Tailoring English Questions for Primary Special Needs Students

Luh Diah Surya Adnyani[1*], Kisyani Laksono[2], Syafiul Anam[3]　iD

[1] Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Indonesia
[2,3] Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra , Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A K

Dalam literatur, diyakini bahwa pertanyaan merupakan bagian integral dari pendidikan. Namun kajian terhadap soal-soal yang digunakan oleh guru di semua jenjang pendidikan terutama dilakukan terhadap siswa dengan perkembangan tipikal. Studi tentang bagaimana guru menggunakan pertanyaan bahasa Inggris untuk meningkatkan komunikasi dan hasil belajar siswa berkebutuhan khusus masih terbatas. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis bagaimana guru di sekolah bilingual memaparkan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa kedua dan menyesuaikan pertanyaan untuk siswa sekolah dasar yang berkebutuhan khusus. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode studi kasus instrumental Stake. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan melakukan observasi di kelas ABK dua kali seminggu selama empat bulan. Subjek penelitian ini adalah dua orang guru dari sekolah bilingual yang diamati selama pembelajaran dan diwawancarai secara individual. Data dianalisis dan dikodekan secara anonim. Kemudian kode tersebut dievaluasi untuk mengidentifikasi tema-tema potensial untuk mempelajari lebih lanjut tentang jenis-jenis penting dan pertimbangan-pertimbangan dalam mengajukan strategi bagi siswa berkebutuhan khusus. Berdasarkan analisis tematik, guru-guru ini menggunakan pertanyaan yang mengutamakan dua faktor: pertanyaan berbasis kognitif dan pertanyaan berbasis afektif. Studi ini menggarisbawahi implikasinya terhadap praktik di kelas sekaligus memperluas pemahaman pengajaran bahasa Inggris kepada siswa berkebutuhan khusus dalam lingkungan bilingual.

A B S T R A C T

In the literature, it is believed that question is an integral part of education. However, the studies on questions used by teachers in all education levels are mainly conducted on typical development students. Studies on how teachers use English questions to enhance communication and learning outcomes of students with special needs are still limited. The aims of this study is to analyze how teachers in a bilingual school expose English as a second language and customize the questions to elementary students with special needs. This study used Stake's instrumental case study method. The data were collected by having observation in the special need classroom twice a week for four months. The subject of this study are two teachers from a bilingual school were observed during lessons and individually interviewed. The data is analyzed and encoded anonymized. Then the code is evaluated to identify potential themes to learn more about the important types and considerations of asking strategies for students with special needs. According to the thematic analysis, these teachers employed questions that prioritized two factors: cognitive-based questions and affective-based questions. The study underlines the implications for classroom practice while expanding the understanding of teaching English to special needs students in a bilingual setting.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a global movement to leave no one behind and support inclusive classrooms where students with special needs can take regular classes. People with moderate disabilities now have the right to be enrolled in mainstream schools because they are thought to have the cognitive capacity to benefit from the national curriculum. The inclusive education notion was announced almost three decades ago in Salamanca statement (Ahmad, 2010; Heyer, 2021; Holifurrahman, 2020). The leaders worldwide accommodate this notion and support that all people get equitable quality education and have lifelong learning opportunities (Bessarabova & Kurysheva, 2020; González-pérez & Ramírez-montoya, 2022; Óskarsdóttir et al., 2020). Enrolment of special needs students in a regular classroom is only the first stage. The schools need to be prepared to handle this growing diversity of students. Unfortunately, there have been instances where teachers in inclusive courses have shown stress while addressing the requirements of special needs students (Aguiar et al., 2019; Arnaiz-Sánchez et al., 2023; González-pérez & Ramírez-montoya, 2022). The inclusion of children with special needs is widely encouraged, but many

*Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: diah77@email.com (Luh Diah Surya Adnyani)

teachers lack the assurance and expertise needed to support students with special needs in the classroom. As a result, this state could obstruct their participation and academic growth (Ismaili, 2020; Menbet, 2018; Ritter et al., 2019). Although teachers' attitudes toward inclusion have been the subject of prior research, little is known about teachers' experiences working with students with special needs, for example, autism spectrum disorder, and adapting English questions for them (Cook & Ogden, 2021; Tay et al., 2019). Questioning has been the subject of much research. Previous studies have investigated teacher questioning practices in preschool, how teachers asked and adapted questions to elementary students and how the role teachers played in encouraging dialogic interaction by questioning served distinct functions for advancing elementary students' conceptual understanding component (Biggers, 2018; Chen et al., 2017; Hamel et al., 2021). At the high school level, the study was conducted to explore the types and strategies of questioning uttered by English as foreign language teachers, while at the college level, students perceive questions that assist them learn (Paramartha et al., 2018; Prasetianto, 2019). These provide evidence that questions are used in education at any level.

Questions can promote student learning. Teachers have long used questions as a teaching tool to evaluate their students' knowledge, foster comprehension, and encourage critical thinking. Moreover, teachers ask questions to assist students to understand what they have learned. Students must study a subject thoroughly to stimulate discussion and encourage peer-to-peer connection (Joseph & Thomas, 2020; Tofade et al., 2013). Current research generally agrees that teachers are asked to promote divergent questions. However, in reality, the majority of teachers' time was spent on convergent, factual, procedural questions with only one correct response that did little to foster critical thinking or engaging class discussion. Instead, teachers should offer open-ended questions, allow more waiting time, and foster a welcoming, non-threatening climate where students feel comfortable making mistakes when responding to questions to achieve more significant benefits. Moreover, there is broad agreement among teachers that questions given to the students in the classroom should be based on all cognitive domains (Tay et al., 2019; Tofade et al., 2013). However, recent literature rarely addresses how teachers tailor questions in the English language to students with special needs. In order to provide special needs students with the possibility to participate in the learning process and improve their learning outcomes, teachers must adapt their questions. One study looks into feedback dialogue and questioning techniques for autism spectrum disorder students in an inclusive classroom (Biggers, 2018; Tay et al., 2019). However, none of the empirical research explores the English questioning types and adaptation in a bilingual primary school. By gathering information from teachers who teach primary students with special needs in a bilingual school, this study intended to close the gap. The result will influence teaching methods and preparation programs for special-needs students. In addition, the limited knowledge of how to tailor questions in the English language to enhance special needs elementary students' learning outcomes will be expanded by the investigation. The aims of this study is to analyze how teachers in a bilingual school expose English as a second language and customize the questions to elementary students with special needs.

2. METHOD

This study used Stake's instrumental case study method to go beyond the case of the tailored English language questions used by teachers in a bilingual school for students with special needs (Mills et al., 2010). An in-depth investigation was conducted to comprehend the phenomenon of interest, especially about the types of questions that the teachers use and any consideration in adapting questions in the English language to special needs students. Both teachers are female and have English education as their background. Teacher 1 had worked for five years in that school dealing with special needs students; meanwhile, teacher 2 had started working last year. In the school, the researchers met three special needs boy students placed in a special needs classroom. One student was in grade two, and two students were in grade three. They were only integrated into the mainstream classroom for physical exercise, art, and music lessons. Only the second-grade student was integrated into English lessons in his regular class. Most of the time, those three students study in the special needs classroom because they cannot fulfil the requirements in regular classes due to their disabilities. Those three boys are students with an autism spectrum disorder. This study focuses on how the two teachers in the bilingual school's special needs classroom interact with those students using English question and answer.

The data were collected by having observation in the special need classroom twice a week for four months. Each observation was conducted for four hours, from 8 am to 12 pm. The researcher sat at the side of the class, away from the participant student's line of sight, in order to reduce the disruption caused by her presence in the classroom. The teachers' and students' interactions were audiotaped, especially when the teachers uttered English questions. Along with the audio recording, the researchers' field notes

related to the types and manner of English questions from the teachers to the special needs students were included in the data. In addition, the data from the teacher participants were obtained through post-observation interviews. The semi-structured interview for the teachers began with questions about their backgrounds and viewpoints; their backgrounds are related to their teaching experiences dealing with special needs students, what they know about those children, how they feel dealing with them, and how they prepare and plan their teaching. Meanwhile, their viewpoints on questioning techniques are related to questions about how the questioning techniques help special needs students' learning outcomes, how the questioning techniques change, and what intention they have when uttering certain questions observed. The instrument grid containing indicators and sub-indicators is presented in Table 1.

Table1. Research Instrument Grid

Indicator	Sub Indicator
Teacher's experience and perception in teaching special needs students	The types and information about their special needs students. The feeling about having them in their class. The preparation teaching special needs students The pivotal incidents in previous lessons/years that have shaped their approach in teaching special needs students (if any).
English question technique to special needs students	The types of questions given to special needs students. How those questions given. how the questioning techniques help special needs students' learning outcomes How the questioning technique changes. The intention they have when uttering certain questions. The things should be considered in giving questions to students with special needs.

The interviews, which lasted an hour on average, were verbatim transcribed after being audio recorded with the participants' permission. Before discussions, the two researchers independently analyzed and coded the anonymized interview and lesson observation data. Next, the researchers familiarized themselves with the data (field notes, interview, and class audio transcripts) before developing initial codes that addressed the study questions. Finally, these codes were evaluated to identify potential themes to learn more about the types and important considerations of questioning strategies to special needs students.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

There were two teacher participants in this study who taught in special needs classroom in a bilingual school. The three special needs students in that class had different characteristics. Therefore, the ways teachers handled those students were different. Of course, there is no one-size-fits-all answer, but having strong and secure social ties makes it easier to perceive progress and go from the shadows to the light. However, there were several recurring themes about the teachers' English questions and the adaptation of the questions for special needs students. The first theme was cognitive-based questions, and the second was affective-based questions.

Cognitive Based Questions

Using cognitive-based questions means that the teachers choose the types of questions based on how the special needs students process the information. Among the three special needs students, Student 1 had difficulty giving close attention and remaining focused during activities. He was talkative and could understand English questions and answered them in English. Student 2 was a non-verbal autistic student. He could only produce simple words and sentences in Indonesian and could utter English that had been repeatedly communicated to him. Last but not least, student 3 could sit still doing the tasks and activities. He keened on electronic devices and rarely spoke, but when he spoke, it was about electronics. Every morning there was a morning circle. The teachers and students gathered on the floor. The teachers greeted students and had a small talk in English about the day, the weather, and the feeling of the students. To make students ready for the school activity, the teachers gave the managerial question, "Are you ready?". It was a yes/no question, and the expected answer was a "yes" answer. Another yes/no question was, "Are you happy?". The teachers found it challenging to have a "yes" answer from three

students. The beginning of the day is often challenging in the special needs classroom. Students have sensitivity dealing with changes in the place, from their house to this school, this class. We try to set a morning routine, make them ready by talking directly face to face on their height level and try to maintain eye contact. Their happy feeling to start the lesson is very important. When the students answered "No", we always asked why. The answer may vary. Sometimes they just do not want to go to school, sometimes because they did not get what they wanted from their parents. We try to direct them to feel enjoy and happy by having a small talk in Bahasa Indonesia or singing together. When we ask, "Are you happy?" again, we hope the answer is "yes". (Teacher 1)

Besides giving yes/no questions, the teachers asked short answer questions in English while the students did activities. Student 1 loved animals. He could mention the name of animals in Bahasa Indonesia and English. When this student drew, he would always draw animals. The teacher clarified his drawing in English by saying, "What animal is this?" Student 1 could answer by stating the names of those animals in English. He answered in words like "dog, cow, etc." or in sentences, for example, "It's a bird", "It's a big hyena". When the teacher asked him, "What is the sound of (name of animals)?" he could produce the sound. When the teachers asked similar questions to student 2 and 3, they could answer some. They need a visual aid to understand the questions better. Students 2 and 3 rarely speak. When I asked, "What is the sound of a cat?" and showed them a picture of a cat, student 3 could answer directly by saying, "meeooww". However, student 2 just kept silent. I took the picture of a cat and showed him. He said, "*kucing*". When I repeated "What is the sound of this cat, *kucing*?" he answered correctly. (Teacher 2) When the teachers asked a short-answer question, "How many chickens are there?" when student 3 matched pictures with correct number, student 3 said, *"tujuh"*. It indicated that the student understood the question, but chose to answer in Bahasa Indonesia. Sometimes the students know the meaning of the questions, we use Indonesian and English in daily conversation, but sometimes they answer English questions by Indonesian language. Perhaps they just want to use Bahasa Indonesia, or perhaps they do not know the answer in English. When they answered in Bahasa Indonesia, we repeated the answer using English and patiently drilled them to say the word in English. (Teacher 2)

Giving yes/no questions and short answers with close-ended answers that can easily be predicted by observing or memorizing, indicated that the teachers use low-order convergent questions. These types of questions were mostly asked by the teachers. The teachers also gave simple English questions for students to demonstrate their understanding. It was high-order convergent questions. Only student 1 could answer, student 2 and 3 mostly did not give any response. When the teachers translated to Bahasa Indonesia, student 3 sometimes could answer, but not for student 2. When I asked about their understanding of the size of the animal, I needed to translate to Bahasa Indonesia first so that the students could give their answers. Student 1 and 3 could answer my questions, "Which one is bigger, frog or monkey?" Student 1 said, "Monkey", student 2 did not give any response and student 3 pointed to the picture of a monkey without saying the word. (Teacher 1) Student 1 was very enthusiastic when he did worksheets or drew animals. The teachers related the task to what students loved. When this student worked, the teachers gave comprehension questions. Student 1 could provide examples of 4-legged and 2-legged animals. However, the three students could hardly understand the questions demonstrating their understanding and applying information. It was hard for them to describe a thing or person, find 5 differences on two pictures, mention the similarity and differences on two things, and other higher-level questions that promote students' critical thinking.

Affective-Based Questions

In teaching special needs students, the teachers should not only focus on the cognitive domain but also on students' emotions, feelings, and motivation. Since students with special needs, especially autistic students, have negative emotionality and socio-emotional deficit, the teachers should make an extra effort to communicate with them. Students often scream, shout, hit, and cry when they do not want to do the task or just want to play, draw, move around or do what they want. They made me exhausted. When one of them screamed, I pointed at the notice, "Don't Scream" and asked, "Can you scream in the classroom?" Students usually say "No," but they still do it. (Teacher 1). We need to close the door and lock it. Student 2 likes to run out of class. He likes to attract our attention and expects us to run after him. When I asked, "Where are you going?" every time he tried to open the lock and hit the door, this non-verbal student just smiled and laughed (Teacher 1).

When the teachers asked questions, they knew that the students might listen but not answer or respond to the question. The students just received and ignored it. Sometimes, they were willing to hear and understand the question, for example, "Can you scream in the classroom?" they answered, "No", but they continued screaming even louder. To make the students calm down, the teacher gave 5 minutes time out and placed them in the corner of the room to sit alone. Then the teachers would approach them and

ask, "Are you OK now?" "Are you ready to study now?" speaking on his height and maintaining eye contact with him. Maintaining eye contact was challenging for these special needs students. The teachers needed to repeat the question and instruction to ensure the students focused on them and later answered or did what was expected. Student 3 was obsessed with electronic devices. Anytime he did the task on paper, he usually drew a mobile phone held by a person in the picture or a mobile phone on the table. For example, he drew a fan on the house's ceiling in the picture or drew other electronic devices. When the teachers asked a question, he often said, "I have a white mobile phone" in Bahasa Indonesia. For example, the teacher asked which one is number 1?", he answered, "I have a white mobile phone". The student knew and was aware that the teacher asked questions, but he only received the question without giving an appropriate answer.

Student 3 likes drawing mobile phones, TV, fan, and the like. He rarely speaks, but when he speaks, it is all about electronics. One day, the task was writing the number based on the picture, and he learned about numbers one to ten. He could write the number correctly and knew the numbers in Bahasa Indonesia, but he could not answer when I asked in English. The question, "Which one is number 1?" was answered by *"Aku punya HP putih"*. When I translated to Bahasa Indonesia, he still could not answer correctly. He said *"HP ku habis baterainya."*. I tried to make him focus on the question. I repeated the question again in English and Bahasa Indonesia while making eye contact and emphasizing the word one. I tried to make him respond to my question. It needed time. I gave him 5 to 10 seconds wait time before repeating the question. (Teacher 1). The special needs students might receive the questions of the teachers but then ignore them. To gain a successful conversation and enhance students learning, the teachers tried to make students respond to the question. Started from routine activity in the morning when the teacher greeted the student by asking, "How are you?". Student 2 knew this question, but he always answered by repeating the question, "How are you?". Then the teacher tried to make him answer by saying, "I am good," by drilling him. Next, the teacher asked, "What is the weather like today?" while showing the weather pictures. Student 3 could not answer the question. The teacher asked him to walk to the window and see the sky. The teacher then asked him back while pointing to the pictures, "is it sunny or cloudy?". Student 3 did not say anything but responded by pointing to the correct picture. The three special needs students did not do a similar activity in the classroom. Instead, they had their own Independent Educational Plan (IEP). Student 1 often had negative emotions, but when he had a good mood, he could do the activities well, responding to the question attentively. Likewise, students 2 and 3, who usually received the questions, were given adequate attention to make them respond to the question.

Discussion

This study would like to explore the teachers' English questions to special needs students in a bilingual school. The teachers and students in this school speak Bahasa Indonesia and English. Since special needs students acquire and learn English at school after they have their mother language, they are sequential bilingual children. They acquire the language unconsciously and learn English consciously at school (Krashen, 1982; Leivada et al., 2021; Mohamad Nor & Rashid, 2018). Many theorists and researchers in the field of second language acquisition think it is essential to comprehend the connection between language and cognition to adequately characterize the process of second language acquisition (Cunnings, 2017; Pavičić Takač, 2008). Bilinguals have an advantage in cognitive regulation, according to several studies. Previous research has suggested that bilingualism may have a positive impact on cognitive control. The objectives that deal with information recall or recognition and the development of intellectual abilities fall under the cognitive domain. It has goals that cover shifting preferences, attitudes, and values, as well as the growth of appreciation and appropriate adjusting (Kusurkar et al., 2021; Ryökkynen et al., 2022). The hidden or internal feelings and emotions have an equally important role. Teachers' questions are a tool for dealing with cognitive behaviours, but they also significantly impact affective behaviours, where values, like, and enjoying are the main factors (Bloom, 1956; Chen et al., 2017; Joseph & Thomas, 2020; Verhagen et al., 2020). Based on the thematic analysis, teachers of special needs students must pay attention to both cognitive and affective domains.

The use of the target language is influenced by exposure to it. The amount and type of exposure to the target language may impact how well bilingual children perform linguistically. Language exposure has significantly impacted both simultaneous and sequential bilinguals' linguistic development (Haman et al., 2017; Thordardottir, 2019). Exposing the students to English questions, adapting the questions to fit the special needs students, and trying to make them not only receive and ignore the questions, but also respond appropriately, can positively impact communication and English language performance. Cognitive concerns pertain to how teachers tailor their comments and question types to the students' information-processing abilities. In their study, the teachers of autism spectrum disorder (ASD) students were mindful of the unique cognitive consideration of their ASD students and avoided the open-ended

questions and feedback that are frequently advocated in the literature. Instead, they tailored their strategy to the unique attentional networks associated with ASD by asking targeted questions and preparing their students to follow along with the course. To promote productive dialogue in the classroom, teachers need to spend the time to prepare particular questions in advance. Additionally, teachers must consciously use good questioning techniques while interacting with students during the teaching and learning process (Joseph & Thomas, 2020; Tay et al., 2019). The vast majority of special needs students, like autism spectrum disorder students, have photographic memories, making it possible for them to retain much information from visual cues. Therefore, teachers should develop visual English teaching materials, such as photos, posters, and movies, since most children with special needs are visual learners who understand communication better with visual help (Martínez & Carvajal, 2021; Nthibeli et al., 2022).

Questions might target different cognitive domains that focus on accomplishing particular learning objectives. Based on the hybrid system of Gallagher-Aschner/Bloom, the level of the questions uttered by teachers to special needs students in this study were mostly level 1 – Low Order Convergent and rarely level 2- High Order Convergent (Joseph & Thomas, 2020; Wilen, 1991). In low-order convergent questions corresponding to Bloom's knowledge level, students were asked to define, identify, quote, recollect, and give a "yes" or "no" response. Because memorizing and observation are prioritized, predicting the students' responses is simple. Meanwhile, in high-order convergent questions corresponding to Bloom's comprehension and application levels, students with special needs hardly present examples, categorize objects, describe, contrast, restate, summarize, clarify, translate, understand, relate, apply, use, and solve problems. Based on the observation, although divergent questions enhance students' learning, discussion, and interaction, the special needs students in this study could not perform analysis level such as finding causes, reasons, or motives, drawing generalizations or conclusions; and offer proof or support for conclusions. Moreover, they were struggle performing evaluative, original, and creative thinking. According to Bloom's taxonomy of learning, cognitive levels are categorized into many categories. Lower-order questions typically elicit answers in the knowledge, understanding, and application domains, whereas higher-order questions elicit answers in the analysis, synthesis, and assessment domains. Teachers are encouraged to pose questions in these domains because higher-order questions elicit more in-depth and critical thinking. It is not to say that simpler inquiries should not be made (Bloom, 1956; Chen et al., 2017; Joseph & Thomas, 2020). In this study, lower-order questions are utilized much more frequently than higher-order inquiries in special needs classrooms, according to repeated observations.

This study supports questioning technique that in elementary settings, the questions appropriate for the students are low cognitive level questions. Teachers still prefer to ask low-level questions that encourage the memorization of facts over higher-order questions that spark vibrant classroom discussion (Joseph & Thomas, 2020; Wilen, 1991). In the lowest order of cognitive processing, remembering, the recall-type questions, are most frequently asked by educators. Close-ended low-level questions outpaced open-ended questions in early childhood education (Hamel et al., 2021; Prasetianto, 2019). In addition, close-ended and display convergent questions were mostly used by English as foreign language teachers to junior high school students (Hamel et al., 2021; Paramartha et al., 2018; Tofade et al., 2013). Although this question has nothing to do with the lesson's subject, it is nonetheless crucial to assess students' comprehension, interest them in the lesson's material, and motivate them to talk in the target language. To reassure students of their comprehension as well as capture the students' attention, teachers frequently used the convergent questioning technique by asking questions with yes/no and short answers. It is because the teachers believed that these questions were sufficient to ensure their students' comprehension and necessary to determine whether the students were paying attention to the subject matter. Although yes/no questions are mostly used for managerial purposes, they are used for the smooth running of the lessons (Astrid et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2017).

In a study by previous study found the teachers showed that they understood how special needs students, ASD children, who also struggle with emotion regulation, experience anxiety and confusion in social situations (Tay et al., 2019). In order to meet their students' socio-emotional needs, these teachers provided a secure and supportive atmosphere for questions and feedback exchange. Deficits in social-emotional reciprocity can take many different forms, such as an abnormal approach to social interactions, a failure to engage in the usual back-and-forth conversation, and a reduction in the sharing of interests, emotions, or affect or a failure to initiate or participate in social interactions. These behaviours indicate social-emotional reciprocity deficits or the capacity to engage with others and share thoughts and feelings. The existing language is frequently one-sided. Soft skills in emotional intelligence or social competence can be quite important in a teacher's job since they can sometimes relate to the challenges of working with certain students with special needs. Teachers face a significant difficulty because of the diversity of the students in schools. For a teacher to effectively deal with students with special needs, they must be

socially competent in cooperation, communication, listening, and openness. In addition, a teacher must employ a variety of strategies, self-efficacy, knowledge, attitudes and confidence for knowledge transfer, developing children's skills and attitudes, supporting them in overcoming obstacles to further education, providing them with emotional support, and preparing them for active participation in social life, depending on the specific challenges faced by a special needs student (Cook & Ogden, 2021; Lisak Šegota et al., 2020; Skura & Świderska, 2022). Previous research has shown that emotions play a crucial role in education and that pleasant emotional experiences encourage more personal involvement in learning (Froiland & Davison, 2020). Increased personal involvement in learning, expanded thought and action, and change and development on emotional, cognitive, and behavioural levels were all supported by a learning environment that generates good emotional experiences. Furthermore, students should feel safe and secure in their ability to advance past their current levels of knowledge and competence in a learning environment. When they experience safety and support in their learning surroundings, students are more receptive and willing to engage in the learning process. Therefore, it is important to promote students' direct and active participation in their educational experiences (Bejnö et al., 2021; Naude et al., 2014).

Students with special needs in this study participated in the learning based on their Individual Education Plan (IEP). They have different lessons and activities based on their ability. They are given differentiated instruction. Applying differentiation within classrooms is a standard practice in primary education. Strong teacher's personal motivation and a specifically made professional development program served as the foundation for implementing differentiated instruction. Teachers can use various instructional and questioning techniques linked to differentiated education, despite certain obstacles in teaching special needs students. We propose that differentiated instruction should be reinterpreted as a teacher competency and believe that the responsiveness of differentiated teaching is a more sophisticated application of it. To encourage teachers' responsive teaching abilities, sustained teacher professional development is required (Kok et al., 2021; Smets & Struyven, 2020). The teacher's emotional intelligence and social skills may be related to the student's special needs. Teachers must possess highly refined soft skills due to the intricacies of working with students who have special needs. The adoption of specialized training that would equip future teachers to work with students with special needs from the start of their studies would be made possible by identifying the soft skill set for students. Such a set of skills might include self-awareness of one's feelings, recognizing emotions in oneself and others, as well as empathy, understanding the circumstances and emotional states of others, the capacity to put oneself in their shoes, or the ability to establish cooperative relationships, all of which would be very useful (Bejnö et al., 2021; Skura & Świderska, 2022).

This study has a limitation on the number of teachers as participants. Future research is recommended to explore the types and adaptations of the English questions used by more teachers who teach special needs students in mainstream schools at preschool, primary, secondary, and higher education levels. In addition, the results of this study have implications for teachers' initial and ongoing professional development. Thus, to promote student active learning and participation, teachers' professional development could actively help them with ways to ask the appropriate questions and respond to certain types of student responses.

4. CONCLUSION

Both cognitive and affective-based questions offer a helpful framework for directing teachers who teach special needs students in exposing the English language in a bilingual classroom. In order to provide adaptations that will allow special needs students to participate effectively in their classrooms, teachers should think carefully about these two areas. Knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of each special needs student leads teachers to ask questions at an appropriate level and consider students' emotions and feelings. For students who can receive and respond to the questions in English, teachers can use low-order convergent and high-order convergent. However, for students who are non-verbal, high-order convergent makes them struggle. The low-order convergent questions can be answered by saying yes or no, or giving a short answer that the answer can be gained from memorization and observation. Although teachers in education widely use low-order convergent questions, those questions are challenging for students with special needs. Teachers are suggested to adapt the question by translating to Bahasa Indonesia, repeating the question, drilling the students, using pictures or other visual support, and being aware of students receiving and responding abilities. Continuous professional development would be beneficial for teachers of special needs students.

5. REFERENCES

Aguiar, A. L., Aguiar, C., Cadima, J., Correia, N., & Fialho, M. (2019). Classroom quality and children's social skills and problem behaviors: Dosage and disability status as moderators. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *49*, 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2019.05.005.

Ahmad, R. (2010). Memaknai Dan Mengembangkan Keberagaman Peserta Didik Melalui Pendidikan Inklusif. *Pedagogi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *10*(2), 70. https://doi.org/10.24036/pedagogi.v10i2.2243.

Arnaiz-Sánchez, P., De Haro-Rodríguez, R., Caballero, C. M., & Martínez-Abellán, R. (2023). Barriers to Educational Inclusion in Initial Teacher Training. *Societies*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13020031.

Astrid, A., Amrina, R. D., Desvitasari, D., Fitriani, U., & Shahab, A. (2019). The Power of Questioning: Teacher's Questioning Strategies in the EFL Classrooms. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education |IRJE|*, *3*(1), 91–106. https://doi.org/10.22437/irje.v3i1.6601.

Bejnö, H., Roll-Pettersson, L., Klintwall, L., Långh, U., Odom, S. L., & Bölte, S. (2021). Adapting the Preschool Environment to the Needs of Children on the Autism Spectrum in Sweden: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *0*(0), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/11038128.2021.1993330.

Bessarabova, I. S., & Kurysheva, E. S. (2020). Multicultural orientation of inclusive education in the modern school of the USA . *Perspektivy Nauki i Obrazovania*, *43*(1), 180–193. https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2020.1.13.

Biggers, M. (2018). Questioning Questions: Elementary Teachers' Adaptations of Investigation Questions Across the Inquiry Continuum. *Research in Science Education*, *48*(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9556-4.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy ofEducational Objectives: The Classification ofEducational Goals: Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*. David McKay Co Inc. https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v03n01_03.

Chen, Y. C., Hand, B., & Norton-Meier, L. (2017). Teacher Roles of Questioning in Early Elementary Science Classrooms: A Framework Promoting Student Cognitive Complexities in Argumentation. *Research in Science Education*, *47*(2), 373–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-015-9506-6.

Cook, A., & Ogden, J. (2021). Challenges, Strategies and Self-Efficacy of Teachers Supporting Autistic Pupils in Contrasting School Settings: A Qualitative Study. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *00*(00), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1878659.

Cunnings, I. (2017). Parsing and Working Memory in Bilingual Sentence Processing. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *20*(4), 659–678. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728916000675.

Froiland, J. M., & Davison, M. L. (2020). Emotional Intelligence, Listening Comprehension, and Reading Comprehension among Diverse Adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *29*(5), 1385–1390. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-019-01557-8.

González-pérez, L. I., & Ramírez-montoya, M. S. (2022). Components of Education 4.0 in 21st Century Skills Frameworks: Systematic Review. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(3), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031493.

Haman, E., Wodniecka, Z., Marecka, M., Szewczyk, J., Białecka-Pikul, M., Otwinowska, A., Mieszkowska, K., Łuniewska, M., Kołak, J., Miękisz, A., Kacprzak, A., Banasik, N., & Foryś-Nogala, M. (2017). How does L1 and L2 Exposure Impact L1 Performance in Bilingual Children? Evidence from Polish-English Migrants to the United Kingdom. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(SEP). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01444.

Hamel, E., Joo, Y., Hong, S. Y., & Burton, A. (2021). Teacher Questioning Practices in Early Childhood Science Activities. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *49*(3), 375–384. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01075-z.

Heyer, K. (2021). What is a Human Right to Inclusive Education? The Promises and Limitations of the CRPD's Inclusion Mandate. In A. Kopfer, J. J. W. Powell, & R. Zahnd (Eds.), *Handbuch Inklusion International, International Handbook of Inclusive Education: Global, National and Local Perspective* (p. 50). Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Holifurrahman, H. (2020). Kurikulum Modifikasi dalam Praktik Pendidikan Inklusif di SD Al-Firdaus. *Inklusi*, *7*(2), 271. https://doi.org/10.14421/ijds.070205.

Ismaili, Y. (2020). Evaluation of students' attitude toward distance learning during the pandemic (Covid-19): a case study of ELTE university. *On the Horizon*, *29*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-09-2020-0032.

Joseph, S., & Thomas, M. (2020). Questioning Behaviours and Patterns of Prospective Teachers on Practicum. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1823142.

Kok, M., Kal, E., van Doodewaard, C., Savelsbergh, G., & van der Kamp, J. (2021). Tailoring Explicit and

Implicit Instruction Methods to the Verbal Working Memory Capacity of Students with Special Needs Can Benefit Motor Learning Outcomes in Physical Education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *89*(May 2020), 102019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102019.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. In *Pergamon*. Pergamon Press Inc. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543033001038.

Kusurkar, R. A., Mak-van der Vossen, M., Kors, J., Grijpma, J. W., van der Burgt, S. M. E., Koster, A. S., & de la Croix, A. (2021). 'One Size Does Not Fit All': The Value of Person-Centred Analysis in Health Professions Education Research. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *10*(4), 245–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-020-00633-w.

Leivada, E., Westergaard, M., Duñabeitia, J. A., & Rothman, J. (2021). On the Phantom-Like Appearance of Bilingualism Effects on Neurocognition: (How) Should We Proceed? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *24*(1), 197–210. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728920000358.

Lisak Šegota, N., Lištiaková, I. L., Stošić, J., Kossewska, J., Troshanska, J., Nikolovska, A. P., Cierpiałowska, T., & Preece, D. (2020). Teacher Education and Confidence Regarding Autism of Specialist Primary School Teachers. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *37*(1), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1829865.

Martínez, Z. L. G., & Carvajal, S. A. R. (2021). Teaching English Online to Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder and Down Syndrome During the covid-19 Pandemic. *Ikala*, *26*(3), 715–730. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v26n3a13.

Menbet, A. A. (2018). The Use of Effective Strategies to Improve Saudi EFL Dyslexic Learners' Writing Skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(12), 1611. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0812.06.

Mills, A. J., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (Eds). (2010). *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research, Volume I and II*. Sage Publication.

Mohamad Nor, N., & Rashid, R. A. (2018). A Review of Theoretical Perspectives on Language Learning and Acquisition. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, *39*(1), 161–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2017.12.012.

Naude, L., van den Bergh, T. J., & Kruger, I. S. (2014). "Learning to Like Learning": An Appreciative Inquiry into Emotions in Education. *Social Psychology of Education*, *17*(2), 211–228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-014-9247-9.

Nthibeli, M., Griffiths, D., & Bekker, T. (2022). Teaching Learners with Autism in the South African Inclusive Classroom: Pedagogic Strategies and Possibilities. *African Journal of Disability*, *11*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.4102/AJOD.V11I0.979.

Óskarsdóttir, E., Donnelly, V., Turner-Cmuchal, M., & Florian, L. (2020). Inclusive school leaders – their role in raising the achievement of all learners. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *58*(5), 521–537. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0190.

Paramartha, A. A. G. Y., Ramawati, N. M. S., & Suputra, P. E. D. (2018). Types, Purpose, and Strategies of Teacher's Questions in Indonesian EFL Classroom of Junior High School in Bali. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.23887/ijll.v2i1.16089.

Pavičić Takač, V. (2008). *Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.

Prasetianto, M. (2019). Kinds of Questions Making EFL Students Learn: Students' Perception. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature)*, *4*(2), 162–176. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v4i2.7607.

Ritter, R., Wehner, A., Lohaus, G., & Krämer, P. (2019). Pre-service Teachers' Beliefs About Inclusive Education Before and After Multi-Compared to Mono-professional Co-teaching: An Exploratory Study. *Frontiers in Education*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00101.

Ryökkynen, S., Maunu, A., Pirttimaa, R., & Kontu, E. (2022). From the Shade into the Sun: Exploring Pride and Shame in Students with Special Needs in Finnish VET. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *37*(4), 648–662. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1940006.

Skura, M., & Świderska, J. (2022). The Role of Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Social Competences with Special Educational Needs Students. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *37*(3), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1885177.

Smets, W., & Struyven, K. (2020). A Teachers' Professional Development Programme to Implement Differentiated Instruction in Secondary Education: How Far do Teachers Reach? *Cogent Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1742273.

Tay, H. Y., Kee, K. N. N., & Hui, S. K. F. (2019). Effective Questioning and Feedback for Learners with Autism in an Inclusive Classroom. *Cogent Education*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1634920.

Thordardottir, E. (2019). Amount trumps timing in bilingual vocabulary acquisition: Effects of input in simultaneous and sequential school-age bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *23*(1), 236–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006917722418.

Tofade, T., Elsner, J., & Haines, S. T. (2013). Best Practice Strategies for Effective Use of Questions as a Teaching Tool. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *77*(7). https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe777155.

Verhagen, J., de Bree, E., & Unsworth, S. (2020). Effects of Bilingual Language Use and Language Proficiency on 24-month-olds' Cognitive Control. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, *21*(1), 46–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2019.1673752.

Wang, A., Chai, C. S., & Hairon, S. (2017). Exploring the Impact of Teacher Experience on Questioning Techniques in a Knowledge Building Classroom. *Journal of Computers in Education*, *4*(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-016-0057-2.

Wilen, W. W. (1991). *Questioning Skills for Teachers* (Third edit). National Education Association.