THE EFFECT OF USING ALTERNATIVES TO QUESTIONS STRATEGY
ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AND SELF-EFFICACY
AT MA TERPADU DURI

Zulfia Siska Wati

STAI Hubbulwathan Duri

zulfia_siska@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa ada perbedaan kemampuan berbicara siswa antara kelompok kontrol dan kelompok eksperimen. Hal ini ditunjukkan dengan nilai sig. (2 tailed) adalah 0,000. Itu lebih kecil dari 0,05. Ini berarti bahwa penggunaan strategi Alternatives to Questions memiliki dampak yang signifikan terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa. Selain itu, ditemukan juga bahwa ada perbedaan efikasi diri siswa antara kelompok kontrol dan kelompok eksperimen. Hal ini dapat dilihat dari nilai sig. (2 tailed) adalah 0,000. Itu lebih kecil dari 0,05. itu menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan strategi Alternatives to Questions memiliki dampak yang signifikan terhadap efikasi diri siswa. Dengan demikian, dapat disimpulkan bahwa penggunaan strategi Alternatives to Questions memiliki pengaruh yang signifikan terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa dan efikasi diri siswa kelas 11 MA Terpadu Duri.

Kata Kunci: *Alternatives to Questions strategy, speaking ability and self-efficacy*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a form of communication. It means that language is used to communicate and interact between one to another. It is a tool that is used to express ideas or information about things, other people, societies or

other groups. Zaenuri (2001) states "Language helps you to understand yourself and the world around you." It can be inferred that through language we can know about ourselves and the world around us. It is clear that language plays an important role in communication.

Proficiency in language facilitates communication running smoothly. Valdés and Figueroa (1994) indicated that knowing a language and knowing how to use a language involves a mastery and control of a large number of interdependent components and elements that interact with one another and that are affected by the nature of the situation in which communication takes place. Specifically, English proficiency is needed in line with English as an international language.

Related to English as a foreign language (EFL), teaching English in Indonesia has become important. English is the first foreign language in Indonesia. It is a compulsory subject to be taught for three years at Junior High Schools and for another three years in Senior High Schools (Lauder, 2008). English has been taught in Elementary Schools as an additional subject since the implementation of the 1994 Curriculum. The development of English language teaching in Indonesia seems to be curriculum objectives.

But ironically, there are still very limited number of students who are able to communicate in English, although they have been studying English for about six years. This is supported by Thalal (2010). He stated that there are many cases in which students' expectations do not match with the reality of learning result showing that their English proficiency is still very low or they do not have the significant English ability after many years of study. Furthermore, Riggenback and Lazaraton (1991) stated that students of second or foreign language education programs are considered successful if they can communicate effectively in the language.

To develop students' proficiency in English, there are several aspects that should be considered. One of the aspects that contribute to the development of students' English proficiency is speaking skill. Graham-Mar (2004) claimed that the importance of teaching speaking skills stems from the fact that human beings have been acquiring language through speaking long before they began reading and writing. Our brains are well programmed to learn language through sound and speech. Brown and Yule (1999) believed that many language learners regard speaking skills as the

criteria for knowing a language. They defined fluency as the ability to communicate with others much more than the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language. They regarded speaking as the most important skill students acquire. Students assess their progress in terms of their accomplishments in spoken communication.

In reality, at school, the students face difficulties to practice their spoken proficiency. In spoken language, students tend to translate word by word from their mother tongue into English and they need to find out the appropriate words to convey meaning accurately. Besides, it is difficult for them to speak English because they tend to think twice before speaking English and also they think of grammar, vocabulary and other language features.

This is supported by Zainil (2003). Many Indonesian students are passive language learners. They are shy to use English in real life communication. They only pay attention to forms and rules when they communicate with others. They do not practice English in real life communication and situations. Only a few of them practice and use it in the classroom. Consequently, they fail to acquire English proficiency. So, it is a very challenging thing for the teacher to teach speaking. It seems that the teacher has the main role in finding appropriate strategies to improve students' speaking ability to find appropriate strategy.

Another aspect that should be considered to develop students' English proficiency is students' belief in their own ability. Ideally, Bandura (1989) explained the importance of self-efficacy as beliefs that function as "an important set of proximal determinants of human motivation, affect, and action". It makes a difference in how people feel, think, behave, and motivate themselves. In fact, the students are still shy to speak. They think that they cannot answer the question nor do the task. They are afraid of failure or mistake. These situations imply that the students have low self-efficacy.

DISCUSSION
Speaking as a Language Skill

Speaking is the basic prominent skill to be studied in a foreign language and as a meaningful interaction between students. Nunan

(1991:39) stated that speaking is the single most important aspect of learning a second or foreign language, and success is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the language. In other words, speaking is the pivotal thing in communicative purpose of language learning. Speaking takes part in social interaction. Richard and Renandya (2002) stated that speaking a language is especially difficult for foreign language learners because effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions.

Assessment of Speaking Ability

In this research, speaking ability is the ability of students in using English as the second language that they learn for their communication activities and interaction orally. The students' speaking ability is measured by using oral language scoring rubric. These are accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension. Below is the description of students' speaking proficiency of students based on Hughes (2003)

1) Accent
   a) Pronunciation frequently unintelligible
   b) Frequent gross error and very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition
   c) "Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciation lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary
   d) Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding
   e) No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker
   f) Native pronunciation, with no trace of "foreign accent"

2) Grammar
   a) Grammar is almost entirely inaccurate, except in stock phrases
   b) Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication
   c) Frequent errors show some major pattern uncontrolled and cause occasional irritation and misunderstanding

    d) Occasional errors show imperfect control of some patterns, but no weakness that causes misunderstanding

    e) Few errors, with no patterns of failure

    f) No more than two errors during the interview

3) Vocabulary

    a) Vocabulary is inadequate for even the simplest conversation

    b) Vocabulary is limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc.)

    c) Choice of words is sometimes inaccurate, limitation of vocabulary prevents discussion of some common professional and social topics

    d) Professional vocabulary is adequate to discuss special interest, general vocabulary permits discussion of any-technical subject with some circumstances

    e) Professional vocabulary broad and precise, general vocabulary is adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations

    f) Vocabulary is apparently as accurate and extensive and extensive as that of an educated native speaker

4) Fluency

    a) Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible

    b) Speech is very slow and uneven except for, short of routine sentences

    c) Speech has been frequently hesitant and jerky, sentences may be left uncompleted

    d) Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused words

    e) Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-native in

    f) Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker

5) Comprehension

    a) Understanding to little for the simplest type of conversation

    b) Understanding only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics, requires constant repetition and rephrasing

    c) Understanding careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require considerable repetition and rephrasing

    d) Understanding quite well normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing

e) Understanding everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech

f) Understanding everything in both formal colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker

Hortatory Exposition Text

Based on the syllabus, one of the types or kinds of the text for the eleventh year senior high school students is Hortatory Exposition. A Hortatory exposition is a type of spoken or written text that is intended to explain the listeners or readers that something should or should not happen or be done. To strengthen the explanation, the speaker or writer needs some arguments as the fundamental reasons of the given idea. Hortatory exposition text can be found in scientific books, journals, magazines, newspaper articles, academic speech or lectures, research report, etc. Hortatory expositions are popular among science, academic community and educated people. The generic structure of Hortatory exposition usually has three components: (1) Thesis, (2) Arguments and (3) Recommendation.

A. Generic Structure of Hortatory Exposition

  1. Thesis : Statement or announcement of issue concern

  2. Arguments: Reasons for concern that will lead to recommendations

  3. Recommendation : Statement of what should or should not happen or be done based on the given arguments

B. Generic Features of Hortatory Exposition

  1. A Hortatory exposition focuses on generic human and nonhuman participants, except for the speaker or writer referring to self.

  2. It uses mental processes. It is used to state what the writer or speaker thinks or feels about something. For example: realize, feel etc.

  3. It often needs material processes. It is used to state what happens, e.g. ….has polluted… etc.

  4. It usually uses Simple Present Tense and Present Perfect Tense.

  5. Enumeration is sometimes necessary to show the list of given arguments: Firstly, secondly…, Finally, etc.(Cahyono and Eka.2006)

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is commonly defined as the belief in one's capabilities to achieve a goal or an outcome. Students with a strong sense of efficacy are more likely to challenge themselves with difficult tasks and be intrinsically motivated. These students will put forth a high degree of effort in order to meet their commitments, and attribute failure to things which are in their control, rather than blaming external factors. Self-efficacious students also recover quickly from setbacks, and ultimately are likely to achieve their personal goals. Students with low self-efficacy, on the other hand, believe they cannot be successful and thus are less likely to make a concerted, extended effort and may consider challenging tasks as threats that are to be avoided. Thus, students with poor self-efficacy have low aspirations which may result in disappointing academic performances becoming part of a self-fulfilling feedback cycle. (Bandura 1989)

There are four sources of self-efficacy. Teachers can use strategies to build self-efficacy in various ways.

1. Mastery experiences - Students' success experiences boost self-efficacy, while failures erode it. This is the most robust source of self-efficacy.
2. Vicarious experience - Observing a peer succeed at a task can strengthen beliefs in one's own abilities.
3. Verbal persuasion - Teachers can boost self-efficacy with credible communication and feedback to guide the student through the task or motivate them to make their best effort.
4. Emotional state -A positive mood can boost one's beliefs in self-efficacy, while anxiety can undermine it. A certain level of emotional stimulation can create an energizing feeling that can contribute to strong performances. Teachers can help by reducing stressful situations and lowering anxiety surrounding events like exams or presentations. (Bandura, 1989)

Monica A, Frank (2011) proposes that there are four characteristics of high self-efficacy.

1) Self-confidence.

One of the most obvious characteristics of high self-efficacy is self-confidence. They approach tasks or situations with a sense of their ability to be successful. This self-confidence tends to lead to more experience which

increases their ability which leads to greater self-confidence. This positive cycle lends itself to increasing self-efficacy even further.

2) Accurate self-evaluation.

Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to be able to accurately evaluate their performance. They are neither overly-critical nor overly positive but are able to examine themselves realistically in order to pursue self-improvement.

3) Willingness to take risks.

Those with high self-efficacy are willing to take risks because they understand that taking calculated risks increases the chances of success. As they are not fearful of failure or mistakes, reasonable risks can only increase self-efficacy.

4) Sense of accomplishment.

Generally, those with high self-efficacy feel a sense of accomplishment because they are often more successful due to the willingness to take risks and to pursue interests. Even if they fail or make mistakes they feel a sense of accomplishment because they view mistakes as opportunities to improve themselves.

It is particularly exciting to note that teaching strategies used in the classroom can and do make a difference to students' self-efficacy.

Other pedagogies for improving self-efficacy include:

- Establish specific, short-term goals that will challenge the students, yet are still viewed as attainable.
- Help students lay out a specific learning strategy and have them verbalize their plan. As students proceed through the task, ask students to note their progress and verbalize the next steps.
- Compare student performance to the goals set for that student, rather than comparing one student against another or comparing one student to the rest of the class (Schunk, D. H. 1995).

In his 1994 textbook chapter, Albert Bandura notes that certain well-worn pedagogical practices may have the unintended effect of diminishing the self-efficacy of students who do not reside at the top of the class academically. These include:

- Generalized, "lockstep" instruction that is inflexible and does not allow for student input. A formulaic type of instructional setting makes it harder for students to ask questions or become involved in

the process. The result may be that if a student becomes confused or discouraged, they are likely to remain so.

• Statements or teaching practices that compare students' performance against each other. This may raise the self-efficacy of the top students, but is likely to lower the self-efficacy of the rest of the class.

Alternatives to Questions as Strategy to Improve Speaking Ability and Self-Efficacy

Learning strategies play important role in the learning process. According to Wenden and Rubin, 1987, cited in Jafar, 2014 define learning strategies as "... any sets of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learner to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information". Language learning strategies are "the conscious thoughts and behaviors used by learners with the explicit goal of improving their knowledge of the target language. Based on Jafar's study (2014), the students in this study were predisposed to employ language learning strategies when they participated in speaking tasks. This required knowledge and individual strategy that they could pick and employ appropriately. This study aimed at examining the effect of learning strategies employed by learners for sharpening their English speaking proficiency in English language institutes. Based on the findings of this successful research, second language learners showed a greater tendency to make use of language learning strategies more frequently and efficiently than less successful ones.(Jafar, 2014)

Mandernach, Forrest, Babutzke & Manker. 2009 cited in Alexander, Martha E. et all. 2010 found a strong body of research that shows critical thinking is enhanced through instructional strategies that promote active learning. Bonwell and Eison. 1991 cited in Alexander, Martha E. et all. 2010) define active learning as "anything that involves students in doing things and thinking about what they are doing". An instructional strategy that promotes active learning (and thus critical thinking) is the "four-question technique" created by Dietz-Uhler & Lanter (2009). They developed the following four questions that fostered analyzing, reflecting, relating, and questioning:

1. "Identify one important concept, research finding, theory, or idea in psychology that you learned while completing this activity." (analyzing)

2. "Why do you believe that this concept, research finding, theory, or idea in psychology is important?" (reflecting)
3. "Apply what you have learned from this activity to some aspect of your life." (relating)
4. "What question(s) has the activity raised for you? What are you still wondering about?"(questioning).

Alexander, Martha E. et all. (2010) conducted a research based on this four-question technique. Results suggested that the four-question technique was effective in enhancing critical thinking in online discussions. Wals, in his article How Can Quality Questioning Transform Classrooms? Questioning to Advance Thinking, Learning, and Achievement, states that Questioning, Thinking and Understanding are the three processes interact in a dynamic fashion to advance student learning, performance, and achievement. These classroom processes create the energy for student work, the fuel for learning. Wals propose 5 reseach findings relate to current practice in teaching and learning:

1. Teachers ask many questions.
2. Most teacher questions are at the lowest cognitive level—known as fact, recall, or knowledge.
3. Not all students are accountable to respond to all questions. Teachers frequently call for volunteers, and these volunteers constitute a select group of students.
4. Teachers often accept incorrect answers without probing; they frequently answer their own questions.
5. Students ask very few content-related questions.
6. Teachers typically wait less than one second after asking a question before calling on a student to answer (Wait Time 1). They wait even less time (usually 0 seconds) before speaking after a student has answered (Wait Time 2).

As noted, the planning of speech takes place under the enormous pressures of time. A degree of thinking ahead occurs while the speaker is actually articulating, but brief pauses of 0.2 to 1.0 seconds are necessary for planning the form of the next utterance. (John Field in Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics, 2011)

J.T. Dillon (1983) recommended Alternatives to Questions as one of strategies in teaching and learning process. He recommended seven

alternatives to questioning used at a particular juncture in the discourse. Suppose that the teacher has said something – even asked a question – and a student has just said something in turn. At that juncture, instead of asking a question the teacher may choose one or another of these techniques. Each is designed to stimulate further student thought and response, to encourage participation and to teach appropriate discussion behavior.

There are seven alternatives to questions proposed by J.T. Dillon:

1. Declarative Statement

A declarative statement is used in place of a question to express a thought that has occurred to the teacher in relation to what the student has just been said. Sometimes teachers use a question to make a point. The point can be made directly by declaring it. In that way the student can immediately apprehend the point and respond to it, rather than trying to figure out the point of the question.

Contrary to what some people think, declarative statements do evoke responses. Moreover, the responses may be both longer and more complex than responses to questions (Dillon, 1983). In that respect, a declarative statement is a useful alternative for enhancing student thought and response.

2. Reflective Restatement

A second alternative to asking a question is to state your understanding of what the student has just said, giving its sense in one economical and exact sentence. The effect of the restatement is to signal to the student and to others in the class that you are attentive to the statement and appreciate the contribution before reacting to it; e.g.; before asking a question about it.

It is fruitless to ask, "What do you mean, Rodriguez?" because Rodriguez has just said what he means. The question gives no clue as to what you got from it and what you missed. All Rodriguez can do is repeat what he said or say it a bit differently. It is also fruitless to base a question on Rodriguez's meaning if you have missed it, in the ensuing discussion goes awry, and everyone has to backtrack and unravel the misconnections. A restatement informs Rodriguez of the extent of your understanding before anyone presumes to rely on it. The restatement makes public possession of a private meaning.

There are several ways to make a reflective restatement. The teacher might start off with "I get from what you say that. . ." Or "So you think that.

. ." For example, a student has just finished a long contribution. The teacher makes a summary statement; the student agrees and goes on to elaborate.

The reflective restatement encourages students to say more with, perhaps, more substance. It confirms the speaker in his effort to contribute and it gives him the opportunity - invariably taken - to elaborate, properly inferring that what he thinks must matter some. The result is to encourage participation (both speaking and listening) and to facilitate discussion of real rather than imagined meanings.

3. State of Mind

On occasion you will wish to respond to what a student has been saying, but you do not seem to have anything very clear to say. You may be tempted to ask a question, but a question does not express your state of mind. The alternative is to express that state of mind.

There are many states of mind and various ways of expressing them, but the technique remains the same in all cases: describe in truth your state of mind, and none other. You might find yourself befuddled by what a student is saying, or you may just have missed the student's point. Declare that fact to the student: "I'm confused about what you're saying," or "I'm sorry, I'm not getting it." Then the speaker or other participants can help you get back into the swing of things.

A related state of mind involves muddling and pondering. In this state a person is wondering about something without yet being at the point of having a question to pose to someone else. You express that state of mind by using a mixed declarative-interrogative sentence: "I was just thinking about whether that would make any difference," or "I'm trying to remember what happens under those conditions." The phrasing resembles an indirect question in form but not in function because it directly describes your state of mind rather than indirectly proposing a question to someone else.

It is useless to tiptoe around with delicacies of phrase if they do not reflect your true state of mind. But it is even worse to march in with a direct question to the student, based on what the student has not said or meant. You are in no condition to ask a question; so describe your state of mind instead.

4. Invitation to Elaborate

This alternative is simple. If you would like to hear more of the student's views, say: "I'd like to hear more of your views on that." Or

specify the invitation: "I'd be interested in your definition/experience of that." The invitation can also be phrased in a mixed declarative-imperative sentence: "Perhaps you could give some examples to help us understand," or "Maybe you can consider the opposite case now:" Such delicacies of phrase are both more expressive and more inviting than "Define your terms!" or "Why do you think something like that?"

In contrast to the invitation to elaborate is the use of questions to probe or find out the feelings, experiences, and personal information of a student. A related use of probing questions is to draw out individual students who are not participating. Ordinarily such questions meet with limited and uninformative responses. The questions have turned the previously rich and expressive discussion into a series of limited, empty exchanges. The answers are barely more than sufficient to the formal terms of the question; they consist of yes/no and silent refusal to elaborate; the individual wait until the teacher asks yet another question for yet another restrained answer, or until the student directs a question to yet another unwilling respondent. The overall effect is to discourage participation and to model inappropriate discussion behavior.

An authority on adult group discussion cites five reasons against asking a question of someone who is not participating (Maier, 1963 cited in Dillon, 1983):

1. The question may threaten the individual.
2. The individual may have nothing worthwhile to contribute at the moment.
3. Others will wonder why this individual was picked out for special treatment.
4. The questioner's behavior suggests that spontaneous contributions are not in order.
5. The technique causes participants to be ready with a response in the case called upon, rather than to think about the problem under discussion.

These same considerations might apply in classrooms as well, accounting for the counterproductive effect of questions put to draw out individuals.

Another type of probing the question is why-question. Although why-questions appear to be most appropriate for a discussion, they usually turn out to be imprecise and counterproductive. They discourage the

expression of thought. Why-questions are imprecise because they do not specify the nature of the response. A variety of responses may count as an answer a cause, reason, motive, justification, process, etc. The respondent does not know which of these are the "why" in question. Often several answers have to be prepared and discounted and several further questions put before the questioner is satisfied. Furthermore, the intent of most why-questions is not to seek any such answer at all. Even given amiable intent, why-question functions to express such things as objections, disapproval, criticism, the response is to defend, withdraw, or attack (Benjamin, 1974 cited in Dillon, 1983). When we react to a student's contribution or behavior by means of a why-question, we risk communicating that what he is saying or doing is wrong or stupid.

Certainly, there are times when a sincere, why-question occurs to a teacher, but the teacher must be sure that the student receives it as a sincere why-question. A teacher might consider using one of the alternatives to questions, because they convey better than a why-question can that the teacher is genuinely interested in learning the student's reasons for saying or thinking something.

5. Speaker's Question

When a student is confused or is having difficulty making a point, asks that student to formulate a question. By will the speaker formulate a question; he discovers precisely the matter at issue and can get the help he needs. The technique consists not merely of worth or gestures of encouragement, but of providing the student with the time to formulate his question with thought and care. By contrast, all goes awry when the teacher asks a series of "diagnostic" questions: "Do you mean this? Do you mean that? What are you trying to say?" Although intended to help the student deliver a stalled thought, these questions confuse the student even more. When faced with such questions, the student is required to disengage from the struggle to formulate his own thoughts and must search for an answer that is satisfactory to the teacher.

6. Class Questions

When the class is confused or intrigued by a student's contribution, instead of asking a question; encourage students to raise questions about the issue under discussion. Peers more readily address questions to one another than they do to superiors. And student responses to student questions are

both longer and more complex than their responses to teacher questions (Boggs, 1972; Mishler, 1978 cited in Dillon, 1983). Soliciting student questions have the effect of encouraging inquiry and of promoting student-student interaction.

It is erroneous to think that students have no questions to ask. Every time that conditions have been provided for them (not by a mere pause, "Any questions? - No? OK, open your hooks "), a flood or intriguing student questions have poured forth (Finley, 1921; Helseth, 1926; Tamminen, 1979 cited in Dillon 1983). When polled on the matter 95% of preservice teachers stated that students indeed have questions, but do not go on to ask them in class (Dillon 1983); Their general reason was that students are afraid to ask questions, largely because of their experience with negative reactions from the teacher (and from classmates). The lesson, students draw from these negative reactions is "Don't ask questions."

One of the simplest ways to permit student questions is to stop asking questions yourself. It is a simple fact of language that a person who is cast in the role of the respondent has no opportunity to ask a question, for at every turn he must answer one. That is especially true in classrooms, where students are clearly subordinate and the teacher always has the next turn at talk. In classroom discourse, especially students must have prior permission to ask a question and they must be granted the turn to ask it. Hence it is not enough for teachers just to have a benevolent attitude about student questions; they must provide conditions that permit and encourage students to ask questions.

Teachers are often wrong in their estimates of how many student questions they hear in class. For example, elementary teachers who were well disposed in theory to receive student questions estimated that they heard about 8 per lesson, whereas observers could count only one (Susskind, 1969 cited in Dillon, 1983). These same teachers estimated that they themselves asked about 15 questions per half -hour lesson, whereas observers counted 42. The real rates work out to more than one teacher question per minute and one question per pupil per month.

Related to class questions is the malpractice of counterquestioning, that is, a teacher replying to a student's question with a question of his own. In elementary grades, teachers have been found to reply with a counter question to two of every three pupil questions (Mishler, 1975 cited in Dillon

1983). A counter question has the force of rejecting a student initiative, of refusing to the student the right to ask a question, for withholding cooperation in the exchange, and of wresting control he interchanges away from the student and back to the teacher. No the student must answer the teacher's question. A counter question says: "I'm the one who asks the questions around here. You answer them."

7. Deliberate Silence

Deliberate silence is the most intriguing alternative to questions and one of the most effective. It is the simplest yet the hardest to practice. And it is the most difficult for everyone in class to get used to. Say nothing at all. When a student pauses, falters, or has ostensibly finished speaking, maintain a deliberate, attentive, and appreciative silence lasting 3-5 seconds. Chances are that the speaker will resume or another student will enter in.

Deliberate silence is difficult for teachers because they feel impelled to speak out of a sense of responsibility, if not anxiety, for maintaining and directing classroom discourse. For many teachers a period of silence seems to be awkward, perhaps wasteful, and a silence of 3-5 seconds seems to be a void.

To use this technique a teacher must first practice the timing. The teacher must learn how long three seconds actually last and then rehearse that duration between two sentences spoken aloud. At home, one might use a stopwatch. In class it might help to nod or murmur while waiting for the student to resume. Students as well as teachers are used in no time at all between utterances. For years everyone has been conditioned to hearing the teacher start to speak within less than a second after the student's last syllable (Rowe, 1974 cited in Dillon, 1983). To be notified in a classroom, a silence has to be maintained for three seconds or so.

The need for silence in a discussion comes from the fact that time is needed for sustained expression of student thought. The act of expressing complex thought, personal opinions, interpretations, and the like requiring more time than the act of expressing factual matters, recounting events, giving descriptions, and the like. Also, the very expression of complex thought is characterized by pauses, false starts, and other hesitations that occur both more frequently and for longer periods than they do during the expression of factual knowledge. For example, in

spontaneous speech both adults and children may pause twice as often (per word produced) while explaining or interpreting an event than while describing it (Goldman-Eisler, 1968; Levin et at., 1967 cited in Dillon 1983). Therefore, if a teacher maintains a deliberate silence for 3-5 seconds when a student falters or pauses, he can expect to hear not only more talk but also more complex thought.

Silence is a deliberate act by the teacher that enhances student thought and response, and encourages participation. Furthermore, it models one appropriate discussion behavior for students to imitate: due attentiveness and listening until the participant has succeeded in delivering an entire thought not just a phrase or a sentence of two. To speak up at the first second's pause or on the first flawed phrase is merely to grab the floor and to dismiss the speaker; it is no less an interruption than when someone is speaking indeed, someone is speaking.

In place of asking a question, the teacher can substitute a variety of alternative techniques. However, on occasion the teacher will use none of these alternatives, but will properly ask a question.

By using these alternatives together, a teacher will have established an atmosphere in which the appearance, sudden and stark, as it were on that lone question now gives form to perplexity and empowers joint inquiry. These are the educative fruits of disposing the class for the question we have prepared. To conceive the question has required of us thought; to formulate it, labor, and to pose it, tact. There is the art of questioning.

Classroom interaction has traditionally been shaped by questions, described in models such as Sinclair and Coulthard's (1992) IRF model, in which the teacher initiates the first move (I), a student responds (R) and the teacher evaluates and asks a question in the follow-up move (F). While this exchange sets cognitive challenges for students, guides the direction of learning and is effective for managing classroom behavior, it has been claimed that there is potential for teachers to encourage more student output by using alternatives to a follow-up question in the third turn (Dillon, 1983). Declarative Statement, Reflective Statement, Speaker Referral, Statement of Mind, Statement of Interest, and Back Channeling. Suppose that the teacher has said something – even asked a question – and a student has just said something in turn. At that juncture, instead of asking a question the teacher may choose one or another of these techniques. Each is designed to

stimulate further student thought and discussion, and to teach appropriate discussion behavior.

1. Declarative statement. Instead of asking a question, express your state of mind by declaring your thought, opinion, feeling, and experience in relation to the previous speaker's contribution or the issue under discussion. The statement in mind is that one which immediately precedes a question, the pre-question though. Contrary to what might be supposed, declarative statements are indeed responding to and can be expected to receive longer and more complex responses than questions.

2. Reflective re-statement. Summarize your understanding of what the previous speaker has just said. The effect is to signal to everyone the importance of listening carefully to someone's contribution and the difficulty of appreciating it right – especially before reacting to it or, worse, ignoring it. The re-statement also gives the speaker an opportunity invariably taken – to clarify or elaborate, properly inferring that what he thinks matters some. The result is to encourage participation as well as to facilitate discussion of real rather than imagined meanings.

3. Declaration of perplexity. If in truth you are perplexed by what the student is saying, so inform the student: "I'm confused about what you're saying." The information can be expressed in a mixed declarative-interrogative phrasing (cf. "Indirect question"). "I was just thinking about whether that would make any difference," "I'm trying to remember if X- or Y is the case," "I wonder what happens under those conditions." It is useless to tiptoe around with such phrases if they do not reflect your state of mind; and, if they do, it is useless to ask a question, for you are not yet in a condition to ask one.

4. Invitation to elaborate. If in truth you would like to hear more of the students' views, say: "I'd like to hear more of your views on that." The request can be phrased as a mixed declarative- imperative (cf. "Softened imperative"). "Perhaps you could give an example to help us understand," "I'd be interested to know the reasons behind that." Such delicacies of phrase are more inviting than "Define your terms!" or "Why do you think something like that?!" Responses of students to

a student question are both longer and more complex than a teacher's question.

5. Class questions. By various means, permit and invite students to raise a question about their classmate's last contribution or about the issue at hand. Responses of students to a student question are both longer and more complex than a teacher's question. Hence, to evoke student questions has the effects of encouraging inquiry, of enhancing discussion, and of promoting student-student interaction. By contrast, the more the teacher asks questions, the fewer questions will students put, and the shorter and simpler do responses become; while student-student interaction and voluntary contributions disappear as everyone begins to talk only to the teacher and only when asked.

6. Speaker's question. When a student is confused or is having difficulty expressing self, let that speaker formulate a question. That way the speaker gets precisely the needed help or provides a new question for all to consider. By contrast, if the teacher starts with a series of so-called diagnostic questions, the discussion muddles ever more and the students' thinking becomes even more confounded in an inevitably protracted, distracting hit-or-miss exchange ("Do you mean this? Do you mean that? What are you trying to say? What is the price of tea in China?").

7. Deliberate silence. Say nothing at all. This is the most intriguing technique and one of the most effective. It is the simplest yet hardest to practice. When a student stops at the (ostensible) end of his or her remarks, maintain a deliberate, attentive silence for 3-5 seconds (perhaps with a murmur and nod or two). Once everyone has become accustomed to such odd teacher behavior, invariably the original speaker will resume or another will enter in. Not only will the contribution has therefore become longer, it will almost certainly exhibit more complex thinking. Hence the teacher's deliberate use of silence can encourage student participation, thought and response. By contrast, the teacher's question at that juncture only closes the floor and forestalls expression of thought.

Using alternatives to routine questions can actively encourage thinking and dialogue. Bury used alternatives to routine questions in his study, it is a good start to encourage students to produce more output.

Although the result of the study needs to be improved, but it can be better over time as the students become more comfortable with, and able to recognize the intention of the moves made by the teacher. Also, giving teachers further training in how to effectively incorporate different moves into their classroom language would greatly benefit the fluidity and authenticity of their interactions because the natural conversations are not just a series of questions being asked by one person and answered by another. Each of the alternatives to questions that applied in this study is to stimulate further student thought and discussion, and to teach appropriate discussion behavior. For example, in reflective statement, students' comments were valued and being listened to. Based on the psychological aspect, we will become more confident in offering our own opinion, if someone listens to us and our opinion is awarded by others. So, in this case the students feel relaxed and say more. Also, it can be seen in "Statement of interest". It is a motivating effect on the student's engagement with discussion. We will feel happy to be asked more if we are involved or take part in a discussion. There is no isolated feeling because others show their interest in our views. 'Speaker referral' challenges the students to comment and develop their classmates' contribution or idea. It brings students' ideas together and they generally link together well and this helps the flow of the class.

Furthermore, Vygotsky, in common with Freire and Dewey, saw the importance of social interaction in education. It is through social interaction that higher order thinking emerges. The 'place' where this is most likely to be facilitated is in the 'zone of proximal development or ZPD', 'the distance between the actual developmental level [of the learner] as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers'. More capable peers (and teachers) aid or 'scaffold' learners in the ZPD, thus contributing a socially oriented rationale for interactive and collaborative pair and group work. (Diane Larsen-Freeman in Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics, 2011)

Regarding to SLA, every learner is different. Some learners might be more successful than others. It arises in part from the humanistic framework within psychology. This framework calls for consideration of emotional involvement in learning, such as affective factors of attitude, motivation,

and anxiety level (Saville-Troike: 2005). It is what the teachers have to concern about applying the strategy or activity in the classroom. According to Harmer (2001), faced with the different description of learner types and styles, the teacher has to start with the recognition of students as an individual as well as being members of a group, not every member has the same knowledge. By monitoring the progress, it can tell us who need more or less help in the class.

METHODOLOGY
Sampling procedure

The population of this research was the eleventh year students of MA Terpadu Duri in the academic year of 2015/2016. The eleventh year students of MA Terpadu Duri in the academic year of 2015/2016 consisted of three classes. Two classes were chosen as the samples of this research by using cluster sampling. According to Cresswell (2012) cluster sampling referred to randomly-selected groups, not individual and all members of selected groups have similar characteristics. It means that the subject of this research had the same material, the same grade, and the same teacher in teaching these classes. The classes were divided into two groups. Group 1 consisted of 20 students that were taught by using Alternatives to Questions Strategy and group 2 consisted of 20 students that were not taught by using Alternatives to Questions Strategy. So, in this research, the total sample was 40 students.

Instrument

This study used observation sheet. It was a sheet aimed to observe student activity during teaching and learning process. A questionnaire was used to get the data about students' self-efficacy. This Questionnaire was used before and after treatment. The questionnaire was arranged based on the indicators of self-efficacy. There were four indicators of self-efficacy: the students' confidence, the students' ability to accurately evaluate their performance, the students' willingness to take risks, and the students' sense of accomplishment. There were 16 items in this questionnaire. It used Likert scale. Speaking test was administered to measure students' speaking ability. The test was an oral test. It was oral presentation. In this test, the students were given three kinds of hortatory exposition texts. They chose one of the texts and there were given twenty minutes for the students to read the text

they had chosen. Then, they retold what the text was about (thesis, argument, and recommendation). Their speaking was recorded to be scored by two raters. According to Hughes (2003: 131), there are five components that should be considered in giving the students' speaking score. They are accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.

Data collection and analysis

In order to analyze the data quantitatively, three kinds of formula of T-test through SPSS 16 was used; a paired sample T-test, independent sample T-test.

Results And Discussion

The result of students' speaking ability mean score of pre-test between experimental and control group was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test. The following table shows the analysis result of students' speaking ability mean score of pre-test between experimental and control groups.

Table 1

The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Pre-test speaking ability score between Experimental and Control groups

Subject	Research Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Pre–test	Experimental Group	60.80	7.053	0	8	.261	.796
	Control Group	61.30	4.889	0			

Table 1 shows that no significant difference is found at pre-test speaking ability between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 0.261, its df is 38. So, in the conclusion p = 0.796, the 2-tailed value is more than 0.05 (p>0.05). There is no significant difference of students' speaking ability on the hortatory exposition text before being taught by using Alternatives to Questions strategy for experimental group and non-treatment of Alternatives to Questions of the eleventh year students at MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of students' speaking ability mean score of post-test between experimental and control group was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test. The following table shows the analysis result of students' speaking ability mean score of post-test between experimental and control groups.

Table 2

The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Post-test score between Experimental and Control Group

Subject	Research Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Post–test	Experimental Group	66.65	6.218	0	8	4.332	.000
	Control Group	74.15	4.614	0			

Table 2 indicates that there is a significant difference is found at post speaking ability between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 4.332, its df is 38. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05). There is a significant difference of students' speaking hortatory exposition text test after being taught by using Alternatives to Questions strategy for the experimental group and non-treatment of Alternatives to Questions strategy of the eleventh year students of MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of students' self-efficacy mean score of pre-questionnaire between experimental and control group is analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test. The following table shows the analysis result of students' self-efficacy mean score of pre-questionnaire between experimental and control groups.

Table 3

The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Pre-questionnaire score between Experimental and Control Group

Subject	Research Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Pre–questionnaire	Experimental Group	60.00	6.415	0	8	0.90 0	0.374
	Control Group	58.00	7.588	0			

Table3 above illustrates that no significant difference is found in pre questionnaire result between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 0.900 and its df is 38. So, in the conclusion p = 0.374, the 2-tailed value is more than 0.05 (p>0.05). There is no significant difference of students' self-efficacy before being taught by using Alternatives to Questions strategy for the experimental group and non-treatment of Alternatives to Questions strategy for the control group of the eleventh year students of MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of students' self-efficacy mean score of post-questionnaire between experimental and control group was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test. The following table shows the analysis result of students' self- efficacy mean score of post-questionnaire between experimental and control groups.

Table 4

The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Post-questionnaire score between Experimental and Control Group

Subject	Research Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Post–questionnaire	Experimental Group	71.95	4.478	0	8	4.641	.000
	Control Group	64.00	6.215	0			

Table 4 reveals that there is a significant difference is found in post-questionnaire between experimental and control groups. T-test result is 4.641 and its df is 38. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05). There is a significant difference of students' self-efficacy after being taught by using Alternatives to Questions strategy for the experimental group and non-treatment of Alternative to Questions strategy for the control group of the eleventh year students at MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of the effect of implementing the treatment of Alternatives to Questions strategy on students' speaking ability for the experimental group of the retelling hortatory exposition score for both pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following table:

Table 5

The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-test and Post-test of students'speaking abilityof Experimental Group

Subject	Group Score	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Effect	Pre – test Score	61.30	4.889	0	9	9.345	.000
	Post – test Score	60.30	7.053	0			

Table 5 above shows that there is a significant difference found at pre-test speaking and post-test speaking ability of experimental groups. T-test result is 9.345 and its df is 39. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05). It can be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent after giving the treatment at students of the eleventh year at MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics eta square, which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 4 meetingsby using Alternatives to Questions strategy can improve 69%on the speaking ability in the Hortatory Exposition text. Based on the calculation above

students' speaking ability is categorized as moderate effect. There is a significant effect of using Alternatives to questions strategy on students' speaking ability in hortatory exposition text for the experimental group.

The result of the effect of implementing the non-treatment of Alternatives to Questions strategy of the students' speaking ability for control group pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented in the following Table:

Table 6

The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-test and Post-test of students'speaking abilityofcontrol Group

Subject	Group Score	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Effect	Pre – test Score	60.80	7.053	0	9	4.690	.000
	Post – test Score	66.65	6.218	0			

Table 6 illustrates that there is a significant difference found at pre-test speaking and post-test speaking ability of control groups. T-test result is 4.690 and its df is 39. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05). The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics eta square, which has been identified after conducting the treatment without using Alternatives to Questions strategy can improve **53%** of the speaking in the hortatory exposition text. There is a significant difference on students' pre-test and post-test mean score in the control group in speaking the hortatory exposition text at MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of the effect of implementing the treatment of Alternatives to Questions strategy on students' self-efficacy for experimental group score for both pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following table:

Table 7

The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire of students' self-efficacy for Experimental Group

Subject	Group Score	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Effect	Pre – questionnaire Score	60.00	6.415	0	9	7.884	.000
	Post – questionnaire Score	71.95	4.478	0			

Table 7 reveals that there is significant difference found at pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire of experimental groups. T-test result is 7.884 and its df is 39. So, in the conclusion p = 0.000, the 2-tailed value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05). It can be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent after giving the treatment of students of the eleventh year at MA Terpadu Duri.

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics eta square which has identified that after conducting the treatment for 4 meetingsby using Alternatives to Questions strategy can improve **62%** on the students' self-efficacy. Based on the calculation above students' self-efficacy is categorized as **moderate effect**. There is a significant effect of using Alternatives to Questions strategy on students' self- efficacy for the experimental group.

The result of the effect of implementing the non-treatment of Alternatives to Questions strategy on students' self-efficacy for experimental group score for both pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following table:

Table 8

The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire of students' self-efficacy ofControl Group

Subject	Group Score	Mean	Standard Deviation		f	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Effect	Pre – questionnaire Score	58.00	7.588	0	9	4.146	. 001
	Post – questionnaire Score	64.00	6.215	0			

Table 8 above shows that there is a significant difference is found in pre-questionnaire students' self-efficacy and post-questionnaire of control groups. T-test result is 4.146 and its df is 39. So, in the conclusion p = 0.001, the 2-tailed value is less than 0.05 (p<0.05). It can be determined that the subjects in both groups are not equivalent.

The result of data analysis is based on inferential statistics eta square, which has been identified after conducting the treatment for **4 meetings** without using alternatives to questions strategy can improve **53%** on the students' self-efficacy. There is significant effect of without using alternatives to questions strategy on students' self-efficacy in the control group.

Alternatives to Questions strategy has the positive effect on the students' speaking abilityand self-efficacy of the eleventh year students at MA Terpadu Duri. The improvement of students' speaking ability may be attributed to students' developing ability to speak by using the Alternatives to questions strategy.

CONCLUSION

The finding of this research revealed that the use of Alternatives to Questions strategy has a significant effect on students' speaking ability and self- efficacy of eleventh year students at MA Terpadu Duri. It implies that the Alternatives to Questions strategy is a suitable strategyin improving students' speaking ability and self-efficacy. Therefore, the teacher is suggested to apply this strategy.

AL-ISHLAH

-------------------------------------- *Jurnal Pendidikan* --------------------------------------

REFERENCES

Alexander, Martha E. et all. 2010. *Using the Four-Questions Technique to Enhance Critical Thinking in Online Discussions*. MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching Vol. 6, No. 2,

Bandura, A. (1989). *Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development* and functioning. Education Psychology, 28(2),

Brown, Doughlas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive approach to Language Pedadgogy*. New York: Longman.

Brown, Doughlas. 2003. Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. New York: Longman

Brown, Gillian and Yule, George. 1999. *Teaching the spoken Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Bury, James. *Encouraging More Student Output: Alternatives to Questions.* Journal of Second Language Teaching and Research. Volume 3 Issue 1

Cresswell, John W. 2012. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Dashwood, Ann. 2005. *Alternatives to Questioning: Teacher Role in Classroom Discussion*. The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, Vol.7, 144-165.

Dietz-Uhler, B. & Lanter, J.R. (2009). *Using the Four-Questions Technique to Enhance Learning. Teaching of Psychology*.

Dillon, J.T. 1983. *Teaching and the Art of Questioning*. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation : Bloomington, Indiana.

Dodds,Jennifer.2011.*The Correlation Between Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Language Performance, And Intergration Amongst Chinese Immigrant Newcomers*

Edwards, A. D., & Westgate, D. P. G. (1994). *Investigating classroom talk*. London: Falmer Press.

Field, John. 2011. *Routledge Handbooks in Applied Linguistics.*

Gay, L.R and Airasian, Peter. 2000. *Educational Research: Competences For Analysis And Application*. USA: Prentice Hall

Graham-Marr, A. (2004). Teaching skills for listening and speaking. Retrieved, from http://www Abax . Co. jp/downloads/ extension/ETJ 2004

Jafar Jabbari, Mohammad. 2014. *The Effect of Learning Strategies on the*

Hamzah, Mohd Hilmi. *Teaching Speaking Skills Through Group Work Activities:A Case Study In Smk Damai Jaya*

AL-ISHLAH

Harmer, Jeremy.1998. *How to Teach English: An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Logman

Harmer, Jeremy. 1983. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, London : Longman Group.

Harmer, J. 2001. *The practice of English Language Teaching.* Pearson.

Hughes, Arthur. 2003. *Testing for Language Teacher*. Cambridge University Press.

Michael, J. Wallace. 1981. *Teaching Vocabulary*, London: Biddles Ltd, Guilford and King's Lynn.

Monica A. Frank. 2011. *The Pillars of the Self-Concept: Self-Esteem and Self-Efficacy*

Nunan, David. 1991. Language Teaching Methodology, New Jersey: Prentice Hall International.

OIler, J. W. (Ed.) (2003). *Issues in language testing research*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury house.

Penny Ur. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory* . New York: Cambridge University Press.

Puri,Angki Candra *A Correlation Study Between Students' Self-Efficacy and Their English Language Achievement*

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002), *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riggenbach, H., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). Promoting oral communication skills. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed.) (pp. 125-136). Boston: Heinle & Heinle

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 2005. *Introduction to Second Language Acquisition*

Schunk, D. H. (1995). *Self-efficacy, motivation, and performance. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 112-137.

Wals. *How Can Quality Questioning Transform Classrooms? Questioning to Advance Thinking, Learning, and Achievement.*

Yule, George. 2006. *The Study of Language –Third Edition,*. New York: Cambrigde University Press.

Zainil, 2003. *Language Teaching Method*: universitas Negeri padang Press.

Zaenuri, A. 2001. *English Vocabulary* I, Revised Edition, Jakarta: unpublished.