UNP Research Journal, Volume XXII
January-December 2013
ISSN 0119-3058

The Art of Questioning of the Faculty in the College of Teacher Education in the University of Northern Philippines

Patria A. Bello

ABSTRACT

Even with today's modern educational practices, the art of questioning has remained one of the best tools In promoting effective learning. In fact, questioning continues to be an essential component of good teaching. Skillful questioning involves knowledge of the various uses of the question, the characteristics of a good question, the techniques of questioning, and the techniques of handling the learners' responses. It is the aim of this study to determine the art of questioning of the faculty of the College of Teacher Education of University of Northern Philippines for School Year 2010-2011. Descriptive-correlational design was utilized and a total of 18 faculty and 97 students served as respondents. Results of the study revealed that the teachers always asked interesting, thought provoking, and challenging questions; used varied techniques in questioning; gave positive and encouraging remarks; and welcomed students' questions graciously. Therefore, it is highly recommended that teachers master a great art of questioning to further encourage the students to answer questions and participate actively during class discussions; further enhancement of the art of questioning and varied techniques and dynamics in questioning should be developed; and an enhancement program should be provided to the teachers such as: seminars and training- workshops; respectively.

KEYWORDS: art, quality, techniques, college of teacher education, descriptive-correlational design

INTRODUCTION

In many classes teachers have handled, the passive behaviour of students is often observed and important qualities like the dynamism and interaction of the students are not often manifested. It is believed that being dynamic and interactive, the students are expected to learn more as they observe key points which they can retain as stock knowledge. These skills can be used in taking future examinations like

the Career Professional Board Examination and especially the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET).

The passivity of the students could oftentimes be mistakenly thought of as mediocrity, a negative behaviour in the pedagogy which if not given the proper intervention would affect the future of the learners. In the desire of teachers to make the students more dynamic and interactive, they give them much of reading lessons for class discussions that can be their schema for future activities.

How can exposure to reading lessons be maximized such that the students become knowledgeable, responsive, and dynamic students? For teachers, it is their responsibility to develop the readiness of the students to take competitive examinations. Aside from being well-prepared in meeting the students in their classes, such that students' competence is honed, the teachers must prepare instructional materials which aid them in the development of adequate learning for the students. Technological advancements like the use of videos of the particular lessons, power point presentations to help them comprehend better the lecture of the teachers or researches from internets may be sources of knowledge to prepare the students for intelligent, critical discussions in the classroom. Sometimes these devices could be better understood with the teachers acting as facilitators of learning.

The researcher's theoretical framework lies in the teachers' ability to use the art of questioning as the stimuli to test the learners' understanding of both written and oral lessons. Teachers, therefore, need to master the art of questioning along the four dimensions namely: quality of questions, technique of questioning, handling students' questions, and handling students' answers.

In terms of the quality of questions, these should be clear, direct to the point, and appropriate to the students' year level; challenging and thought-provoking questions that may activate their stored knowledge can develop better understanding and appreciation of the lesson. No matter how good the quality of questions is, if the technique used in questioning does not encourage the students to answer correctly because the teachers' touch of kindness or patience in questioning is minimal, the teachers cannot get the most from the students. The same is true when the students' questions and answers are not properly responded by the teachers, the students cannot give out their best both in written and oral tests. The students may have good ideas but very often are not given the opportunity to answer the questions or they just keep quiet especially when they feel that academic freedom is not exercised.

The researcher believes that there may be many factors that could facilitate good teaching and learning. One of them is the teacher's art of questioning. This researcher, then, conducted this study to find out the effect of the art of questioning on the students' class performance. Specifically, it looked into the art of questioning of the CTE faculty in terms of quality of questions, technique of questioning, handling students' answers, and handling students questions .This research also aimed to find out the effect of the art of questioning of the 18 CTE faculty of the University of Northern Philippines during the School Year 2010-2011 on the subject performance of the students using the Pearson r.

Questioning is a very important and indispensable tool for teaching. By means of effective questioning, the teacher can help students draw out their thoughts and increases the depth of their answers (Aquino, 1988). By means of questioning, the teachers allow the students to demonstrate what they know, to argue points of view and to reflect on critical issues or personal values which they had not previously examined. However, opportunities of misunderstanding arise especially when students have not understood well the questions or may not have given a correct answer. Questioning sometimes may be stressful for the teacher when they are not able to handle or answer students' questions properly. Teachers using high level questions who tend to be rated low in faculty evaluation may not be fair. In both cases embarrassment may occur.

Arabit, Inlayo, and Boiser (1993) stress the succeeding ideas on questioning: The ability to ask questions is basic to effective teaching. They claim that a teacher spends much of his teaching act in asking questions. Since one of his chief goals is to stimulate mental activity on the part of his pupils, he does not ordinarily supply or spoon-feed information. Instead of pointing out the significance of a particular bit of knowledge, he leads his pupils through his questions, to help them discover it for themselves.

Dalao (http. Groundreport.com) asserts that even in today's educational practices, the art of questioning which has remained one of the best tools in promoting effective learning and questioning continues to be an essential component of good teaching. According to her there are some people who believe that the effectiveness of a teacher can be measured by his ability to ask good questions. And yet far too many teachers take this teaching tool for granted or use it carelessly. It often takes many years of classroom experience, professional reading, and self- evaluation for a teacher to be a proficient questioner.

Most research indicates that as much as 80 percent of classroom questioning is based on low order factual recall questions. There is a need to create a climate of inquiry and engagement in high quality, high order questioning if formative progress is to be identified effectively. Teachers need to carefully formulate questions with precision and target the right questions to the right students. It was observed that the entire system teachers work within appears to reinforce a close-minded 'answer'; inquisitiveness, time to explore and think are rail-roaded into one track examination system. The two writers would like classrooms to maximize creativity by encouraging the asking of good, thoughtful questions, one where a culture of inquiry is fostered in which questions are no longer the domain of the ignorant because they become dynamic—more about critical involvement questioning is the key, stretching knowledge, and enriching understanding. In this culture of inquiry, effective questioning is the key because it makes the thinking visible: it identifies prior knowledge; reasoning ability and the specific degree of student understanding. In order to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to participate in discussions and do the important thinking when a question is posed, teachers use a variety of questioning strategies. In addition teachers strategically vary the types of questions they ask to generate meaningful dialog that supports the development of high-order thinking skills

In building a culture of total participation, the following steps may be done: (1) Clarify with student the importance of everyone doing the thinking, learning, and reflecting throughout each stage of the lesson. (2) Model how art of questioning strategies will be used in the classroom, reminding students that they can say "please come back to me" if they need more think time or are unsure, if they want to build on new ideas of their peers. However be sure to let them know you will always come back to them. (3) Ensure you and your students have the materials needed. (4) Practice questioning strategies with students until it becomes routine. (5) Make think- time a natural routine.

The following strategies may be useful (1) Cold Call will be done by naming the question before identifying students to answer it; call on the students on random calls, tracking charts to ensure that all students contribute; scaffold the questions from simple to complex, probing for deeper explanations; connect thinking threads by returning to previous comments and connecting them to current ones. (2) No opt out by requiring all students to correctly answer questions posed to them. (3) Think-ink-pair--share. (4) Turn and talk. (5) Go around. (6) Whiteboards. and (7) Hot Sea.

All the while the teacher must make a constant and persistent effort to improve his questioning ability and technique. Towards this end, the following

questioning techniques are suggested by Dalao: (1) Questions should not be asked hurriedly or in a manner that is likely to create nervous tension which may block the learners' thinking. (2) A teacher should ask the question first and wait before asking anyone to give all of them time to organize their ideas which makes them all alert and inattention of students would be reduced. (3) A sufficient number of questions should be asked to stimulate learners to activity. (4) The majority of the students should participate in group thinking. Difficult questions should be asked to the bright students. (5) Leading questions which give away answers may result to boredom on the part of the learners. (6) Repeating questions and answers challenges students' attention; unless necessary it should be avoided.

The following are selected techniques of questioning from Dalao: (1) The student should not be abetted either in doing careless work. When the learner does not answer correctly, the teacher can ask further questions to help the learner discover for himself why his original answer was wrong. (2) Clarity in every point expressed by the learner should be insisted upon by the teacher. If a learner fails to make clear answers the teacher can ask him to elaborate. (3) Learners should be encouraged to answer in complete thought units and grammatically correct sentences. (4) A teacher should not mark the learners in his record book during the class recitation.

Wink (1993) provides the following discussion on the dynamics of questioning: The Physical Environment factor is a safety atmosphere of inquiry and faculty openness to new ideas and essential to effective teaching. Accepting emotional environment gives the students the freedom to suggest ideas or approaches. They will not be encumbered by the unwritten rules of the classroom which state that only the teacher can generate discussion and students do not question the teacher. This is in line with what Campbell (1986) as cited by Wolf (1987) stated that teachers tend to monopolize the right to question and that the environment of teacher- student exchange of questions, more so questions flowing from student to student is not available. Wink gives the following guides to build a positive emotional environment for questioning as follows:

1. The Question Source - Faculty dominance should be avoided to encourage students to ask questions to clarify content they are unsure of and to determine content areas not yet mastered.
2. The question delivery or the way the question is directed. Using students' names will govern the level of attention the students give to the question. When the names of students are told at the beginning or at the end of the question or when the question is directed to the whole class, different levels of attention to the question will result. The slower

the question is asked and the longer is the wait time, the higher is the cognitive response that can be expected.

3. Faculty response to questions and answers-The faculty members' non-verbal and verbal responses help determine the degree of additional contributions by students. After the students see how the faculty reacts to their peers, they make decisions whether or not and to what degree they participate.-
   a. **Non-verbal responses -** looking at the students, nodding and maintaining interest. Negative verbal responses – looking away, yawning, talking to other persons.
   b. **Verbal responses –** probes that can be useful verbal responses after an initial question and some response by one or more students: Extension, Clarification, Justification, Prompting, and Redirection. All these can help extend the breadth of their answers.
   Alternative faculty responses – silence, brief restatements of students' questions.
4. Handling Problems - When a student is dominating the conference or the discussion, change how questions are directed. Redirection probes may be done such as" what do the rest of you think?" or any other views/ideas. Or the teacher may let other participants to join the discussion. The teacher may talk with the student in private or other reinforces need to dominate the discussion as group work and debate. For non-responding students, the teacher may give a longer wait time; a private discussion to clearly identify reasons for not participating; private roleplaying or practice in general question formation or answering.
5. Incorrect or unexpected responses - If an answer is wrong, this must be knowledge. However, the faculty should ask themselves why; what in the student thought processes or knowledge-based caused the wrong answer. By listening to the students' questions, incorrect interpretation of facts or previously learned material can be identified. Baron(http.groundreport.com)mentions that a teacher should not allow incorrect answers to slip by ;otherwise the learners will adopt wrong facts or concepts

The following questions may be used by the teacher to develop the critical thinking ability of the student: (knowledge questions, comprehension which train students to organize and select facts and ideas; application of facts, rules, and principles; analysis which is the separation of a whole into parts; synthesis, the combination of ideas to form a new whole, evaluation-development of opinions, judgment or

decision, affective domain-feeling tone, emotion or degree of acceptance or rejection.

Objective tests involve straightforward answers which are also clear and constructed to eliminate ambiguity in scoring a correct response. Multiple choice tests ask questions or make statements and provide a list of answers from which the students can select when these tests are validated.

Wolf wrote an article on the art of questioning which was originally a talk delivered at the Summer Institute of the College Boards Educational Equality Project, held in Sta. Cruz, California, July 9-13, 1986. One topic given particularly close attention was that of questioning in the classroom. In her discussion with the classroom teachers she asked a teacher how he or she teaches and the answer is by asking questions. And if the teacher is asked how he or she uses questions or what sets apart keen or invigorating questioning from perfunctory versions, that same teacher had a hard time replying.

Still, a growing body of observation and research suggests that teachers' uncertainty about how they question cannot, or should not, be explained simply as a lack of explicit knowledge. The following observations have emerged from recent educational research (Wolf, 1987):

1. There are many classrooms where teachers rarely post questions above the "read-it-and-repeat-it" level. Questions that demand inferential reasoning, much less hypothesis-formation or the creative transfer of information to new situations, simply do not occur with any frequency (Mills, Rice, Berliner, and Rousseau, 1980.)

2. Goodlad (1984) says that extended stretches of questioning in which the information builds from facts toward insight or complex ideas rarely take place.

3. Bly (1986) claims that classroom questions are often disingenuous, rhetorical, and mere information checks. Missing questions are true questions, either requests for new information that belongs uniquely to the person being questioned or initiations of mutual inquiry.

4. According to Campbell (1986), the teachers tend to monopolize the right to question – rarely do more than procedural questions come from students. Second, the question-driven exchanges that occur in classrooms

almost uniformly take place between teachers and students, rarely or hardly shift between students. Moreover classroom questioning can be exclusive for the private preserve of few- the bright, the male, the English-speaking (Hall and Sandler, 1982).

S. Questions can embarrass rather than inquire, leaving a student feeling exposed and stupid, more willing to skip class than to be humiliated again (Bly, 1986).

6. Wolf stressed that she had seen skilled teachers who raised questions that ignited discussion which can establish and sustain not just a momentary discussion but a lasting climate of inquiry.

7. Based on rote learning which occurs early and inquiry late, the skills of scribes and clerks are taught rather than authors and mathematicians.

Independent of whom teachers teach, skilled teachers question in distinctive ways: they raise a range of questions, they sustain and build arcs of questions, their inquiries are authentic, they inquire with a sense of respect flail decency.

Benjamin Bloom as cited by Wolf asserts that same information can be handled in many ways like asking students to recall facts, to analyse those facts, to synthesize or discover new information based on the facts, or to evaluate knowledge. But Wolf suggests that there is an even greater range of challenging questions than Bloom's familiar taxonomy indicates as follows: 1) Inference Questions - these questions ask students to go beyond the immediate available information. To push beyond the factual in this way is to ask students to find clues, examine them, and discuss what inferences are justified. 2) Interpretation questions-If information questions demand that students fill in missing information, then, interpretive questions propose that they understand the consequences of information or ideas. 3) Transfer questions-If inference and interpretive questions ask a student to go deeper, transfer questions provoke a kind of breath of thinking, asking their students to take their knowledge to new places. 4) Questions about hypotheses- They are typically questions about what can be predicted and tested which are thought of as belonging to sciences and other "hard" pursuits. But, predictive thinking matters in all domains. 5) Reflective questions- When teachers ask reflective questions they are insisting that students ask themselves: "How do I know I know?"; "What things do I assume rather than examine?" Such questions may leave a class silent, because they take mulling over.

As important as the variety of questions is the way in which teachers respond to the answers their questions provoke. A research by Sacker and Sadker (1985) suggests that when student replies meet with a little more than a passing "Uh-huh" leading to dead-end situations, skilled teachers **give an** exchange of questions a life-course which later give way to increasingly interpretive questions until new insights emerge.

Teachers know that questions may be one of their most powerful tools but many classrooms have a low level of inquiry. The reason given is that they have colleagues who are simply interested in the work of questioning and they also point out that there are hurdles even for the most committed. Other reasons are there are few fora in which teachers can be helped in -or rewarded for this endeavour. And it is a formidable challenge to establish and maintain a climate of inquiry with students of widely varying backgrounds and **skills.** Another reason given for questions at low level in classrooms is the school culture which teaches that most questions especially big messy ones are dangerous that one has to keep too many of them from happening. So, according to Wolf it is not such problems as class size and diversity of students as the major obstacle but the culture of schools which dampens the teachers' enthusiasm for inquiry or questioning.

METHODOLOGY

This study made use of the descriptive-correlational design. It described the level of the teachers' art of questioning along the quality of questions, technique of questioning, handling students' answers, and handling students' questions. It is correlational because the influence of the overall art of questioning of the faculty on the subject performance of the students was determined.

It was conducted at the College of Teacher Education of the University of Northern Philippines during the First Semester of School Year 2012-2013.The respondents of the study were the faculty members of the College of Teacher Education (CTE) teaching at least one of the following subjects: English, Filipino, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Professional Education and the 97 student respondents.

The data gathering instrument that was used is a 45-item questionnaire prepared by the researcher based on readings. Ten items deal with the quality of questions (1-10), 18 items on the techniques of questioning (1-18), eight items on

handling students' questions (1-8), and nine items on handling students' questions (1-9). The instrument was validated by Professional Education faculty of the College of Teacher Education.

After the researcher had identified the respondents, she floated the questionnaire to 97 students who were handled by the teacher respondents. The students' grades were taken from the grading sheets filed at the Dean's Office.

The mean was used to determine the level of the art of questioning of the CTE faculty. The Pearson -r was used to determine the r- coefficient between the art of questioning and the subject performance of the students. The formula for the Pearson-r is given below.

$$r = \frac{n(\Sigma xy) - (\Sigma x)(\Sigma y)}{\sqrt{n(\Sigma x^2) - (\Sigma x)^2} \times \sqrt{n(\Sigma y^2) - (\Sigma y)^2}}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. The Level of the Art of Questioning of the CTE Faculty

a. On Quality of Questions of the CTE Faculty

The quality of questions of the overall faculty of the College of Teacher Education is at "Good" level (5=3.54). All the faculty by discipline are at "Good" level along this same dimension. In terms of the mean rating by discipline found in Table 1, the Mathematics students rated the quality of their teachers' questions with the lowest mean rating (3.44) followed by the Natural Sciences (3.48). On the other hand, the Social Science students rated the quality of their teachers' questions with the highest mean rating (3.66). By discipline, the teachers' art of questioning is all at "Good" level.

The mean ratings of most of the items on teachers' quality of questioning given by students by discipline are at "Good" level. Two items which are "Questions have definite answers" and "Questions have single answers are at "poor" level. The reason could be that their teachers always asked questions specifying one correct answer which may not always be acceptable because questions could be answered in more than one way especially when the students are critical or creative. This is true

UNP Research Journal, Volume XXII
January-December 2013
ISSN 0119-3058

to all the student respondents by discipline who rated their teachers "poor" which is the lowest rating.

Table 1. Distribution of the CTE faculty item mean ratings by discipline on quality of questions during the S.Y. 2010-2011.

Items	Faculty by Discipline							DR
	Eng	Fil	Math	Nat Sci	Soc Sci	Prof. Ed.	Overall	
1. Questions asked are clear.	4.0	3.86	3.96	3.98	**4.35**	**4.23**	4.06	Good
2. Questions are direct to the point.	3.83	**3.38**	4.03	**3.84**	4.17	4.06	**3.88**	Good
3. Questions are appropriate to the student's vear level.	3.93	**3.84**	**3.88**	3.96	**3.94**	**4.25**	3.97	**Good**
4. Questions have definite answer.	2.53	2.03	2.07	**2.0**	2.0	1.98	**2.10**	Poor
5. Questions have single answer.	2.7	2.16	2.0	2.29	2.24	2.11	2.55	Poor
6. Questions are challenging requiring students to compare, evaluate and draw inferences.	**4.3**	**4.22**	**4.22**	3.87	**3.94**	3.98	**4.09**	**Good**
7. Questions do not use the wording and organization of the textbook.	3.58	3.76	**3.85**	3.69	**3.88**	**3.84**	3.77	**Good**
8. Questions are interesting and thought-provoking.	3.9	3.76	3.78	3.76	**4.21**	4.09	**3.92**	Good
9. Questions do not suggest the correct answer.	3.23	3.30	3.19	3.33	3.53	**3.68**	**3.38**	MG
10. Questions require students to answer by activating their stored knowledge and experience background.	3.95	4.08	3.74	3.96	4.09	**4.17**	**4.0**	Good
GRAND MEAN	**3.56**	**3.50**	**3.44**	**3.48**	**3.66**	**3.61**	**3.54**	**Good**

Legend: 4.21–5.0 Very Good (VG) 1.81–2.60 Poor (P)
3.41–4.21 Good (G) 1.0–1.80 Very Poor (VP)
2.61–3.41 Moderately Good (MG)

The Social Sciences students gave the highest mean ratings to their teachers for "Questions asked are clear" (4.35) and "Questions are interesting and thought-provoking" (4.21). The Professional Education students rated "Questions are appropriate to the students' year level" (4.25) and "Questions asked are clear" (4.23). Inversely the same students, rated "Questions have definite answers" (1.98)" with the lowest rating. "Questions are challenging, requiring students to compare, evaluate, and draw inferences" (4.3) is appreciated by the students in English because this is one of the competencies in reading which are developed in English classes. The same students gave a high rating to "Questions which require them to answer by activating their stored knowledge and experience background". Like the

students in English, the Filipino students gave a high score to "challenging questions requiring students to compare, evaluate and draw inferences" (5=4.22). "Questions that activate students' stored knowledge and experience background" got a mean of (4.08). Likewise, students in Mathematics gave the highest (4.22) to "questions that compare, evaluate, and draw inferences". Also "questions that are direct to the point" (4.03). The lowest scored items are "questions with a single answer (2.0) and questions with a definite answer (2.07).

Based on the overall evaluation of the quality of questions of the faculty by item, the question of the faculty which got the highest overall mean score (4.09) is "Questions are challenging requiring the students to compare, evaluate and draw inferences". This quality of questions was rated "very good" by the English (=4.3), Filipino (5=4.22), Mathematics (5=4.22), Social Science (5=4.35) and Professional Education faculty (X=4.23). These are like the inference questions of Bruner, which as cited by (Wolf, 1987), ask students to go beyond the immediately available information. When students are asked to compare two characters of two different selections, it is challenging because the students have to see similarities of thinking, acting, behaving, and responding of chosen characters to varied situations. It is also very challenging for the students to ask them to make a literary analysis of a short story, novel, or poetry simply discussed in class by making use of the appropriate approach to literary criticism. Furthermore, the student must see differences on the same points. Out of given data in Mathematics the students can find the missing number. The second quality of questions rated "very good" is "interesting and thought-provoking question". If students are exposed to interesting and thought provoking questions, their critical thinking ability is developed which enables them to make good judgments and better decisions affecting not only themselves but everyone. Except "questions with definite, single answers" (X=2.1), and "question have single answers" with "poor" mean rating (=2.5), all the rest of questions are rated "good" by the respective students of the English, Filipino, Mathematics, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Professional Education faculty.

"Questions with definite, single answers" could be considered "recall" question which is the lowest domain of questions. These questions are really not advisable to the students because it is only memory that they measure and not understanding and comprehension. These kinds of questions do not train the students to think critically. As a result they become passive. For this reason, in scoring these two questions, they are considered negative questions such that those who checked 5 are given 1 point; 4, 2 points; 3 with the same point; 4, 2 points; and 5, 1 point.

b. Technique of Questioning of the CTE Faculty

Table 2 shows the teachers' techniques in questioning. As a whole the technique of questioning of the CTE faculty is "Good" as revealed by the overall mean (3.77). The grand mean ratings of the faculty by discipline are as follows: English, 3.71; Filipino, 3.69; Mathematics, 3.80; Natural Sciences, 3.70; Social Sciences, 3.94; and Professional Education, 3.39. The faculty by discipline are rated "Good" by their respective students except the Professional Education teachers with "Moderately Good" rating (=3.39). The faculty with the highest grand mean (5=3.94) along technique of teaching belong to the Social Science discipline. The researcher has noted that the age gap between the Social Science faculty and their students is less than that of the Professional Education teachers and their students. In this case, the Social Science faculty could be more familiar to the current issues and technological innovations which made the Social Science faculty more responsive to the times. Consequently they are more acceptable to their students compared to the Professional Education faculty to their students.

Among the 18 techniques of questioning, "asking questions in natural and modulated voice was rated with the highest overall mean of (4.15) at "good" level. In a classroom activity like in the lecture of the teachers, the volume of the teachers' voice stimulate nervousness that would negatively affect their composure to answer or may lead to the loss of good ideas they have in mind but in the case of the CTE faculty almost all the students of the subject teachers gave the highest rating of "Very Good" to this technique to English (4.4) and Social Sciences (4.29) faculty.

"Asking questions in a manner which indicates confidence to students" was ranked second in terms of overall mean rating (3.9). Why this technique is desirable to the students could be the positive effect to them. The thought that the teachers have confidence in their students as regards their capability to answer their questions motivates or stimulates them to answer without fear or guilt of answering his questions incorrectly. They have the courage to express their viewpoints in spite of uncertainties of the correctness of their answers. This technique shows the teachers' good attitude towards their students asking them to try voicing out their ideas which may be acceptable without their knowing it.

Table 2. Item mean rating of the CTE Faculty by discipline on technique of questioning S.Y. 2010-2011.

Items	FACULTY BY DISCIPLINES							
	Eng	Fil	Math	Nat. Sci.	Soc. Sci.	Prof. Ed.	Over-all	DR
1.Asks questions in a modulated voice.	**4.4**	3.86	4.03	4.16	4.29	4.17	4.15	Good
2. Asks questions in an informal way.	3.78	3.86	3.85	3.71	3.82	4.0	3.84	Good
3. Calls on students to recite only after the student has analysed the question.	3.68	3.54	3.85	3.56	4.05	3.92	3.77	Good
4. Does not use any special order of students to answer.	3.15	3.43	3.74	3.78	3.82	4.0	3.65	Good
5. Asks sufficient number of questions for every lesson discussed.	3.63	3.81	3.44	3.56	3.82	4.0	3.71	Good
6. Designates selected students to answer challenging questions	3.65	3.65	3.88	3.36	4.05	3.68	3.71	Good
7. Designates selected students to answer easy questions	3.33	3.32	3.48	3.13	3.94	3.86	3.29	Moderately Good
8. Asks questions to inattentive students.	3.68	3.70	3.63	3.71	3.88	3.64	3.71	Good
9. Allows students to organize their answers before calling anyone to answer.	3.65	3.81	4.0	3.71	4.12	3.88	3.86	Good
10. Varies his rate of question by adjusting it to purpose of questionina.	3.9	3.65	3.93	3.76	4.17	3.88	3.90	Good
11. Adjusts his rate of questioning to the students' relative familiarity to the topic.	3.75	3.57	3.81	3.69	4.17	3.88	3.81	Good
12. Repeats questions for only some legitimate reasons.	3.93	3.57	3.93	3.71	3.82	3.84	3.80	Good
13. Questions are repeated only once.	3.1	3.24	3.63	3.36	3.94	3.60	3.48	Good
14. Fairly distributes questions.	3.73	3.70	3.88	3.89	4.17	4.0	3.89	Good

Table 2 continued

Items	FACULTY BY DISCIPLINES							
	Eng	Fil	Math	Nat. Sci.	Soc. Sci.	Prof. Ed.	Over-all	DR
15. Asks questions in a manner which indicates confidence in students.	3.9	3.65	4.22	3.91	4.0	4.08	3.96	Good
16. Gives clues to help underachievers to make a correct answer.	3.75	3.81	3.81	3.87	3.76	3.35	3.72	**Good**
17. Scolds/embarrasses students who cannot answer his questions correctly.	4.03	4.19	3.48	3.89	3.12	3.19	3.65	Good
18. Encourages students to answer questions by his kindness and patience.	3.9	4.05	3.8	3.89	3.94	4.0	3.93	Good
GRAND MEAN	**3.74**	**3.69**	**3.80**	**3.70**	**3.94**	**3.39**	**3.77**	Good

Legend:
4.21 – 5.0 Very Good (VG) 3.41**–**4.21 . Good (G)
2.61**–**3.41 Moderately Good (MG) 1.81--2.60 Poor (P)
1.0 **–**1.80 Very Poor (VP)

The technique with the lowest overall mean rating (3.29) is "designating selected students to answer easy questions". The students' low rating given to their teachers reveals their negative feelings to this unfair practice of their teachers. The students probably misunderstand their teachers who could be using that as their strategy for the underachievers to be encouraged to recite correctly to help them overcome their shyness. However, to erase this misunderstanding of the students with their teachers, the latter should state simply or rephrase their questions in words familiar to the students.

The teachers' technique with the second lowest overall mean rating is repeating questions only once" (X=3.48). Many teachers give their questions so fast that many students could not catch up with the speed of their teachers. The students' feedback against this practice could be due to their desire to pass the test. Students do not have the same level of intelligence. The many repetitions until they understood the question would give them a greater chance of answering correctly the question. If they answer a question without understanding it, that could be a reason for failing in the subject. To the students, this technique of repeating questions once or twice is very important to them because it gives them adequate time to organize their ideas and schema to be able to give an acceptable answer.

Among the 18 questions, there is one item that Is negatively scored which is "scolding and embarrassing students who cannot answer correctly". The researcher reversed the point system. Those who checked 1 was given 5 points; 2, 4 points; 3, 3 points; 4, 2 points; and 5, 1 point. Scolding and embarrassing students with wrong answers got an overall mean rating (3.65) which is third from the lowest. The students do not like this technique of questioning because they would feel bad scolded and embarrassed in front of their classmates because their dignity and self-respect are affected. To the teacher, his purpose could be to remind them to study their lessons or to pay attention so that they would understand the lesson to improve their class performance to be at par with their classmates. Nevertheless, this technique still falls at "good" level; probably the reason is that the students understand that it is for their own good.

c. Handling Students' Answers by the CTE Faculty by Discipline

The practices used by the CTE faculty in "handling students' answers" are reflected in Table 3. They are rated based on the frequency these are used by the faculty in handling answers. The overall or grand mean in handling the students' answers is (3.88) at "Good" level. By discipline the grand mean in handling students' answers is given as follows: English, (3.81); Filipino, 3.83; Mathematics, 3.84; Natural Sciences, 3.76; Social Sciences, 4.05; Professional Education, 3.96.

The ways of handling students' answers by the Social Sciences faculty which are rated "very good" (5=4.47) are "showing an appreciative attitude towards students' answers", "giving encouraging remarks to students who answer correctly (=4.35)", "not embarrassing unintelligent students" (5=4.41), and "students with funny ideas or reasons are always never insulted" (=4.29).

The Filipino teachers who always "give encouraging remarks to students who answer correctly" obtained a mean rating (4.46) which falls at "very good" level. Only the English faculty who are rated "very good" (5=4.23) are those "who always use a variety of positive words to encourage their students".

Teachers of the English, Filipino, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Professional Education who often " handle students' answers in the following are rated "good": showing an appreciative attitude to students' answers, rephrasing questions for students who are unable to answer correctly, and often not embarrassing students with incorrect answers. Except the Social Sciences faculty, the faculty of the other disciplines often "never insult students with funny ideas or reasons.

UNP Research Journal, Volume XXII
January-December 2013
ISSN 0119-3058

Table 3. Item mean ratings of the CTE faculty by discipline in handling students answers.

Items	Faculty by Discipline							DR
	Eng	Fil	Math	Nat. Sci	Soc. Sci	Prof' Ed	Ove rall	
1. Makes every effort to show an appreciative attitude towards student's answers.	4.05	3.97	4.19	3.91	**4.47**	**4.23**	**4.14**	Good
2. Gives encouraging remarks to students who answer correctly	4.03	**4.46**	3.93	3.93	**4.35**	**4.19**	**4.15**	Good
3. Rephrases questions for students who cannot answer questions correctly.	4.0	3.86	3.85	3.71	**4.05**	**4.08**	4.0	Good
4. Uses a variety of positive words whenever students correcUy answer his/her questions.	**4.23**	**3.78**	**3.85**	**3.84**	**4.17**	**4.11**	**4.0**	Good
5. Never allows wrong answer to slip by.	**3.25**	3.35	**3.74**	**3.4**	**3.47**	**3.64**	3.47	Good
6. Checks wrong answers on the spot.	3.05	**3.43**	**3.81**	**3.64**	3.17	**3.72**	3.47	Good
7. Does not embarrass students who cannot answer correctly.	3.9	**4.03**	**3.74**	3.96	**4.41**	**3.82**	3.97	Good
8. Never insults students with funny ideas or reasons different from his/her idea.	3.98	3.76	3.65	3.69	**4.29**	3.90	**3.88**	Good
GRAND MEAN =	**3.81**	**3.83**	**3.84**	**3.76**	**4.05**	**3.96**	**3.88**	Good

Legend:

4.21–5.0	Very Good	(VG)
3.41–4.21	Good	{G)
2.61–3.41	Moderately Good	(MG)
1.81–2.60	Poor	{P)
1.0–1.80	Very Poor	(VP)

Practices in handling answers of students rated "moderately good" are: "never allowing wrong answers to slip by" (3.25) by the English, Filipino and Natural Sciences faculty and "checking wrong answer on the spot" by the Social Sciences (3.17) and English (3.05).

By discipline all the faculty handling students' answers are at "good" level because the overall practices are "often" done by the Social Sciences obtaining the

highest mean score of 4.05, followed by the Professional Education faculty (3.96). The overall mean (3.94) reveals that the faculty of the College of Teacher Education knows how to handle students' answers. These findings could be an effect of subjects they have been teaching like the Principles of Teaching 1 and 2, Facilitating Learning, and the like.

c. Handling Students' Questions by the CTE Faculty

Table 4. Item mean rating by discipline in handling students' questions by the CTE faculty.

Items	Faculty by Discipline							DR
	Eng	Fil	Math	Nat. Sci.	Soc. Sci.	Prof Ed	Over-all	
1. Welcomes students' questions.	4.48	4.22	4.33	4.04	4.58	4.29	4.32	Very Good
2. Before answering students' questions he/she throws them to the class.	**3.68**	3.43	3.93	3.42	3.88	3.94	3.71	Good
3. Clearly answers students' questions that quite enlighten them.	4.23	3.84	4.07	4.04	4.17	4.13	4.08	Good
4. Allows students to present their points of view about their own questions.	4.08	3.89	4.03	3.76	4.17	4.06	4.0	Good
5. Not allow indiscriminate students' question.	3.58	3.51	3.93	3.93	3.71	3.76	3.74	Good
6. Helps students rephrase their questions.	3.88	3.97	3.88	3.8	4.12	4.0	3.94	Good
7. Requires students to form grammatically correct question.	3.78	3.81	4.22	3.82	3.82	3.98	3.92	Good
8. Does not scold students whose questions seem to be testing her capability.	**4.1**	3.92	3.93	3.78	3.94	3.88	3.66	Good
9. Whenever he can't answer students' questions he promptly admits his/her inability.	3.48	3.62	3.93	3.51	3.82	3.60	3.66	Good
GRAND MEAN	**3.92**	**3.80**	**4.03**	**3.79**	**4.02**	3.96	**3.92**	**Good**

Legend:

4.21–5.0	Very Good	(VG)
3.41–4.21	Good	(G)
2.61–3.41	Moderately Good	(MG)
1.81–2.60	Poor	(P)
1.0–1.80	Very Poor	(VP)

Table 4 presents the overall or the grand mean rating (3.92) of the CTE faculty on how they handled their students' questions at "Good " level. All of the faculty by discipline handled their respective students' questions in the same level

although they got different mean ratings as shown in the following **data:** English, (3.92); Filipino, (3.80); Mathematics, (4.03); Natural Sciences, (3.79); Social Sciences, (4.02); and Professional Education, (3.96). The Mathematics and Social Sciences faculty got the highest mean while the lowest mean went to the Natural Sciences and Filipino faculty. Under the dimension on handling students' questions, welcoming students' questions obtained the highest mean (4.32) at "very good" level. By discipline, it is the Social Sciences Group with the highest mean score of 4.58. Almost all groups always welcome students' questions.

However, the CTE teachers do not answer the students' questions on the spot to allow students to develop participation in solving students' problems. Otherwise they become passive and may develop inferiority complex, consequently the students become non-interactive. The second way that the teachers do in handling students' questions is clearly answering students' questions that quite enlighten them (=4.08). Only the English faculty (5=4.23) always clearly enlightens the class about the questions of the students. This could be attributed to their facility of the language. The Filipino group probably due to language constraint got the lowest mean rating of (3.84). The two lowest scored items in this same dimension are not scolding students whose questions seem to be testing their capability (3.66) and promptly admitting their incapability to answer their students' questions (3.66). This could be a sort of honesty and humility of the teachers although their personality as teachers could be affected.

e. Item Mean Level of the CTE Faculty on their Art of Questioning along its Four Dimensions

As displayed in Table 5, there are six disciplines of CTE Faculty whose art of questioning was evaluated by students which they handled during the S.Y. 2010-2011.These are the English, Filipino, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and the Professional Education faculty.

The mean ratings given to the faculty by discipline by their students in the four dimensions of the art of questioning reveal that the teachers are "good" in the art of questioning. This gives a good picture of the CTE faculty. On the quality of questions, the Social Sciences faculty was given the highest mean rating (3.66). By dimension, the Professional Education faculty obtained the highest mean rating (3.88) on techniques in questioning. In handling students' answers, the highest mean rating was obtained by Social Sciences faculty (4.03) and in handling students' questions the Social Sciences faculty was also rated the highest (4.06). The last

dimension of the Art of Questioning was rated "good" by all the teachers by discipline. The overall mean on the quality of questions is (3.54), technique of questioning, (3.79); handling students' answers, (3.89); and handling students' questions, (3.89).These are proof of the need for all the teachers by discipline to still learn better the art of questioning. There are still two steps in the range of scores to reach to enable the teachers to possibly give the best in questioning to make better students.

Table 5. Mean rating summary of the CTE faculty along the art of questioning S.Y. 2010-2011.

S	Quality of Questions		Technique of Questioning		Handling Students' Answers		Handling Students' Questions	
	5x	DR	5	DR	5	DR	X	DR
English	3.56	G	3.71	G	3.87	G	3.87	Good
Filipino	3.50	G	3.72	G	3.84	G	3.87	Good
Mathematics	**3.44**	G	**3.86**	G	4.0	G	3.85	Good
Natural Sciences	**3.48**	G	3.72	G	3.77	G	3.73	Good
Social Sciences	3.66	G	3.85	G	4.03	G	4.06	Good
Professional Education	3.61	G	3.88	G	3.9	G	4.0	Good
Overall	3.54	G	3.79	G	3.89	G	3.89	Good

Legend:

4.21–5.0	Very Good	(VG)
3.41–4.21	Good	(G)
2.61–3.41	Moderately Good	(MG)
1.81–2.60	Poor	(P)
1.0–1.80	Very Poor	(vP)

2. On Subject Performance of the Student Respondents

Table 6 manifests the distribution of student respondents by their subject grade. The highest number 34 (35.05%) obtained a grade of 1.75 followed by 15 (15.46%) with a grade of 2.25; another 15 (15.46%) with a grade 2.5. Only 4 (4.12%) obtained a grade of 1.25 at "Outstanding" level. The mean subject performance of the students is 2.00.

Table 6. Distribution of grades of the student respondents, School Year 2010-2011.

Grades	DR	*I* *n=97*	%
1.25	O	4	4.12
1.5	VH	11	11.34
1.75	H	34	35.05
2.0	H	12	12.37
2.25	MO	15	15.46
2.5	MO	15	15.46
2.75	L	5	5.15
3.0	VL	1	1.03
Mean = 2.00			

Legend: 1.25-1.0 Outstanding (O) 2.5-1.99 Moderately High (MO)
1.5-1.26 Very High (VH) 3.0-2.74 Very Low (VL)
2.0-1.49 High (H) 2.75-2.49 Low(L)

3.Relationship between the Art of Questioning of the CTE Faculty and the Subject Performance of the Students.

Table 7. The **r between art of questioning and subject performance of students.**

Art of Questioning of the CTE faculty	Subject performance of the students
r=-0.09	

tat1.95 at 0.05 level of significance

The results of the Pearson-r gave a computed coefficient correlation (r) of (-.09) which did not reach the tabular r coefficient of 1.95 at .05 level of significance. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the art of questioning of the CTE faculty and the subject performance of the students. This implies that there could be other significant factors that affect the subject performance of the students. These could be teaching effectiveness, use of modern technology like the powerpoint, internet as source of instructional materials, teacher and student motivation, and student input.

CONCLUSIONS

The art of questioning of the faculty in the College of Teacher Education of the UNP was found to be at "good" level. The four dimensions which were looked into to correctly arrive at the conclusion are quality of questions, technique of questioning, handling students' answers, and handling students' questions through the use of item indicators by dimension. All these four dimensions are all at "good" level.

After a thorough computation of the grades the researcher gathered at the Dean's Office, she concluded that most of the grades of the students are at "high" level.

The result of the Pearson r showed a -0.09 correlation coefficient at .05 level of significance. An inverse relationship is indicated by the negative value of r but no relationship between the two variables is indicated by (r= -.09) which did not reach the tabular value of r which is 1.95.

RECOMMENDATION

Through seminar- workshop on the art of questioning to be sponsored by the administrators, the CTE Faculty could upgrade their art of questioning to two steps higher than their current level so that they can make better questions for their students.

The "high" grades of students could be attributed to other factors, namely: high student input, effective teaching methods and strategies, and the like.

The additional readings on the art of questioning may be used by future researchers for improvement on how to ask questions to improve the findings. For future researchers, actual class observation on how teachers by discipline utilize the art of questioning in the classroom is strongly recommended to validate the findings of this present study.

UNP Research Journal, Volume XXII
January-December 2013
ISSN 0119-3058

LITERATURE CITED

Aquino, G. V. (1988). *Principles and methods of effective teaching.* Philippines: National Bookstore

Calderon, J. F. *(1998).Principles and practices of teaching* Philippines: Great Book Trading.

Rivera, F.V. (1992).Toward effective teaching. Quezon City. National Bookstore.

Salandanan, G.G. (2000). *Teaching approaches and strategies.* Quezon City: Katha Publishing Company Inc.

Wink, Dianne M. (1993). *The nurse educator.* XVIII, 11- USA:

Online **References**

Flaherty, S. and Newman, L. (2012). Questioning strategies to engage all learners. Retrieved on October 30,2013 fromhttp://www.doc

Moss, J. F. (1996).The art of questioning. Retrieved on October 30, 2013 from http://www.ncte.org/library/nctefiles/resources/books/sample/29633chap05.pdf

Dalao, B. The art of questioning. Retrieved on November 29,2013 fromhttp.goundreport.com/the-art-of-questioning-a-guide-to teachers/

A Refereed and Indexed Multidisciplinary Research Journal
Of the University of Northern Philippines
Vigan City, Ilocos Sur
2700 Philippines