Chapter V

Conclusions and Suggestions

This is the last chapter of all. It presents the conclusions and suggestions for the present study.

Conclusions

This study unveils the implementation of HOT questions in Grade 5 reading classes in a private primary school in Surabaya. The study in particular was aimed to find out (1) the delivery of the teacher's questions, (2) the types of the teacher's questions, and (3) the students' responses. This study used the New Bloom's taxonomy as the underlying instrument for classifying the types of questions and the students' responses. Four observations, four teacher's interviews and two students' focus group discussions were conducted in this study. The recorded data were transcribed and analyzed to get the results.

The results of the data analysis indicate that 65.15% of the total of 66 questions used by the teacher in the classroom were HOT questions. Among all types of HOT questions, the New Bloom's *analyze* questions were used the most with 37.88% of the total questions. HOT questions were mostly addressed during the whilst-instructional activities. Interestingly, the HOT questions were answered in different forms: oral answers, dramatizations and presentations. Related to this finding, the teacher was quite satisfied with the students' responses since they reached the same thinking level, although sometimes it is necessary for the teacher to simplify his questions in order to get students' responses.

Suggestions

Questioning in the classroom is essential; therefore, teachers have to equip themselves with the art of questioning. Questioning strategies do not just serve as tools to help students understand the reading text, but they also enhance the liveliness of the class through the interaction between teacher and his students. Teachers, therefore, need to prepare their questions in class during their lesson planning.

From this study, it can be concluded that HOT questions are good starters in pre-instructional activities; they serve as stimuli to trigger students' prior knowledge which is related to the discussed reading text. LOT questions can be used during this stage to ensure students' vocabulary mastery. In the next stage which is whilst-instructional activities, it is preferably to address reading related questions ranging from LOT to HOT; nonetheless, if the students are not able to answer the HOT questions, lowering the level of question, even from HOT to LOT, will be the best option. Lastly, during the post-instructional activities, HOT questions can be used to wrap up the meeting.

As the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) aims to foster HOT skills in the classroom, further research on the use of HOT questions and the types of HOT questions used in the classroom should be conducted to reach a more comprehensive result. Furthermore, MOEC should conduct more teacher workshops on HOTS so as to enhance teachers' questioning skills.

Students' lack of questioning initiative may also be an interesting topic to be brought in the future research. As teachers have to enhance students' class participation and at the same time manage the class, students' critical questioning possibly fades away due to their insecure

feeling. Therefore, a further research, possibly experimental research, will be interesting to finally discover some ways to overcome the issue of students' lack of questioning initiative.

REFERENCES

Bailin, S., Case, R., Coombs, J. R., & Daniels, L. B. (1999). Conceptualizing critical thinking. *Journal of curriculum studies 31*, 285-302.

Bapan, D. N. (2016). *Teacher Questions in Junior High School Classroom.* Surabaya: English Education Department Graduate School Widya Mandala Catholic University.

Barahal, S. L. (2008). Thinking about thinking. *Phi Delta Kappan 90.4*, 298-302.

Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *How to Assess Higher Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom.* USA: ASCD.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* New York: Pearson Education.

Browne, M. N., & Keeley, S. M. (2007). *Asking the Right Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking.* New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Duron, R., & Waugh, B. L. (2006). Critical Thinking Framework for Any Discipline. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 160-166.

Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture. (2019, April 22). *Ujian Nasional*. Retrieved from BSNP: http://bsnp-indonesia.org/category/uasbn-dan-un/

Larsson, K. (2017). Understanding and Teaching Critical Thinking - A New Approach. *International Journal of Educational Research 84*, 32-42.

Masduqi, H. (2011). Critical Thinking Skills and Meaning in English Language Teaching. *TEFLIN*, 185-200.

Ndun, L. N. (2012). *Teachers' Questions in a Junior High School English Classroom.* Yogyakarta: The Graduate Program, English Language Studies, Sanata Dharma University.

NEA. (2017). *Preparing 21st Century Students for a Global Society.* United States: National Education Association.

Papafragou, A., Li, P., Choi, Y., & Han, C.-h. (2007). Evidentiality in language and cognition. *Cognition 103*, 253-299.

Renaud, R. D., & Murray, H. G. (2007). The Validity of Higher-Order Questions as a Process Indicator of Educational Quality. *Research in Higher Education*, 319-350.

Santrock, J. W. (2011). *Life-Span Development Thirteenth Edition.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Sunggingwati, D., & Nguyen, H. T. (2013). Teachers' Questioning in Reading Lessons: A Case Study in Indonesia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 80-95.

Tamah, S. M. (2003). Teacher Questions in EFL Classes. *Seameo Regional Language Centre Singapore*.

Wilson, L. O. (2016). *Anderson and Krathwohl – Bloom's Taxonomy Revised*. Retrieved from The Second Principle: https://thesecondprinciple.com/teaching-essentials/beyond-bloom-cognitive-taxonomy-revised/