟ شها دة ؟ ام اسماء الحسنى .... ما هذا؟	0.702	

Based on Table 3 above, the average waiting time for Phase I given by inexperienced teachers increases when asking questions at a high cognitive level, which is 4,242 seconds. In addition to giving a portion of time for analyzing question types, the teacher also gives a portion of time for types of questions at a low cognitive level, namely understanding questions. The average waiting time for phase I for the recall question type is 3,156 seconds. Meanwhile, the average waiting time for phase II given for analyzing question types is 6,345 seconds. This average waiting time is the longest average waiting time for phase II. However, the provision of waiting time II for the type of analyzing question lasted for an average of 0 seconds. Based on Table 3, the average waiting time for II is shorter than the average for waiting time I for phase I and waiting time for phase II. In other words, inexperienced teachers' pay little attention to waiting time II.

Meanwhile, the longest average waiting time given by experienced teachers is the average waiting time for applying question types. The average waiting time for phase I is 4,810 seconds, the average waiting time for phase II is 1,460 seconds, and waiting time II is 1,444 seconds. Based on the data in Table 3 above, experienced teachers give a portion of waiting time on types of questions that are at a low cognitive level, namely applying. According to Banks (2012) the types of applying questions include questions at a low cognitive level. However, the average waiting time for analyzing question types is the second longest after applying question types. Experienced teachers give a portion of

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

waiting time for the analyzing type, but not as long as that given for the applying type. On the other hand, waiting time II given by experienced teachers is less than other waiting times. Therefore, overall it can be concluded that inexperienced and experienced teachers pay little attention to waiting time II. The following is an example of giving waiting time I phase I, waiting time I phase II, and waiting time II by experienced teachers for questions that do not get a direct response from students.

Example 4: Observation 1

Teacher/ Student	Conversation	Waiting time I Fase I (detik)	Waiting time I Fase II (detik)	Waiting time II (detik)
T	*الفلاح يزرع النباتات*الفلاح النباتات. (T continues discussing and translating the text) there is. الاعشاب النباتات هي	0.834		
Ss	(not responding)			
T	*الاعشاب*		0.000	
S14	: herbs			0.000

Based on example 4 above, the teacher tells the equivalent of the word النباتاتcathedral is الاعشاب church. Next, the teacher asks the question "ماالنباتات؟ النباتات؟" to students. In this case, the student did not give an answer after the teacher gave a phase I waiting time of 0.834 seconds. In this type of recall question, the teacher gives a waiting time of less than one second to ask the question again (Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2011). After giving a waiting time of 0.834 seconds, the teacher re-asked the question " النباتات" and the students responded immediately without any time lag. The waiting time for Phase II after the teacher repeats the question is 0 seconds. Meanwhile, waiting time II lasts for 0 seconds after the student answers the question. In other words, the teacher takes over the speech again to ask another question.

3. Types of Questions that Facilitate Student Participation

The types of questions that facilitate student participation are limited to the types of questions that get a direct response from students and those that do not get a response from students. Inexperienced teachers asked 219 facilitating questions out of a total of 267 questions. A total of 195 out of 219 questions received direct responses from students. The percentage of the number of these questions is 89.04%. Meanwhile, as many as 24 out of 219 (10.96%) questions did not get a direct response from students. All types of questions asked by inexperienced teachers facilitate student participation. The percentage of question types that facilitate the most are understanding question types.

Meanwhile, experienced teachers asked 271 questions which facilitated participation out of a total of 359 questions. A total of 231 of the 271 questions asked by experienced teachers received direct responses from students. The percentage of the number of these

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

questions is 85.24%. Meanwhile, as many as 40 of the 271 questions asked did not get a direct response from the students. The percentage of the number of these questions is 14.76%. The types of questions that facilitate student participation are the types of remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing questions, while the types of evaluating questions do not facilitate student participation. The percentage of question types that facilitate the most are the types of remembering questions.

4. Waiting Time That Facilitates Student Participation

Inexperienced teachers give many portions of waiting time I and waiting time II for less than three seconds. The percentages of waiting time I and II which lasted less than three seconds for questions that immediately received responses from students were 97.95% and 96.92%, respectively. In this case, the waiting time for questions that get an immediate response from students is less than three seconds. The provision of waiting time by inexperienced teachers for questions that do not immediately get responses from students lasts less than three seconds with a percentage of waiting time I phase I as much as 75.00%, waiting time I phase II as much as 79.17%, and waiting time II as much as 79.17%.

Just like inexperienced teachers, experienced teachers provide a large portion of waiting time I and waiting time II for less than three seconds. The percentages of waiting time I and II which lasted less than three seconds for questions that immediately received responses from students were 99.13% and 100.00%, respectively. In other words, students can answer the teacher's questions in a short time so that the waiting time given by the teacher is short. The waiting time given by experienced teachers for questions that do not immediately get a response from students is less than three seconds. The percentage of waiting time I phase I is 85%, waiting time I phase II is 100%, and waiting time II is 100%. In this case, experienced teachers simply don't give a portion of waiting time of up to three or five seconds. The teacher immediately repeats the question in less than a second and even answers questions for students.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis conducted, the researcher can draw the conclusion that both inexperienced and experienced teachers ask more questions on the type of remembering and understanding during class interactions. Meanwhile, analyzing and evaluating types of questions are types of questions that are rarely asked during teaching and learning interactions. In other words, the types of questions applying, analyzing, and evaluating are types of questions that are often neglected by both teachers. Meanwhile, the types of creating questions were never asked by the two teachers.

The waiting time for questions that get an immediate response is divided into waiting time I and waiting time II. For questions that directly get responses from students, the cognitive level of questions asked by inexperienced and experienced teachers only affects the length of waiting time I. The average waiting time I increases as the cognitive level of the questions increases. However, this waiting time lasts about one second. Meanwhile, the

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

length of waiting time II given by inexperienced and experienced teachers did not increase with the cognitive level of the questions. In other words, the two teachers were inconsistent in providing waiting time for the types of questions that were at a low cognitive level to a high cognitive level.

Questions that facilitate student participation posed by both inexperienced and experienced teachers are the types of remembering, understanding, applying and analyzing questions. Although the types of questions that were asked the most by the two teachers were those that were at a low cognitive level, both teachers had developed questions to a cognitive level that went beyond the cognitive process of remembering in accordance with the educational goals of Anderson & Krathwohl (2001), namely retention and transfer. The waiting time that facilitated student participation in this study lasted less than three seconds. Both teachers gave a portion of less than three seconds, both for questions that immediately received a response and for questions that did not receive an immediate response. Giving a waiting time of less than three seconds reflects that the teacher does not pay attention to the provision of waiting time during teaching and learning interactions.

References

- Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D.R. (2001). Kerangka landasan untuk pembelajaran, pengajaran, dan asesmen: Revisi taksonomi pendidikan Bloom (Agung Prihantoro, Penerjemah). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Armstrong, P. (2015). Bloom's taxonomy. Vanderbilt University, Center for Teaching.
- Banks, S.R. (2012). Classroom Assessment: Issues and practices (2nd ed.). Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed.). California: Longman
- Clotfelter, C.T, Ladd, H.F.,& Vigdor, J.L. (2006). Teacher-student matching and the assessment of teacher effectiveness. National Bureau of Economic Research, 11936, 1-54.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research methods in education (6th Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Collins, R. (2014). Skills for the 21st century ; Teaching High oder thinking. Curriculum and Leadership Journal, 12 (14).
- Cotton, K. (2001). Classroom questioning.North West Regional Educational Laboratory.Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom interaction and communication strategies in learning English as foreign language. ELOPE: Studies in the English Language and Literature in Slovenia, 1 (1-2), 127-139.
- Critelli, A., & Tritapoe, B. (2010). Effective questioning techniques to increase class participation. E-journal of Student Research, 2 (1), 1-7.
- Godbold, J.V. (1970). Oral questioning practices of teachers in social study classes. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 61-67.
- Iksan, Z.H., & Daniel, E. (2015). Types of wait time during verbal questioning in the science classroom. International Research in Higher Educational, 1(1), 72-80.

Tianjin Daxue Xuebao (Ziran Kexue yu Gongcheng Jishu Ban)/
Journal of Tianjin University Science and Technology
ISSN (Online):0493-2137
E-Publication: Online Open Access
Vol: 55 Issue: 12:2022
DOI10.17605/OSF.IO/DCZE8

- Kane, T.J., Rockoff, J.E., & Staiger, O.O. (2006). What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York city. National Bureau of Economic Research, 12155, 1-54.
- Ladd, F.H. (2013). Why experienced teachers are important – and what can be done to develop them. Scholar Strategy Network, Research to Improve Policy and Strengthen Democracy.
- Lewis, K.G. (1961, May). Developing questioning skills. The Education Forum, 25, 481-482.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S.M. (2005). Second language research: Methodology and design. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Inc.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1999). Designing qualitative research (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Nunan, D.,& Bailey, K.M. (2009). Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide. Boston: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Richard, J.C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). Reflective teaching in second language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowe, M.B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, 43-50.
- Sadker, D., Sadker, M., & Zittleman, K.R. (2011). Questioning Skill. In James M. Cooper (Ed.). Classroom Teaching Skills (9th Ed.). California: Wadsworth.
- Sass, T., Hannaway, J., Xu, Z., Figlio, D. (2010). Value added of teachers in high-poverty and lower-poverty schools. CALDER Working Paper 52, 1-47
- Thornbury, S. (1996). Teachers research teacher talk. ELT Journal, 50(4), 279-289.
- Tobin, K. (1987). The role of wait time in higher cognitive learning. Review of Educational Research, 57 (1), 69-95.
- TNTP (2012, March). Teacher experience: What does the research say?
- Wu, K. (1993). Classroom interaction and teacher question revisited. RELC Journal, 24 (2), 49-68.