



Implementation of the Giving Questions and Getting Answers Method in Akidah Akhlak Instruction

Elda Fadlia Rahmah^{1*}, Kasja Eki Waluyo², Abdul Azis³

¹²³ Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang, Karawang, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: 2210631110109@student.unsika.ac.id | ORCID: not provided

Received: 16th August 2026

Revised: 27th August 2026

Accepted: 28th August 2026

Published: 30th August 2026

ABSTRACT

Teacher centered instruction can limit student participation in Akidah Akhlak learning, even though the subject requires learners to understand, discuss, and internalize religious values. This qualitative field study examines the implementation of the Giving Questions and Getting Answers (GQGA) method in Grade XI Akidah Akhlak instruction at MA Nihayatul Amal Rawamerta. Data were obtained through classroom observation, interviews with the subject teacher and students, and documentation, and were analyzed through data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing with triangulation used to support trustworthiness. The findings show that GQGA was implemented through a structured sequence of introductory explanation, individual question formulation, question exchange, peer answering and discussion, teacher facilitation, and reflective closure. Within this sequence, students displayed greater participation in asking and answering questions, discussing ideas, and expressing opinions. The method also supported students' confidence and their engagement with the learning material because they were required to process information actively rather than receive it passively. Implementation challenges included uneven ability to formulate appropriate questions and limited instructional time; the teacher responded by modeling questions, providing staged guidance, and using small-group interaction. The study contributes a contextual description of how GQGA can function as an active-learning strategy in Akidah Akhlak classrooms and highlights the importance of teacher scaffolding for sustaining meaningful participation.

Keywords: Active Learning; Student Engagement; Islamic Education; Classroom Interaction; Qualitative Field Research

1. INTRODUCTION

Islamic education is concerned not only with the transmission of knowledge but also with the development of dispositions, values, and conduct that shape students' everyday lives. This dual intellectual and moral orientation is particularly visible in Akidah Akhlak, a subject that addresses faith, belief, ethical awareness, and commendable behavior. In this context, learning outcomes cannot be reduced to the ability to reproduce conceptual definitions. Students are also expected to interpret religious values, relate them to situations they encounter, and gradually internalize those values in their attitudes and actions. The broader educational significance of such learning is therefore connected with cognitive understanding, affective formation, and behavioral responsibility (Azis et al., 2026; Hafidz, 2021). A classroom approach that provides opportunities for students to think, speak, question, and respond is consequently relevant to the character-forming aims of Akidah Akhlak instruction.

In classroom practice, however, the intended participatory character of learning can be constrained when instruction is dominated by teacher explanation. Lecture remains useful when the teacher needs to clarify concepts, organize difficult material, or provide an authoritative framework, but prolonged teacher-centered delivery may position students primarily as recipients of information. The source study identifies this condition as a practical problem in Akidah Akhlak learning: students may become passive, participate only minimally, and have limited opportunities to ask questions, articulate interpretations, or examine their own understanding (Hakim & Wahid, 2026; Sanjaya, 2014). When this pattern persists, the issue is not simply a matter of classroom atmosphere. Limited participation may also reduce the extent to which



Copyright: © 2026. The author(s). Published by Institut Al Fithrah Surabaya. This article distributed under the terms of the a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

learners actively process ideas and connect abstract religious concepts with prior knowledge and lived experience.

Student engagement is therefore an important dimension of instructional quality. Sardiman (2020) associates active participation with stronger involvement in the learning process, while Hamalik (2013) emphasizes that learners understand material more readily when they participate in thinking, questioning, discussing, and expressing ideas. Active learning frameworks similarly view students as participants in the construction of understanding rather than as passive endpoints of information delivery (Slavin, 2020). From this perspective, engagement is not synonymous with visible activity for its own sake. Its educational value lies in the cognitive work embedded in the activity: learners retrieve information, identify what they do not understand, organize questions, compare alternative answers, justify interpretations, and revise their ideas in response to feedback.

One active-learning strategy that directly organizes these processes is Giving Questions and Getting Answers (GQGA). The method centers on structured questioning and answering activities that redistribute classroom participation. Rather than waiting for the teacher to provide all questions and all explanations, students are asked to formulate questions based on the material and to respond to questions generated by others. The procedure thus combines individual thinking, peer exchange, discussion, and teacher feedback. The source manuscript presents GQGA as a strategy that can create more dynamic, communicative, and participatory interaction because students are required to take an active role in the learning sequence (Hamida et al., 2022; Mutia et al., 2025). The teacher remains important, but the role shifts from sole information provider toward facilitator, guide, and source of clarification.

The pedagogical relevance of this strategy can be understood through the relationship between questioning and knowledge construction. Formulating a question requires a learner to inspect the material, distinguish what is understood from what remains uncertain, and translate that uncertainty into language. Answering a question requires a related but different process: students must retrieve relevant information, interpret the wording of the question, organize a response, and communicate it in a way that can be evaluated by others. Discussion adds a further layer because answers can be confirmed, challenged, expanded, or corrected. Woolfolk (2009) notes the contribution of discussion and questioning to active thinking and socially mediated understanding, while Jamil (2022) underscores the importance of interaction in contemporary educational processes. These features make question-and-answer activities especially relevant when the instructional goal includes conceptual understanding and communicative confidence.

Previous studies cited in the source manuscript generally indicate positive effects of active-learning approaches on student participation and learning. Mutia et al. (2025), for example, report the use of a GQGA-type active-learning strategy in relation to learning outcomes, while Putri et al. (n.d.) discuss the implementation of Giving Questions and Getting Answer in relation to student activity. Nasution et al. (2025) likewise emphasize active-learning strategies as a means of increasing participation. Taken together, this literature supports the expectation that structured student involvement can improve classroom interaction. At the same time, the studies do not eliminate the need for context-sensitive investigation. A method that appears promising in one subject or research design still needs to be examined in terms of how it is enacted by teachers, how students respond in real classroom conditions, and what practical constraints shape its implementation.

This need is particularly important because much of the evidence highlighted in the source manuscript is oriented toward quantitative outcomes or classroom action research. Such designs can show whether participation or achievement changes across cycles or conditions, but they may provide less detailed attention to the lived process through which a method is introduced, facilitated, adjusted, and experienced during an ordinary lesson (Susanti et al., 2022). A qualitative field description therefore offers a complementary contribution. Instead of treating GQGA only as an instructional treatment, it can examine the method as a sequence of teacher and student actions situated within the social and temporal realities of the classroom.

The present study addresses that contextual gap by focusing on Grade XI Akidah Akhlak instruction at MA Nihayatul Amal Rawamerta. Its novelty lies less in proposing GQGA as an entirely new method than in documenting how the strategy operates in a specific Islamic education setting and how its implementation is associated with student participation, confidence, interaction, and understanding. This focus is relevant because an instructional strategy is not effective merely because its procedural steps are known. Its classroom value depends on the quality of teacher scaffolding, the readiness of students to formulate and answer questions, the opportunities provided for peer interaction, and the way the teacher manages time and clarification.

Accordingly, this study aims to describe the implementation of the Giving Questions and Getting Answers method in Grade XI Akidah Akhlak instruction at MA Nihayatul Amal Rawamerta, with particular attention to the learning sequence, student engagement and responses, and implementation constraints. The study is guided by three questions: (1) How is the GQGA method implemented during Akidah Akhlak learning? (2) How do students participate in and respond to the questioning, answering, and discussion activities? and (3) What challenges emerge during implementation, and how does the teacher respond to them? By addressing these questions descriptively, the study seeks to provide a grounded account that can inform the selection and facilitation of active-learning strategies in comparable Islamic education classrooms.

2. METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive field-research design. The design was selected because the research objective was to understand and describe the implementation of GQGA as it occurred in the natural classroom setting rather than to manipulate instructional conditions or quantify treatment effects. Qualitative field research allows attention to the sequence of classroom events, the meanings participants attach to those events, and the interaction between instructional procedures and contextual conditions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In the present study, the unit of interest was the learning process itself: how the teacher organized the method, how students engaged with the activities, what responses were visible or reported, and what practical difficulties appeared during implementation.

The research was conducted at MA Nihayatul Amal Rawamerta in a Grade XI Akidah Akhlak class. Participants included the Akidah Akhlak teacher and Grade XI students who were directly involved in the observed learning process. Participant selection was purposive because the individuals were chosen on the basis of their direct relevance to the research focus rather than through random sampling (Sugiyono, 2023). The source manuscript does not report the exact number of students in the class or the exact number of students interviewed. For that reason, this article does not introduce a numerical participant count that is not supported by the available research documentation. The qualitative emphasis is instead placed on the classroom process and the converging patterns identified through observation, interviews, and documentation.

Data collection combined observation, interviews, and documentation. Classroom observation was used to examine the implementation of GQGA directly, including the opening activity, the teacher's initial explanation, student question formulation, the exchange and answering of questions, peer discussion, teacher guidance, and the closing reflection. Observation also focused on indicators of participation such as willingness to ask and answer questions, involvement in discussion, interaction with peers, and confidence in expressing opinions. In qualitative research, direct observation is valuable because it allows the researcher to compare reported experiences with visible classroom practices and to document the social organization of learning as it unfolds (Moleong, 2019).

Interviews were conducted with the Akidah Akhlak teacher and several students to obtain reflective information about their experiences of the method. The teacher interview focused on perceived changes in classroom participation, the usefulness of the strategy for supporting understanding, and difficulties encountered during implementation. Student interviews focused on how they experienced the learning activities, including whether the questioning and answering process felt engaging, whether it affected their

confidence, and how they perceived the opportunity to participate more directly. The source manuscript reports interview findings in summarized form rather than as verbatim transcripts; consequently, the present article preserves that level of evidence and does not create direct quotations that were not included in the original documentation.

Documentation functioned as a complementary source of evidence. The materials reported in the source study included photographs of learning activities, instructional materials, and relevant classroom records. Documentation helped support the descriptive account of the learning process and provided an additional basis for checking whether the sequence described in observations and interviews was consistent with the recorded instructional context (Arikunto, 2021). The use of several forms of data was intended to reduce dependence on a single perspective and to provide a more comprehensive picture of how the method was implemented.

Data analysis followed three interrelated stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing, consistent with the qualitative analytic procedures associated with Miles et al. (2014). During data reduction, information from observations, interviews, and documentation was selected and organized according to the study focus. Particular attention was given to recurring information about implementation stages, forms of student participation, teacher facilitation, student responses, and constraints. Data display involved arranging the selected information in narrative and thematic form so that relationships across the different sources could be examined. Conclusion drawing involved identifying the patterns that best represented the implementation and its perceived effects while checking those patterns against the available evidence.

Trustworthiness was supported through triangulation of sources and data-collection techniques. Information observed in the classroom was compared with teacher and student interview accounts and with relevant documentation. Triangulation did not serve to make the findings statistically generalizable; rather, it was used to strengthen the credibility of the descriptive interpretation by examining whether similar patterns appeared across different forms of evidence (Moleong, 2019; Sugiyono, 2023). For example, the observation of increased participation was considered together with the teacher's report that students were more active and students' own positive responses to the opportunity to ask and answer questions.

The study is qualitative and context-bound, so the findings should be interpreted as an account of one instructional setting rather than as causal proof that GQGA will produce identical outcomes in every classroom. The available manuscript also does not provide a formal observation rubric, interview protocol, duration of fieldwork, or numerical coding scheme. These absences limit the extent to which procedural replication can be specified in detail. Nevertheless, the reported steps of the method, the use of multiple data sources, and the systematic analytic stages provide a coherent basis for describing the classroom process and identifying its principal themes.

No identifying information about individual students is reported in this article. Details concerning formal ethics approval and documented informed consent procedures were not provided in the source manuscript; therefore, no ethics approval number is stated here. This information should be confirmed by the authors and institution before journal submission if required by the journal's policy. The article limits its presentation to non-identifying classroom-level descriptions and summarized participant responses contained in the source research documentation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings show that the GQGA method was implemented as a structured classroom sequence rather than as an isolated question-and-answer activity. The teacher combined introductory explanation, student-generated questioning, peer response, discussion, facilitation, and reflection. Across these stages, the central pattern was a redistribution of classroom activity: students were expected to produce questions, process questions from peers, articulate answers, and participate in discussion, while the teacher monitored, guided, and corrected the process. The results are presented thematically below and discussed in relation to the study objectives and the active-learning literature cited in the source manuscript. Because

the evidence is qualitative, descriptions of increased engagement refer to observed and reported changes in participation rather than statistically tested differences.

3.1 Implementation Sequence of the GQGA Method

The lesson began with an opening stage intended to establish readiness and continuity. The teacher greeted the class and invited students to pray together, a routine that is consistent with the religious and institutional context of Akidah Akhlak learning. The teacher then conducted apperception by connecting the new topic with material previously studied. This step provided students with an initial conceptual orientation and helped position the forthcoming activities as part of an ongoing learning sequence rather than as a disconnected exercise. The teacher also communicated the learning objectives so that students understood the competencies expected during the lesson.

The core activity started with a brief teacher explanation of the Akidah Akhlak material. Importantly, the explanation did not replace the active-learning phase; it functioned as an instructional foundation for it. Students first needed sufficient conceptual input to formulate meaningful questions. The teacher therefore retained a direct-instruction role at the beginning of the core activity, but the role was deliberately limited. After the basic material had been introduced, responsibility for producing the next stage of classroom discourse shifted toward the students.

Students were then asked to formulate questions based on the material. They were given time to think independently and write their questions. This individual preparation stage is pedagogically important because it gives every learner an entry point into the activity. A whole-class question session can easily be dominated by a small number of confident students, whereas written preparation requires each student to inspect the material and attempt to identify a point that can be questioned. In cognitive terms, question formulation asks students to monitor their own understanding. They must decide what is central, what is unclear, and how a possible gap in understanding can be expressed as a question.

The questions were subsequently exchanged with other students, either individually or through small-group arrangements. Students were asked to answer the questions they received. This exchange transformed the activity from private preparation into peer-mediated learning. A student could no longer focus only on the question that he or she had written; the learner also had to interpret another person's question and construct a response. The process therefore required reading, comprehension, retrieval of relevant content, and verbal or written explanation. Peer exchange also widened the range of issues encountered by students because the questions reflected different points of attention within the class.

During the answering and discussion stage, students had opportunities to express opinions and respond to classmates. The teacher observed the process, provided direction when students experienced difficulty, corrected inaccurate answers, and reinforced appropriate responses. This facilitative role was central to maintaining instructional accuracy. Active learning does not remove the need for teacher expertise; rather, it changes the timing and function of that expertise. Instead of providing every answer in advance, the teacher allowed students to attempt interpretation first and then intervened when clarification or reinforcement was needed.

The lesson concluded with a joint summary and reflection. The teacher and students revisited the main material and students were given an opportunity to reflect on the activity. This closing stage helped reconnect the participatory process with the learning objectives. Without synthesis, a highly interactive lesson can leave students with multiple contributions but insufficient clarity about the core concepts. The summary therefore served as a form of consolidation, while reflection created space for students to recognize what they had understood and how they had participated.

Table 1
Instructional sequence and pedagogical function of GQGA in the observed classroom

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Observed practice</i>	<i>Primary student role</i>	<i>Pedagogical function</i>
<i>Opening</i>	Greeting, prayer, apperception, and explanation of objectives	Prepare and connect prior learning	Establishes readiness, continuity, and purpose
<i>Initial input</i>	Brief explanation of Akidah Akhlak material	Listen, identify key ideas, prepare for active work	Provides a common conceptual basis for questioning
<i>Question formulation</i>	Students write questions independently	Monitor understanding and formulate uncertainty	Promotes active processing and metacognitive attention
<i>Question exchange</i>	Questions are shared individually or in small groups	Interpret peers' questions	Broadens exposure to different points of attention
<i>Answering and discussion</i>	Students answer, discuss, and express opinions	Retrieve, explain, compare, and justify ideas	Supports knowledge construction and communication
<i>Teacher facilitation</i>	Teacher observes, guides, corrects, and reinforces	Revise responses based on feedback	Maintains conceptual accuracy and scaffolds participation
<i>Closure</i>	Joint summary and reflection	Consolidate learning and reflect on participation	Connects activity to objectives and strengthens understanding

Note. The table synthesizes the implementation steps described in classroom observation and interview findings; it does not represent a separate quantitative instrument.

3.2 Student Engagement and Classroom Interaction

Observation findings indicated that students became more visibly involved in the learning process during GQGA activities. Participation appeared in several forms: students formulated questions, attempted answers, joined peer discussion, and expressed opinions. Students who had previously tended to remain passive began to show greater willingness to contribute. The importance of this finding lies in the breadth of participation rather than in a single behavior. Engagement was not limited to raising a hand; it involved a chain of learning actions that required students to prepare, respond, and interact.

This pattern aligns with Sardiman's (2020) emphasis on active participation as a component of successful learning and with Hamalik's (2013) view that direct involvement in thinking and discussion supports understanding. In GQGA, the structure of the method itself creates repeated opportunities for participation. A student who does not volunteer spontaneously in a conventional teacher-led discussion can still be drawn into the learning process through the requirement to write a question or respond to a peer. This procedural distribution of responsibility may help explain why previously passive students were observed to participate more actively.

The interaction generated by the method was also multidirectional. The classroom included student-to-student interaction through question exchange and discussion as well as student-to-teacher interaction when clarification or correction was needed. This differs from a communication pattern in which most discourse travels from the teacher to the class. Active-learning theory suggests that such multidirectional interaction can make learning more meaningful because learners must respond to information rather than only receive it (Slavin, 2020; Silberman, 2013). The observed two-way and peer-based communication is therefore not merely a change in classroom liveliness; it represents a different organization of cognitive and social participation.

Student interviews reinforced the observational pattern. Students reported that the learning process felt more interesting and less monotonous because they could participate directly. This response is significant in relation to engagement because perceived variety and participation can affect students' willingness to sustain attention. The method gave students concrete tasks and a reason to follow the material: they needed to formulate questions and prepare to answer questions that might come from others. In this sense, engagement was supported by accountability embedded within the activity rather than by entertainment alone.

The teacher's interview similarly indicated that students were more active and more willing to express opinions than under the previous teacher-centered approach. This convergence between observation and interview data strengthens the interpretation that the method altered the classroom participation pattern. At the same time, the qualitative design does not establish a causal effect or quantify the magnitude of change. The finding is best understood as a consistent, context-specific pattern across the available data sources.

3.3 Questioning, Answering, and the Construction of Understanding

The findings also suggest that GQGA supported students' understanding of the material by requiring active processing. The teacher reported that students appeared to understand the lesson more readily because they were directly involved in the learning process. Students did not simply receive an explanation and wait for the lesson to end. They had to transform the content into questions, interpret questions written by peers, and produce answers that could be discussed and evaluated. Each of these tasks requires learners to reorganize information in a form different from the teacher's initial presentation.

Question formulation is especially important because it can reveal the structure of a learner's understanding. A vague or inaccurate question may indicate that the student has not yet identified the central relationship among concepts, whereas a focused question may show that the student has recognized a specific issue requiring clarification. The teacher's later need to model appropriate questions for some students confirms that question quality cannot be assumed. Students may need scaffolding to move from simple recall prompts toward questions that more effectively represent conceptual relationships. Thus, the difficulty observed in question formulation is not only an implementation problem; it also reveals why the activity can be educationally productive when guided carefully.

Answering peers' questions creates a complementary form of cognitive demand. Students must interpret language that was not produced by the teacher and may therefore be less predictable. They then need to connect the question with the relevant part of the lesson and explain an answer. This process can make gaps in understanding visible. A student may discover that a concept that seemed clear during listening becomes more difficult when it must be explained to another person. Such moments create opportunities for clarification and teacher feedback. Woolfolk (2009) associates classroom discussion with active thinking and social interaction, while Slavin (2020) emphasizes learning processes in which students engage with ideas rather than merely encounter them.

The teacher's corrective role was therefore essential. When an answer was incomplete or inaccurate, the teacher provided clarification; when an answer was appropriate, the teacher reinforced it. This pattern created a cycle of attempt, feedback, and consolidation. The students were given intellectual responsibility without being left without guidance. From an instructional standpoint, this balance is important because active-learning strategies can become unproductive if learners exchange misconceptions without a mechanism for checking accuracy. In the observed lesson, teacher facilitation provided that mechanism.

The closing summary further strengthened conceptual consolidation. After students had encountered multiple questions and answers, the class returned to the main ideas with teacher guidance. This helped distinguish central concepts from incidental discussion. The source findings therefore suggest that GQGA worked not as a replacement for explanation but as an interactive layer around explanation: brief teacher input established a foundation, student activity elaborated and tested understanding, and teacher-supported closure consolidated the material. This integrated pattern is more educationally plausible than a simple opposition between lecture and active learning.

3.4 Confidence, Communication, and Affective Participation

A further theme concerned students' confidence in speaking and participating. Observation showed that students who had previously tended to be passive began to express opinions more readily, and student interviews indicated that they felt more confident asking and answering questions. This finding extends the interpretation of engagement beyond the cognitive domain. Participation in classroom discourse has an

affective dimension because students must manage uncertainty, the possibility of error, and the social exposure involved in speaking before others.

GQGA may support confidence by distributing participation through a structured task. In an open discussion, a hesitant student must decide independently whether to speak and may compete with more confident classmates for the floor. In the observed GQGA sequence, every student was first asked to prepare a question, and the subsequent exchange created a specific reason to respond. The structure can therefore lower the threshold for participation by giving students a defined role. Small-group discussion, which the teacher used to support less active students, can further reduce the social pressure associated with whole-class speaking.

The affective value of participation is especially relevant in value-oriented education. Students may understand a moral concept at a declarative level yet remain reluctant to articulate how they interpret it. Opportunities to ask questions and express opinions can help make learning personally and socially meaningful. Waluyo (2021) emphasizes character formation within Islamic educational contexts, and the source manuscript connects increased participation with the broader development of students' character. The present findings do not demonstrate long-term character change, but they do show classroom behaviors confidence, respectful exchange, and active involvement that are compatible with the formative aims of the subject.

The positive student response also suggests that the method can influence the perceived quality of the classroom experience. Students described the lesson as more interesting and less boring because they had a participatory role. This does not mean that all active-learning tasks are automatically motivating or that participation should be maximized without regard to learning goals. Rather, the finding indicates that when participation is directly tied to the lesson content, it can make the learning process feel more purposeful. The combination of cognitive responsibility and social interaction appears to have contributed to the favorable response reported in the study.

3.5 The Teacher as Facilitator and Provider of Scaffolding

The implementation findings highlight the central role of the teacher in making GQGA workable. Although the method increases student responsibility, the teacher remained involved at every stage: establishing the learning context, introducing the material, explaining objectives, giving procedural directions, observing student work, responding to difficulties, correcting answers, reinforcing accurate responses, and leading the final synthesis. The method therefore represents a change in the distribution of instructional responsibility rather than a withdrawal of teacher guidance.

Scaffolding became especially visible when students experienced difficulty constructing appropriate questions. The teacher responded by providing examples and guiding students gradually. This response is pedagogically significant because the ability to ask a useful academic question is itself a learned skill. Students who are accustomed to receiving questions from teachers may initially produce questions that are too broad, too simple, unrelated to the objective, or difficult for peers to interpret. Modeling gives students a concrete representation of what counts as an appropriate question, while staged guidance allows the teacher to support performance without permanently taking over the task.

The use of small-group discussion was another form of scaffolding. The teacher encouraged group interaction so that students who were less active could receive support from peers. This approach can distribute assistance within the classroom and provide a more accessible participation setting for hesitant learners. It also helps address differences in readiness. Students who can formulate or answer questions more easily can contribute to the group process, while those who need more time can observe examples, ask for clarification, and participate at a level that may be more manageable than immediate whole-class response.

Teacher facilitation also affected classroom time. Because the method includes several stages, the teacher had to balance the desire for broad participation with the available instructional period. The source manuscript identifies time limitation as a practical challenge. This is a common tension in interactive learning: increasing the number of student contributions can deepen engagement but also requires time for

preparation, exchange, response, correction, and synthesis. Effective implementation therefore depends on procedural clarity and selective management of discussion. The teacher must decide which questions require extended exploration, which can be answered briefly, and when the class needs to move toward closure.

The findings consequently suggest that the quality of GQGA implementation depends not only on the method's formal steps but also on teacher judgment. The same procedural sequence could produce different classroom experiences depending on the clarity of instructions, the examples provided, the grouping arrangement, the timing of feedback, and the way incorrect answers are handled. The teacher's role is thus not secondary to the method; it is one of the conditions through which the method becomes educationally meaningful.

3.6 Constraints, Adaptations, and Boundaries of Implementation

Two principal implementation constraints were reported: differences in students' ability to formulate appropriate questions and limited instructional time. The first constraint reflects variation in learner readiness. Some students were able to generate questions independently, whereas others required examples and guidance. If such differences are ignored, the activity may become uneven, with confident students producing substantive questions while others contribute only minimal or repetitive prompts. The teacher's use of modeling and gradual guidance was therefore an important adaptation.

The second constraint concerned time. GQGA requires more than the moment in which a question is asked. Students need preparation time to construct questions, time to exchange them, time to formulate responses, and time to discuss and receive feedback. A teacher working within a fixed lesson period may therefore face pressure to shorten one or more stages. If preparation is too short, question quality may decline; if discussion is too short, students may participate without sufficient elaboration; if closure is omitted, the class may not consolidate the main concepts. Time management should consequently be considered part of the instructional design rather than a logistical afterthought.

These constraints also define the boundaries of the study's conclusions. The positive findings do not imply that GQGA is automatically effective under all conditions. Students need sufficient familiarity with the material, instructions must be clear, and the teacher must be able to support question formation and manage discussion. Classes with very limited time or learners who have little experience with participatory methods may require gradual introduction. The observed success is therefore better understood as the result of a method-in-context, supported by teacher facilitation, rather than as an effect of procedure alone.

A further limitation concerns the evidence base. The study describes engagement and understanding qualitatively and does not report standardized measures, numerical participation counts, or longitudinal follow-up. It therefore cannot determine whether the observed changes persist over time or translate into measurable achievement differences. The findings remain valuable because they describe the instructional process in detail, but their contribution is explanatory and contextual rather than predictive. Future research could build on this field description by combining process observation with more explicit participation indicators, student work analysis, or learning assessments while retaining attention to the classroom context.

3.7 Integrated Interpretation and Pedagogical Implications

When the themes are considered together, the GQGA method appears to function through a chain of mutually reinforcing processes. The requirement to formulate questions activates attention to the material; question exchange creates peer accountability; answering requires retrieval and explanation; discussion produces opportunities for comparison and clarification; teacher feedback protects conceptual accuracy; and reflection consolidates the lesson. Student engagement, understanding, and confidence are therefore not separate outcomes produced by unrelated features. They emerge from the same participatory structure, although each is supported by a different part of the sequence.

This integrated interpretation helps explain why the method was perceived as more interactive and meaningful than the previous teacher-centered pattern. Students were not active merely because they moved into groups or spoke more often. They were active because the instructional tasks required them to do something intellectually relevant with the content. This distinction is important for pedagogy. Active learning should be evaluated by the quality of the thinking and interaction it produces, not simply by the visible amount of classroom activity. In the observed lesson, questioning and answering were connected directly with the Akidah Akhlak material, and teacher feedback linked student contributions back to the intended concepts.

For Akidah Akhlak instruction, this structure has particular potential because the subject combines conceptual and formative aims. Students need accurate knowledge of religious concepts, but they also need opportunities to articulate interpretations, hear others' perspectives, and practice respectful communication. The method's social interaction can support these aims when discussion is carefully facilitated. It should not be assumed that a single lesson produces deep internalization of values, but the classroom behaviors documented in the study participation, listening, confidence, and reflective discussion create conditions that are more compatible with value-oriented learning than passive reception alone.

The findings also have implications for teacher preparation. Successful use of GQGA requires more than knowledge of the procedural label. Teachers need to be able to design suitable prompts or examples, anticipate difficulties in question formulation, manage groups, monitor multiple interactions, provide concise corrective feedback, and protect time for closure. Professional learning around active-learning methods should therefore include facilitation skills and adaptation strategies, not only step-by-step descriptions. This is consistent with the broader principle that instructional innovation depends on how a method is enacted in relation to learners and context (Susanti et al., 2022).

The study's contribution is therefore a contextual account of how GQGA can be enacted in an Islamic education classroom and why teacher scaffolding matters. It complements outcome-oriented studies by showing the mechanism of participation in practice: students are given structured responsibility for asking, answering, and discussing, while the teacher maintains conceptual direction. The observed pattern supports the use of GQGA as an alternative active-learning strategy, but it also indicates that the method is most effective when participation is planned, supported, and brought back to clear learning objectives.

Table 2

Summary of principal findings, evidence, and interpretive significance

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Evidence reported in the study</i>	<i>Interpretive significance</i>
<i>Student engagement</i>	More participation in asking, answering, discussion, and expression of opinions	GQGA redistributed learning activity from teacher-dominated delivery toward structured student participation.
<i>Classroom interaction</i>	Two-way student–teacher communication and peer exchange occurred throughout the activity	Interaction became a mechanism for processing content rather than an incidental classroom feature.
<i>Understanding</i>	Teacher and students reported that direct involvement helped students engage with the material	Questioning and answering required students to retrieve, explain, and clarify concepts.
<i>Confidence</i>	Previously passive students showed greater willingness to speak; students reported increased confidence	Structured roles and small-group interaction may lower barriers to classroom participation.
<i>Teacher role</i>	Teacher modeled, guided, corrected, reinforced, and summarized	Active learning depended on scaffolding and conceptual quality control rather than teacher withdrawal.
<i>Constraints</i>	Uneven question-formulation ability and limited time	Implementation quality depends on modeling, grouping, pacing, and selective facilitation.

Note. The table presents a qualitative synthesis of observation and interview findings; no statistical effect sizes were calculated in the study.

4. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the Giving Questions and Getting Answers method created a more active, interactive, and meaningful pattern of Akidah Akhlak learning in the observed Grade XI class at MA Nihayatul Amal Rawamerta. Its implementation followed a coherent sequence: the teacher established the learning context and provided brief conceptual input; students formulated questions, exchanged them, developed answers, and discussed ideas; the teacher facilitated, corrected, and reinforced responses; and the lesson ended with summary and reflection. This sequence increased the amount and variety of student participation compared with the previously teacher-centered pattern described in the study.

The findings also indicate that participation was connected with perceived improvements in understanding and confidence. Students were required to process the material actively through question formulation and peer response, and both teacher and student accounts described the learning process positively. The principal contribution of the study is therefore not a statistical claim about the magnitude of learning gains, but a contextual explanation of how GQGA can organize student engagement in an Akidah Akhlak classroom. The method appears particularly useful when the objective is to create opportunities for students to think aloud, articulate uncertainty, explain ideas, and participate in respectful peer interaction.

Implementation was not without difficulty. Students differed in their ability to formulate appropriate questions, and the multi-stage activity placed pressure on available instructional time. The teacher addressed these issues by providing examples, guiding question construction gradually, and using small-group discussion to support less active students. These adaptations underline the importance of scaffolding. GQGA should not be treated as a self-executing procedure; its educational value depends on clear instructions, appropriate pacing, teacher monitoring, corrective feedback, and a final synthesis that reconnects student contributions with the learning objectives.

The study is limited by its qualitative, single-context design and by the absence of reported numerical participant counts, standardized engagement measures, and formal learning assessments in the source documentation. Future research can extend the present findings by applying GQGA in different Akidah Akhlak topics and school contexts, documenting participant characteristics and implementation duration more fully, and combining qualitative process analysis with evidence of learning outcomes. Such work would help clarify both the transferability of the method and the conditions under which questioning-and-answering activities most effectively support active learning in Islamic education.

DECLARATIONS

Author Contributions

Specific author contributions were not reported in the source manuscript. The authors should confirm and complete the contribution statement, preferably using CRediT roles, before submission.

Funding

Funding information was not reported in the source manuscript. The authors should confirm whether the research received external or institutional financial support before submission.

Conflict of Interest

A conflict-of-interest statement was not included in the source manuscript. The authors should confirm and provide the journal-required declaration before submission.

Acknowledgments

No acknowledgment statement was provided in the source manuscript. This subsection may be removed if there are no non-author contributors or institutions to acknowledge.

Ethics Approval

Details of formal ethics approval and informed consent were not reported in the source manuscript. The authors should provide the appropriate institutional information if required by the journal and the research context.

Data Availability

The source manuscript does not specify a public repository or access procedure for the underlying observation, interview, and documentation data. The authors should provide an appropriate data-availability statement that reflects applicable ethical and privacy restrictions.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Hakim, & Muchdjabir Wahid. (2026). E-module based learning as an effort to improve understanding of Imla' among Islamic Religious Education students. *Halaqa: Islamic Education Journal*, 10(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.21070/halaqa.v10i1.1758>
- Arikunto, S. (2021). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Azis, A., Mastur, Rahmi, H., Che Hasim, M. A. B., Tuanto, E., Mildan, A. R., Muttaqin, M. A., & Asysyifa, F. (2026). Internalization of multicultural values in Fiqh learning at Muhammadiyah Boarding School Al-Mujahidin Gunungkidul. *Ta'dib: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 30(2), 213–227. <https://doi.org/10.19109/td.v30i2.31610>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hafidz, M. (2021). Tantangan pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam pada materi abstrak dan konseptual. *Jurnal Tarbawi*.
- Hamalik, O. (2013). *Proses belajar mengajar*. Bumi Aksara.
- Hamida, N. A., Sein, L. H., & Ma, W. (2022). Implementasi teori meaningful learning David Ausubel dalam pembelajaran sejarah kebudayaan Islam di Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya. 6(4), 1386–1400. <https://doi.org/10.35931/am.v6i4.1294>
- Jamil, S. (2022). Teknologi dan pendidikan Islam: Peluang dan tantangan dalam era digital. *Wistara: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 3(1), 122–126. <https://doi.org/10.23969/wistara.v3i1.11239>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2019). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Edisi revisi). Rosdakarya.
- Mutia, A. S., Pertiwi, R. P., & R. S. (2025). Pengaruh strategi pembelajaran aktif tipe GQGA (Giving Question and Getting Answer) terhadap hasil belajar matematika. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 11, 156–165.
- Nasution, A., Rahmah, A. D., Fitri, N. A., & Pratiwi, L. (2025). Active learning strategies in increasing student participation at MIS Al Islam, Bengkulu City. *Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(4), 928.
- Putri, L. S., Isbir, M., Afifah, B. N., & Miftahul Ulum Modung Bangkalan, S. (n.d.). Implementasi metode Giving Questions and Getting Answer dalam meningkatkan keaktifan siswa di MA Al-Mukhlisin Kampao Blega Bangkalan Jawa Timur.
- Sanjaya, W. (2014). *Strategi pembelajaran berorientasi standar proses pendidikan* (11th ed.). Prenada Media.
- Sardiman, A. M. (2020). *Interaksi dan motivasi belajar mengajar*. Rajawali Pers.
- Silberman, M. L. (2013). *Active learning: 101 cara belajar siswa aktif*. Nuansa Cendekia.
- Slavin, R. E. (2020). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. Pearson Education.
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

- Susanti, S., Ambarwati, D., Wibowo, U. B., & Arsyadanti, H. A. (2022). Studi literatur: Peran inovasi pendidikan pada pembelajaran berbasis teknologi digital. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pendidikan*, 8(2), 173–184. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jitp.v8i2.43560>
- Waluyo, K. (2021). Strategi pondok pesantren dalam membentuk karakter santri di era Revolusi Industri 4.0 (Studi di Pondok Pesantren Manba'ul Hidayah Purwamekar Karawang). *Jurnal Ilmiah Edunomika*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.29040/jie.v5i1.2082>
- Woolfolk, A. (2009). *Educational psychology* (11th ed.). Pearson Education.