

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTEMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PAUSES IN COLLEGE  
ENGLISH CLASSES: AAU IN FOCUS

By  
KASSAHUN TIGISTU

June, 2006

**ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PAUSES IN  
COLLEGE ENGLISH CLASSES:  
AAU IN FOCUS**

**BY  
KASSAHUN TIGISTU**

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE  
PROGRAM  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
MASTER OF ART IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN  
LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

June, 2006



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PAUSES IN COLLEGE  
ENGLISH CLASSES: AAU IN FOCUS

BY  
KASSAHUN TIGISTU

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

Alemu Haider  
ADVISOR

Minist  
SIGNATURE

Dejenie Leta (Dr)  
EXAMINER

Dejenie Leta  
SIGNATURE

Italo Beriso  
EXAMINER

Italo  
SIGNATURE

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PAUSES IN COLLEGE  
ENGLISH CLASSES: AAU IN FOCUS

BY  
KASSAHUN TIGISTU

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

Alamu Haider  
ADVISOR

Almu  
SIGNATURE

Dejenie Leta (Dr)  
EXAMINER

Dejenie Leta  
SIGNATURE

Italo Beriso  
EXAMINER

Italo  
SIGNATURE

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
Acknowledgements-----	i
List of tables-----	ii
Acronyms-----	iii
Abstract-----	iv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION-----	1
1.1 Background of the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	4
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	5
1.4 Significance of the Study .....	6
1.5 Scope and Limitations of the study .....	6
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	8
2.1 The Essence of Instructional Pauses .....	8
2.2 Categories of Periods of Silence .....	11
2.2.1 Post- Teacher’s Question Wait – time .....	11
2.2.2 Within –student’s Response Pause-Time .....	11
2.2.3 Post-students’ Response Wait-Time-----	12
2.2.4 Student’s Pause –Time-----	12
2.2.5 Teachers’ Pause –Time .....	13
2.2.6 within- Teacher’s Presentation Pause –Time .....	13
2.2.7 Students’ Task- Completion Work –Time .....	14
2.2.8 Impact Pause –Time .....	14
2.3 Wait-time and Student Achievement.-----	14
2.4 The Role of Instructional Pauses in Higher Cognitive Development-----	16

2.5 Changes Associated to Extended Instructional Pauses .....	17
2.5.1 Changes in Student Behavior.....	17
2.5.2 Changes in Teacher Behavior.....	18
2.6 Pauses in Classroom Questioning .....	19
2.6.1 Responses and Reactions to Questions-----	20
2.6.2 How Classroom Teachers Approach the Teaching Of Thinking-----	21
 CHAPTER THREE: METHODS OF THE STUDY-----	 23
3.0 Introduction-----	23
3.1 Subject of the study-----	23
3.2 Instruments of the study. ....	24
3.2.1 Classroom Observation and Records.....	24
3.2.2 Questionnaire.....	26
3.3 Triangulation.....	26
 CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION-----	 27
4.0 Introduction.....	27
4.1 Data from the lesson transcript .....	27
4.1.1 Post Teachers' Question Wait-Time .....	27
4.1.2 Within Students' Response Pause-Time. ....	31
4.1.3 Post Students' Response Wait-Time. ....	32
4.1.4 Student Pause-Time. ....	35
4.1.5 Teacher Pause Time.....	35
4.1.6 Within -Teacher Presentation Pause Time.....	37
4.1.7 Student Task Completion Work-Time.....	39
4.1.8 Impact pause-time.....	40
4.2 Data from teachers' questionnaire.....	40

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	54
5.1 Conclusion .....	54
5.2 Recommendations .....	55
Bibliography -----	58
Appendix I (Lesson Transcripts) -----	62
Lesson One-----	62
Lesson Two-----	69
Appendix II-----	77

## ACNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most of all, I would like to praise the Lord, who let this to be a reality.

Next to none, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Alemu Hailu, who has been of great help critically reading my papers and giving his scholastic comments from the onset to the end of this study.

I am also greatly indebted to every member of my beloved family who nurtured me with their ceaseless and invaluable support.

My sincere gratitude also equally goes to the sampled teachers who let me observe their classes and filled in the questionnaire.

# LIST OF TABLES

## PAGES

### Tables for the lesson Transcript

• Table 1:PTQWT in second-----	28
• Table 2:WSRPT in second-----	31
• Table 3:PSRWT in second-----	33
• Table 4:TPT in second-----	36
• Table 5: WTPPT in second-----	38
• Table 6: STCWT in minutes/seconds-----	39

### Tables for the teachers' questionnaire

• Table 7: Importance of Silent Periods-----	41
• Table 8: Post Teacher Question Wait-Time-----	42
• Table 9: Within Students' Response Pause Time-----	43
• Table 10: Within Students' Response Pause Time-----	44
• Table 11: Post Students' Response Wait-Time-----	45
• Table 12: Duration of PSRWT-----	46
• Table 13: Teachers' Opinion On WSRPT-----	46
• Table 14: Duration of SPT-----	47
• Table 15: Intentional Pauses-----	48
• Table 16: Length of Teachers' Pause-Time-----	49
• Table 17: Within Teacher Presentation Pause Time-----	50
• Table 18: Duration of WTPPT-----	50
• Table 19: Importance of WTPPT-----	51
• Table 20: Impact of Silent Periods on Classroom Environment-----	52

## Acronyms

- PTQWT; Post Teacher Question Wait-Time
- WSRPT; Within Student's Response Pause Time
- PSRWT; Post Student's Response Wait-Time
- SPT; Student Pause Time
- TPT; Teacher Pause Time
- WTPPT; Within Teacher Presentation Pause Time
- STCWT; Student Task Completion Work-Time
- IPT; Impact Pause Time

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to make an assessment on teachers' awareness and use/implementation of the different kinds of pauses in classroom instruction. For the purpose of categorizing instructional pauses, the present study has made use of Stahl's (1994) category as a framework. Accordingly, the following eight kinds of instructional pauses are assessed in this study: pauses following teachers' questions, pauses within students' responses, pauses following students' response, pauses in students' self-initiated statement/comment, pause during teachers' lesson presentation, pause while students work on tasks, pauses deliberately made by teachers, and pauses to create cognitive\ affective impact on classroom environment.

The study is done on EFL classes at tertiary level. Particularly, College English classes of the freshman (2005/2006) program at AAU are the settings of the present study.

The study follows an observational approach with the help of video camera. A questionnaire, for sampled teachers, is also used as a tool for data collection. First, the whole lesson was recorded and thoroughly viewed. Later, taking the duration of the eight kinds of instructional pauses into account, the lesson was transcribed and tabulated for the analysis. Then, the obtained time duration at different instructional places were examined against the standard time stated in the literature.

The investigation shows that teachers are not conscious and skillful on the pauses to occur at different place/time of instructional setting. Contrary to the literature, the pauses in teachers' instruction are not extended as they are supposed to be i.e. three to five seconds on average. The different categories of silent period within and between verbal behaviors of teachers and students are immensely manifested lasting only for brief moments of zero to two seconds. Thus, the study, in general shows that both teachers and students are not beneficiaries of the potential learning and teaching benefits to be obtained from extended pauses at appropriate classroom instructional setting.

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the study

Nowadays, to come up with the best practice in all walks of life, both individuals and existing ideas need to pass through the ceaseless line of change and growth. Likewise, if language teaching is to be a genuine professional enterprise, teachers should engage in a continual career development.

Advance in language teaching is not an imposition of fixed approaches and fashionable formulas. According to Malamah-Thomas (1987), what really mediates between teaching and learning is not the pedagogic approach but what happens in the classroom and the assumption of different participant roles. Especially in countries like Ethiopia, where English is not used outside of the classroom, it is worthwhile to carry out a classroom research and examine what is happening there.

It is therefore of crucial importance to critically and carefully examine what goes on in actual classroom. Winne and Mark (1983), cited in Tobin (1987), state that classroom researchers should consider internal processes of students, and should focus on the students as information processing learners. Hence, it sounds feasible to examine classroom variables in connection with how learners process information in actual classroom.

In relation to this, Stahl (1982) constructs the concept of "think-time," which is defined as a distinct period of uninterrupted silence by the teacher and all students so that they both can complete appropriate information processing tasks, feelings, oral responses and actions. The concern is to provide the period of time that most effectively assists nearly every student to complete the cognitive tasks needed in the particular classroom situation. The teacher's job

is to manage and guide what occurs prior to and immediately following each period of silence so that the processing that needs to occur is completed.

Therefore, it is appropriate to question whether teachers are properly doing this job or not. In that, an essential variable demanding particular attention is teachers' pausing behavior in an instruction. The integral role played by pauses in teachers' instruction has been pointed out by scholars. Stahl (1990:4), for example, claims:

*Language learning is an information processing activity, which involves multiple cognitive tasks that take time. Students must have un interrupted periods of time/pauses to process information; reflect on what has been asked, said, observed, or done; and consider what their personal responses/reactions will be; i.e. time to think.*

Tobin (1986) also highlights numerous benefits of extending pauses between teacher utterances in classroom instruction. Tobin further notes that pauses in an instruction provide students with the opportunity to consider what has been said, and to assimilate new knowledge with the previously learned information. Similarly, Duell (1994) says that teachers can use the pauses in their instruction for selection of appropriate verbal moves and suitable course of action at different place and time of their instruction. Thus, it is possible to understand that these instructional pauses are of potential importance to learning by creating opportunity for learners to cognitively process orally presented information from the teacher.

Pauses in an instruction are supposed to occur at different classroom situations. Especially, pauses between and among utterances (verbal behaviors) from teachers or students play crucial role for learning as they provide both teachers and students with thinking time. Besides, teachers can make pauses at any place and time of instruction, whenever the need comes.

Different writers discuss instructional pauses in different ways. Lake (1973), for example, describes pauses as teacher pause-time and student pause-time. Fowler (1975) discusses instructional pauses as student controlled and teacher controlled pauses. Rowe (1972), on her part identifies two kinds of instructional pauses: Wait-time I and Wait-time II. Wait-time I refers to the pauses that follow teachers' question, while wait-time II refers to the pauses that follow students' response.

Taking their purpose and where they occur into account, Stahl (1994), on the other hand, identified eight kinds of pauses in an instruction. These are: the pause after teachers' question, pauses within students' response, pauses after students' response, pauses during students' hesitation, teachers' deliberate pauses, pauses in teacher's presentation, pauses for task completion and pauses for creating cognitive or affective classroom environment.

A study by Rowe (1974) in Chicago, using an observational approach, has reported that though sufficient wait-time allows classroom participants the opportunity to provide a thoughtful response to questions, most instructors allow their students less than 1.5 second of wait-time. This study was conducted on college population using a video recorded data.

Rowe's conclusions are supported by Tobin (1987), who conducted a review of 50 published studies of wait-time using audio-recorded materials. Similarly, using a questionnaire and audio recorded material, Blancheffe(1999) confirms that while posing a question, many teachers are not comfortable with "long" silences. This is because they think that allowing such silences during their questioning can be unsettling.

Regardless of the efforts made, the present researcher could not find sufficient local study conducted on instructional pauses. All through the wide local studies on language teaching, pauses in teachers' instruction, though an important part of classroom life, has received very little attention. A sole related local study is conducted by Seime (2002). Seime carried out the study at Kotebe College of Teachers Education and his result has indicated that the bulk of the questions (93%) raised by the instructors were all recall questions and highly proficient students are given less wait-time when compared to the students with low linguistic proficiency. This study, thus, dealt with only the kind of instructional pauses, which occur following teachers' questions and students' responses i.e. PTQWT and PSRWT, as named in the present study. Yet, the remaining kinds of instructional pauses have not ever been locally researched.

## **1.2 Statement of the problem**

Despite its pedagogical worth, Ethiopian teacher's proper awareness of the fact about instructional pauses has always been questioned. The widespread instructional practice in Ethiopia seems to deny sufficient uninterrupted pauses for learners to empower their thinking capacity. Tobin (1987) declares that giving less pauses/think-time in an instruction can reduce/inhibit learners' response, disrupt students' cognitive activity, and deprive learners' creativity, which in turn, impair learning.

A study by Carlsen (1991) also confirms that in most classrooms, students are typically given less than one second to respond to a question posed by a teacher. His research result shows that under these conditions, students generally give short, recall responses or no response at all rather than giving answers that involve higher-level thinking. In a similar manner, Seime (1999) states that many teachers would find it difficult to get average wait-time to

three second or longer. According to Seime (1999), what appears to be a simple technique that makes a fundamental impact on reasoning, roles and norms in a classroom is, in fact, difficult to learn.

Additionally, Stahl (1994) puts-over extended periods of pauses in teachers' instruction tend to increase the confusion, heighten the frustration, and leads to no response at all. Each period of pauses at different place and time of classroom instruction should then be appropriate to the needed cognitive tasks in that particular situation. Thus, it is teacher's job to manage and guide the duration and frequency of the pauses prior to and immediately following each kind of verbal behaviors so that the processing that needs to occur is successfully completed. The present study thus sets out to assess the place of instructional pauses in classroom instruction.

### **1.3 Objectives of the study**

This study is aimed at assessing the pauses during classroom instruction. It specifically aims to:

- assess to what extent teachers are aware of the pauses in their instruction,
- find out how teachers use/ implement pauses in their instruction,
- investigate which kinds of pauses are employed in teachers' instruction,
- to see the impact of pauses on teaching-learning process.

## **1.4 Significance of the Study**

Hopefully, the study is expected to have the following contributions:

- It gives teachers an awareness to evaluate the length of pauses at different place and time of classroom instruction.
- It is hoped that the result of this study will promote the use of pauses in the whole instructional setting, which significantly contributes to the improved quality of learning and teaching in the classroom environment.
- It is also hoped that this study would encourage teachers to carry out further studies on the area. Thus, it leads teachers towards the appraisal of their classroom pausing behavior and the informed application of their observation.

## **1.5 Limitation of the study**

The inability to find comprehensive and in-depth treatment the area in the theoretical back up was one limitation of the study. Moreover, insufficient number of classes\teachers to be observed was another problem of the researcher. Lack of adequate related local study has also limited the current researcher. Despite these, the current researcher has tried to overcome the possible shadows that may be cast on the outcome of the study.

## **1.6 Scope and Delimitation of the study**

Despite the complexity and unpredictability of classroom dynamics, the study had certain delimitations. One limitation is that the study dealt with only one aspect of instructional variable i.e. “Pauses” in teachers’ instruction. Thus, only classroom verbal behaviors related to the objectives stated were included in the study. Classroom discourses that were extraneous to the lesson are not dealt with.

Besides, as the literature does not set a time limit for “Task Completion Work Time”, it is not justifiably treated in this study so as to avoid subjectivity. Moreover, though instructional pauses can be applied in a similar manner for other subjects, the present study deals only with EFL classrooms.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### 2.1 The Essence of Instructional Pauses

The study of language learning and teaching has gone through successive methods and approaches in the language education spectrum. Across the development, some approaches have been designed in order to overcome the shortcomings witnessed in others. The behavioral approach to learning, for example, has been criticized for the fact that it limits creativity and self-expression, ignores cognitive process, and overlooks personality traits of learners.

Thus, in the recent years, language learning theory has been reshaped and transformed into cognitive field theory and discovery learning. In this holistic approaches thought, perception, motivation, individual traits and theoretical deductivity are looked at thoroughly. Moreover, constructivism is becoming a dominant theory. According to this theory, knowledge/meaning is constructed in the learners' mind via the interaction of new information with the old information existing in the long term memory. Accordingly, it is felt that it is appropriate to examine classroom practices against these contemporary insights.

The fact that language classroom is specifically designed for the purpose of facilitating language learning should constitute sufficient justification for studying what goes on there. Classroom research can focus on teachers, learners or on the interaction between teachers and learners. The purpose of classroom-oriented research is to identify the pedagogic variables that may facilitate or impede language acquisition. The variables may relate to the learner, the teacher, the instructional treatment or some form of interaction among these factors.

## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### 2.1 The Essence of Instructional Pauses

The study of language learning and teaching has gone through successive methods and approaches in the language education spectrum. Across the development, some approaches have been designed in order to overcome the shortcomings witnessed in others. The behavioral approach to learning, for example, has been criticized for the fact that it limits creativity and self-expression, ignores cognitive process, and overlooks personality traits of learners.

Thus, in the recent years, language learning theory has been reshaped and transformed into cognitive field theory and discovery learning. In this holistic approaches thought, perception, motivation, individual traits and theoretical deductivity are looked at thoroughly. Moreover, constructivism is becoming a dominant theory. According to this theory, knowledge/meaning is constructed in the learners' mind via the interaction of new information with the old information existing in the long term memory. Accordingly, it is felt that it is appropriate to examine classroom practices against these contemporary insights.

The fact that language classroom is specifically designed for the purpose of facilitating language learning should constitute sufficient justification for studying what goes on there. Classroom research can focus on teachers, learners or on the interaction between teachers and learners. The purpose of classroom-oriented research is to identify the pedagogic variables that may facilitate or impede language acquisition. The variables may relate to the learner, the teacher, the instructional treatment or some form of interaction among these factors.

An important aspect of classroom situation is the verbal behaviors that occur in an instruction. The term verbal behavior entails both teachers' and students' discourse as well as the interaction between the two. Basic instructional variable that is recently addressed by second language classroom researchers such as Stahl (1990, 1994), Rowe (1972, 1974, 1986), Tobin (1986, 1987) and Marzano (1993) is the pauses within classroom verbal behaviors. Instructional Pause can roughly be defined as silent periods at different places and time of classroom instruction (Stahl, 1994).

Being an essential feature of classroom verbal variable, the concept of instructional pauses is coming to light in the study of classroom discourse. In literature, the concept of instructional pauses is addressed in different words and phrases. The commonly used key words are: wait-time, think-time, pause time, lapse time, silent period and pausing. As all these terms entail a common essence, they are used interchangeably in this work.

Scholars on the area describe the concept of instructional pauses in the following ways.

Rowe (1972) identifies two types of wait times to occur in teachers' instruction. These are 'wait time **I**' and 'wait time **II**'. Wait time **I** refers to pause duration that follows teacher utterance. Wait time **II** refers to the duration of the pause that follows students' utterance. In most classroom instances, the first wait-time appears following a teacher question, and the second wait time appears following a student response to a question. According to Rowe (1972), an extended or criterion wait-time refers to an average duration of three to five seconds.

Lake (1973), on the other hand, suggests that pauses in classroom instruction needs to be described in terms of the period of silence that precedes teacher-talk. Accordingly, he forwards two descriptions based on which a speaker can command over the pause duration. Teacher wait-time is described as the length of the pause preceding teacher talk, and student wait-time is described as the length of the pause preceding student-talk. Thus, the two descriptions lead to the fact that teacher or student talk can precede the relevant pause in either case.

Fowler (1975) also identifies student controlled silence and teacher controlled silence. Then he sets four divisions of pauses: teacher reaction wait-time, student reaction wait-time, teacher initiated wait-time and student initiated wait-time.

According to Tobin (1986) wait-time is identified in terms of duration of pauses separating speakers .He identifies two types of pauses. The first is a pause that separates two teacher utterances and the second is a pause preceding a teacher utterance that follows a student utterance.

Based on the place they occur or by the primary function they perform during conversation and discussions, Stahl (1990) identifies eight categorizes of silence periods in a classroom instruction. Post –Teacher Question Think-Time, Within-Students’ Response- Time, Post– Student’s Response Think-Time, Student Pause-Time, Teacher Pause-Time, Within –Teacher Presentation pause-Time, Student Task- Completion work–Time and Impact pause- time.

Though the above identifications/descriptions appear different, they deal with a common central idea, i.e. silence periods elapsed in different place and time of classroom instruction. The instructional pauses identified by Stahl (1990) appear feasible for this research as it distinctively shows the different

instructional pauses across an instruction. Thus, Stahl's identification has been applied as a framework in the present study.

## **2.2 Categories of Periods of Silence**

Based on their purpose and where they occur, Stahl (1990, 1994) discusses periods of silence under eight groups.

### **2.2.1 Post- Teacher's Question Wait – time**

Post-teacher's question wait-time occurs when a period of 3 or more seconds of uninterrupted silence follows a teacher's question, so that students have sufficient uninterrupted time so as to first consider the question and then respond to the query. To be most effective, this period of silence should follow a clear, well-structured question with cues so that students can construct adequate answers. Conversely, extended periods of silence following imprecise questions tend to increase confusion, heighten frustration, and lead to no response at all (Stahl, 1994).

### **2.2.2 Within –students' Response Pause-Time**

Within- student's response pause- time, as the name indicates, occurs during students' response, explanation or any kind of statement by the student. According to Stahl (1990), this period of silence can last up to three or more seconds. By definition, no one except the student making the initial statement can interrupt this period of silence. The student may or may not need to take the full three seconds, or he/she may need more than three seconds. It is up to the student to make the decision. The widespread practice is that teachers interrupt students from completing their responses. However, if teachers manage to extend this period of silence to at least three seconds, students are likely to

instructional pauses across an instruction. Thus, Stahl's identification has been applied as a framework in the present study.

## **2.2 Categories of Periods of Silence**

Based on their purpose and where they occur, Stahl (1990, 1994) discusses periods of silence under eight groups.

### **2.2.1 Post- Teacher's Question Wait – time**

Post-teacher's question wait-time occurs when a period of 3 or more seconds of uninterrupted silence follows a teacher's question, so that students have sufficient uninterrupted time so as to first consider the question and then respond to the query. To be most effective, this period of silence should follow a clear, well-structured question with cues so that students can construct adequate answers. Conversely, extended periods of silence following imprecise questions tend to increase confusion, heighten frustration, and lead to no response at all (Stahl, 1994).

### **2.2.2 Within –students' Response Pause-Time**

Within- student's response pause- time, as the name indicates, occurs during students' response, explanation or any kind of statement by the student. According to Stahl (1990), this period of silence can last up to three or more seconds. By definition, no one except the student making the initial statement can interrupt this period of silence. The student may or may not need to take the full three seconds, or he/she may need more than three seconds. It is up to the student to make the decision. The widespread practice is that teachers interrupt students from completing their responses. However, if teachers manage to extend this period of silence to at least three seconds, students are likely to

be volunteer to give responses. Thus, students can provide the expected information (response), even without the teacher's prompt (Stahl, 1990).

### **2.2.3 Post-students' Response Wait-Time**

This three or more second of uninterrupted silence occurs after a student has completed a response and till other students make their reactions or comments on their friend's response. This period allows other students to think, formulate a reply, alternative response and reflect on what has been said and to consider what to say next. If students are to interact during academic discussion, they must be given time needed to consider one another's response so that they can have dialogue among themselves. In relation to this, Tobin (1986:192) writes:

*The teacher can use the pauses following student discourse/response to decide on an appropriate course of action. A number of alternatives are possible. For example, the teacher might decide to react to what the student has said, paraphrase the student's answer, provide an explanation, ask another question, move on to a new topic, allow the students to continue to speak, or call on another student to respond or react.*

### **2.2.4 Students' Pause -Time**

Student's pause-time occurs when a student pauses or hesitates during a self-initiated question, comment, or statement. This time lasts for three or more seconds of uninterrupted silence till the student finishes his\her self-initiated statements. In principle, no one except the student making the initial statement can interrupt this period of silence. The student may or may not need to take the full three seconds or may need more than three seconds. It is the student who is responsible to make the decision (Stahl, 1994).

### **2.2.5 Teachers' Pause –Time**

This kind of silent periods can occur at different place and time during a class period. These are pauses deliberately made by teachers to consider what just took place, what the present situation is, and what their next statements or behaviors could and should be. Teachers' Pause Time may last for three or more seconds of uninterrupted silence. When students ask a question that requires more than an immediate\short recall answer, such pauses are essential for teachers to make a reflective thought and provide proper response. Furthermore, when students have asked for further clarifications, clearer explanation or better examples teachers can make use of this pause periods to make deep and thoughtful justification (Stahl, 1994).

### **2.2.6 within Teachers' Presentation Pause –Time**

According to Stahl (1990, 1994), Within-teacher's presentation pause-time occurs during lecture presentations or other extended information input periods. Such a pause-time is observed when teachers deliberately stop the flow of information and give students three or more seconds of uninterrupted silence to process the just presented information. These pauses allow students time to consolidate their thinking with no request of them to follow with a public response. In effect, this period of silence provides students uninterrupted time to momentarily consider the information of the teacher's presentation in smaller, "bite-sized" chunks, rather than all at once (Stahl, 1994).

### **2.2.7 Students' Task- Completion Work –Time**

According to Stahl (1994) students' task-completion work-time refers to the uninterrupted silence period provided for students to remain on-task. This

period allows students to complete a short or lengthy academic task that demands their undivided attention. This period of uninterrupted silence should be appropriate to the length of time students need to complete the particular task.

### **2.2.8 Impact Pause –Time**

It is a kind of pause time that occurs when the most dramatic way to focus attention at a given time is to provide a period of uninterrupted silence. Impact pause-time may continue for more than three seconds or far longer periods, up through several minutes, depending up on the time needed for targeted cognitive or affective impacts. One example of a desired result is creation of a particular mood or affective environment when sudden silence may generate feeling or mood of anticipation, expectation, drama, suspense, or uncertainty. Another example is providing time for students to consider and internally respond to a rhetorical question before continuing with additional information or activity (Stahl, 1994).

## **2.3 Wait-time and Student Achievement**

Research, both local and international, indicates that teachers, at any level, ask numerous oral questions during instruction; (Seime, 2002), (Amdesellassie, 1999), (Perrot, 1982), (Chaudron, 1988) and (Alemayehu, 2004).

An information processing model of learning as Gagne and Yekovich (1993) as cited in Duell (1994), suggest language learning is an information processing activity involving cognitive task. Consequently, providing language learners with time to formulate their response to teachers' questions before they begin speaking would increase the quality of answers, especially answers to questions requiring more than a mere recall of information.

According to this model, to answer a question, the learner must locate the relevant information in long-term memory, retrieve it into working memory, check to see if the retrieved information does answer the question, apply it to principles\concept and new situations and later answer the question or make another thought if unable to answer. For all these to happen, the learner needs time i.e. think-time/wait-time. Hence, providing thinking time before expecting the student to respond to a question allows the student to search, retrieve, apply, evaluate and, if needed, do additional searches before responding.

In the same way, Glover (1989), cited in Carlsen (1991), has penned the fact that providing thinking time for students to complete mental process and answer questions successfully has the following positive effects:

- students master the content,
- students get opportunity to retrieve relevant information to the cue given in the question, which increases the probability of arriving at the correct answer and retrieving the idea later, and
- students are encouraged to elaborate on information which is later stored, and provide more pathways to the relevant idea.

Tobin (1987) also argues that, in order to relate and apply newly learned information to their prior knowledge, language learners call for silent period to cognitively process information. That is to mean, whenever new information is brought to foreign language learners, unlike first language learners, they need time to mentally process the former knowledge in their schema so as to react and create a link with the new one.

Thus, if classroom teachers fail to provide adequate time for cognitively processing information, the potential benefits mentioned above are likely to be reduced or eliminated. Stating the problem, Stahl (1990), indicates that

inadequate response time results in an interruption of learners' cognitive process, which in effect makes the learner miss the next verbal behaviors. The foregoing discussion, therefore, indicates that extending instructional pauses like 'wait-time' results in students' achievement and an improved ways of learning. The achievement can be either immediate or to be seen across time.

## **2.4 The Role of Instructional Pauses in Higher Cognitive-Development**

Tobin(1987) asserts that if language learners are perceived as an information processing learner, teaching roles can be defined in terms of maintaining appropriate student cognitive task involvement and thus utilizing the cues to stimulate the cognitive processes are essential aspects of learning. Hence, in accordance with the information processing model of learning above, (see 2.3) the stimuli used by teachers to cue learners to particular cognitive processes are important components of a classroom learning environment.

If students' learning is actually wanted to be influenced by the teacher discourse, the information in the discourse needs to be cognitively processed by the learner. For this to happen, the rate at which information is presented should be matched with the cognitive processing capabilities of students (Duell, 1994). The time which students are let free to cognitively process information is what is called in this study as instructional pauses/ think-time.

The cognitive processing model, described above Gagne and Yekovich (1993) as cited in Duell (1994) highlighted the importance of actively processing stimuli within few seconds of receipt. Unless active processing occurs, the stimuli are likely to fade from the storage system and be lost. Consequently, if learners are to benefit from instruction, it is important that sufficient time is provided for cognitive processing. To ensure that adequate time is provided it seems to follow that teachers should consciously manage the duration of pauses after

solicitations and provide regular intervals of silence during explanations. It is these intervals of silence periods that the present study treats as instructional pauses.

## **2.5 Changes Associated to Extended Instructional Pauses**

When an instructional pause, like wait-time, is extended at least to three seconds, there are changes that could occur in student and teacher behavior. Some of these changes are fairly immediate, while others occur over time.

### **2.5.1 Changes in Student Behavior**

Rice, 1977; Chaudron, 1988; Perrott, 1982; and Stahl, 1994 have identified the following changes in student behaviors:

- the length and correctness of their responses increase.
- the number of their “I don’t know” and no answer responses decreases.
- students offer more evidence in support of their responses, offer more speculative thought, and give more complex answer.
- the number of volunteered, appropriate answers by large number of students greatly increased.
- the score of students on academic achievement tests tend to increase

Similarly, Tobin (1986, 1987); Amdesellassie (1999), have pointed out the following positive outcomes to be manifested from an extended post teacher question and post students’ responses wait time:

- more quality student discourse and less failure to respond
- increased in alternative responses.

- increase in the complexity and cognitive level of student responses
- decreased disciplinary move
- more student initiated discourse
- more student to student interactions /conversation
- language content perceived to be less difficult
- decrease in student confusion
- increased elaboration, improved language and logic
- more confidence and good spirit
- decreased apathy towards English
- increased students' participation and self correction
- fewer student interruptions
- longer pauses within conversations
- higher achievement.

### **2.5.2 Changes in Teacher Behavior**

When teachers wait patiently in silence for 3 or more seconds at appropriate instructional instances, positive changes in their own teachers' behaviors are also manifested.

Stahl (1994) reports the following four important improvements on teacher behavior.

- Their questioning strategies tend to be more varied and flexible.
- They decrease the quantity and increase the quality and variety of their questions.
- They ask additional questions that require more complex information processing and higher level thinking on the part of students.
- Teachers' expectations of the performance of certain students seem to improve.

The following points are added by (Tobin 1986, 1987; Sadker, 1997; and Rice, 1977):

- Less teacher talk
- Fewer repeated verbal patterns
- Fewer chain questions
- Teacher comments are less disjointed and more fluent
- Classroom discussion becomes more logical, thoughtful and coherent
- Less mimicry
- Fewer low level reaction
- Lesser teacher anxiety
- Less teacher interruptions
- Increased proportion of teacher soliciting, structuring and probing
- Instructors get an opportunity to get some feedback on student problems in understanding certain aspects of lecture

## **2.6 Pauses in Classroom Questioning**

Talking about classroom verbal behaviors, questioning is one area of great concern. Being embedded under classroom verbal interaction, questioning is an area in which the effect of instructional pauses is observed. Questioning is one of the techniques that greatly contribute to effective classroom teaching and learning. As Kissock and Iyokrtsuun (1982) indicate, effective questioning has greater potential than any other teaching method for stimulating students' thinking. Questioning changes the traditional one way mode of delivery from the teacher into a bidirectional way, which makes learners get involved in classroom discussion.

Classroom questioning can be studied from diverse theoretical orientations. Carlsen (1991) says that most of the research works on classroom questioning are grounded in two important paradigms; Process-Product Paradigm and

Sociolinguistic Paradigm. Research in the process-product tradition has focused on the relationship between discrete observable teacher questioning practices and student outcomes. In this paradigm, questioning is studied from its interactional point of view by constructing taxonomy of teacher behaviors and relating them with individual student outcomes. Common and primary student outcomes are students' achievement and students' questions and responses.

Sociolinguistics offers an alternative paradigm for the study of questioning in classrooms. (Carlesen, 1991:158) writes:

*Sociolinguistic is concerned with the interdependency of language and situation. In contrast to other linguistic orientations, a sociolinguistic approach will emphasize the role of social context in the interpretation of spoken language*

As the very purpose of the present study is to assess teachers' pauses in classroom instruction, the discussion in this paper is broadly geared towards the product-process approach. Most of the arguments in this project focus on the silent periods in the responses and reactions that teachers and students have during questioning. Other features of questions like context and content remain untouched, but it should be noted that thorough understanding of questioning demands critical examination of many features including the mentioned ones.

### **2.6.1 Responses and Reactions to Questions**

The way teachers and students respond to questions and an answer is an important process of classroom questioning. One related area, heavily researched at the international level, is teachers' wait-time in questioning. Skillful and proper implementation of instructional pauses like wait-time in

teachers' questioning contributes a lot for maintaining classroom discourse life. Hence, it is appropriate to ask 'why most students fail to actively participate more in question and answer exchanges?' is an absolutely essential question?

One possible way of attempting to answer this question is to carefully and critically examine teachers' wait-time while posing a question. According to Rowe (1986) teachers ask students to answer questions and often wait for less than a second for the students to start to reply, after the student stop speaking, they immediately react by giving their responses or raising further questions. Such quick reactions by teachers are likely to cut off students thought and elaboration.

However, if the wait-time following teacher question is a little bit extended to three seconds or more, there are marked changes on student discourse, teacher discourse, student achievement and student cognitive development. Moreover, scholars like Marzano (1993) claim that questioning is one way of teaching thinking in a classroom.

### **2.6.2 How Classroom Teachers Approach the Teaching of Thinking**

In earlier educational processes, the call for the teaching of thinking seemed to be overlooked. Nowadays, however, the idea permeates the discussion of educational reforms. In the current cognitive theory of learning, plenty of educators like Marzano (1993) strongly advocates the teaching of thinking as a necessary component of school reform.

A wide variety of techniques have been designed to enhance the thinking of students. According to Marzano (1993) these techniques can be sorted into three major categories. These are: questioning technique, writing technique and general information processing strategies. Among these, the questioning technique appears to be relevant to the concept of wait-time.

Scholars like Perrot (1982) and Kissock and Iyortsuun (1982) believe that questioning is the most frequently used classroom method of enhancing thinking. To make sure that they are enhancing higher order thinking, many teachers rely on classification systems or taxonomies that differentiate the levels of thought various questions elicit.

One general classification of questions is as recitation questions and construction questions. Recitation questions require students to simply retrieve information previously learned. Construction questions, on the other hand, require students to make higher order thinking and construct new knowledge that are not previously learned. Another oldest method, yet most popular system of classifying questions, is using the Bloom's (1956) taxonomy: Knowledge, comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, and Evaluation.

However, scholars like Ennis (1981) and Wood (1977), cited in Marzano (1993), claim that teachers have little success in differentiating one level from another, specifically at the higher levels. Thus, these scholars believe that one way of enhancing thinking is the proper implementation and manipulation of wait-time. Given its simplicity and ease of execution, wait-time appears to be an effective instructional technique.

When teachers let the students to have three to five seconds after posing a question, students will have the opportunity to think on the question and produce a speculative response. Yet, as these scholars put, it should be noted that the utility of wait-time as a strategy for enhancing thinking, appears limited in that the general conclusion about its casual relationship with higher level thought is that it is a necessary but not sufficient condition.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODS AND PROCEDURES

### 3.0 Introduction

The study aims to investigate instructional pauses in a language classroom. Similar to studies conducted at international level by Rowe (1974), Tobin (1986) and Blancheff (1999), the presented study broadly followed a qualitative approach. Thus, attempts have been made to assess teachers' awareness and implementation of instructional pauses in their classroom practice. To achieve these objectives, certain procedures were followed. This chapter, hence, deals with procedures followed in the study, the respondents, the instruments and ways in which data are organized and presented.

### 3.1 Subject of the study

The respondents of this study were twelve instructors teaching College English at Addis Ababa University. College English was selected as it is expected to have classroom interactions, which are likely to better exhibit the variable under investigation, that is, pauses in classroom instruction. Among these twelve teachers, five were observed with the help of video recording. From the five teachers, the researcher observed eight different sessions. In that, three of the teachers were observed twice and the other two only once.

### 3.2 Instruments of the study

Following international studies by Rowe (1974) and Tobin (1986), the researcher employed an observational approach. In doing so, a video camera and a questionnaire were used as reliable instruments to collect relevant

information for the study. Altogether, there were 18 teachers involved in the College English course. Though there was an intention to take all the teachers as subject of the study, the researcher managed to get the questionnaires filled in only by 12 of them.

### **3.2.1 Classroom Observation and Records**

Classroom observation was the main data collection instrument for the study. The observation was done with the help of a video camera. As it was investigated, three of the observed classes were totally teacher-dominated while in two classes, students were making individual presentations. Then, two lessons, which had better interaction, were selected for close examination as source of data.

First, the researcher, with two co-observers who received training on aspects to be focused on during the observation session, recorded the eight different class periods. Then, the researcher and the assistants watched each recorded sessions thoroughly.

Before counting the pause time in the selected lessons, the researcher first made a rough transcription of the two lessons by marking instructional places where pauses were supposed to be made. In other words, chunks were made to show the pausing patterns across the whole instruction. This helped both the researcher and his co-observers to visibly know where pauses between verbal behaviors could be measured. The instructional places/chunks were marked based on the category recommended by Stahl (1994). However, one kind of pause (student Task-Completion Pause -Time) was reserved in the analysis as it is likely to bring about subjectivity.

While watching the video record, both the researcher and the co- observers used a stopwatch to measure the pause timing between marked utterances. Counting the duration followed the following procedure; first the video was played till the expected verbal behavior appeared. Then, the video was stopped exactly after the end of the expected verbal behavior. Later, the time difference between the two verbal behaviors was recorded and written at the marked place.

In short, counting of the duration between utterances/verbal behaviors from the recorded video was done in the following procedure: *play*→ *stop*→ *record* → *play*→ *stop*→ *record*. Besides the stopwatch, the time on the video cassette player was also used as a reference.

After that, average duration from the three raters, the researcher with his two co-observers, and the video cassette player was taken as a dependable data. For easy understanding, decimal seconds were rounded to the nearest whole number. Later, the obtained pause durations were examined against the standard set in the literature. Additionally, for increasing precision and accuracy, the researcher alone repeatedly watched and checked the obtained figures.

Later, the two lessons were retranscribed by writing the measured pause durations (in seconds/minutes) before and after the marked classroom utterances/discourse (See Appendix I and II). Classroom discourses that were irrelevant to the lesson objectives, for discipline or classroom organization, for example, were not considered in the analysis.

### **3.2.2 Questionnaire.**

The teachers' questionnaire was designed to gather data on the teachers' awareness, opinion and classroom implementation of the different kinds of pauses in an instruction. The questionnaire comprised of 20 items. The items were, in general, designed to elicit the different kinds of pauses in an instruction. Both open and close-ended questions were included in the questionnaire. For easy understanding and proper response from respondents, cues were provided.

In order not to limit the respondents' response and elicit the necessary information, the respondents were asked to add their own option, if any, whenever they were asked objective type questions.

Before its actual use, to make it valid and reliable, the format and content of the questionnaire was evaluated and revised repeatedly by the researcher and his supervisor. Later, fourteen questionnaires were distributed to the teachers. Among these, twelve were properly filled in and returned to the researcher. Then, the responses from these twelve teachers were tabulated and used as a data source for the analysis.

### **3.3 Triangulation**

Eventually, data obtained through the recorded lesson and the questionnaire were compared and contrasted to arrive at sound conclusion. At first, the data from the two recorded lessons were presented in separate tables. Then, the result from the questionnaire is discussed by comparing and contrasting with the result from the recorded lesson. Finally conclusions were drawn based on the results obtained.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, analysis and interpretation of the organized data are presented. Based on the data obtained from the records of classroom practices and the teachers' questionnaire, the analysis is made in two separate sections.

The first part deals with the discussion of the data obtained from classroom records. To analyze the data obtained from the video record, Stahl's classification of instructional pause was applied as a framework. Thus, each kind of instructional pause was discussed in sequence. The different kinds of instructional pauses marked in the lesson transcript were addressed in terms of the indicated line of move.

The second part discusses the data gathered through the teachers' questionnaire. An attempt was made to compare and contrast information obtained from the two instruments.

#### 4.1 Data from the lesson transcript

In the following sub sections, the data obtained on the eight different kinds of instructional pauses are presented in the form of table and discussed thoroughly.

##### 4.1.1 Post Teachers' Question Wait-Time

Summary of teachers' wait-time is presented in tables as follows.

Table 1: PTQWT in Seconds

*Transcript 1*

<b>PTQWT in sec.</b>	<b>No of Questions</b>	<b>Percentage of questions</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
0 sec	4	18.2%	106,108,110,112
1 sec	5	22.7%	008, 008, 053,077 and 096
2 sec	9	40.9%	009,013,023,034,043,048,053, 088 and 093
3 sec	2	9.1%	019 and 032
4 sec	2	9.1%	058 and 070
	Total=22		

*Transcript 2*

<b>PTQWT in sec.</b>	<b>No of questions</b>	<b>Percentage of questions</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
0 sec	13	35.1%	003,013,045,059,059,070,084,085, 094,094,105,105 and 128
1 sec	7	18.9%	053,071, 077,087,117,125,155
2 sec	10	27%	051,059,074,089,094,110,126, 144,151,155
3 sec	3	8.1%	064,131,140
4 sec	2	5.4%	096,153
5 sec	1	2.7%	057
6 sec	1	2.7%	051
	Total=37		

As could be seen in the above tables, the first teacher totally posed twenty-two questions and the second teacher posed thirty-seven questions during their recorded lessons.

Nine of the twenty-two questions (40.9%) as shown in the first table were followed by a wait-time of two second. Besides, four of the teacher's questions (18.2%) were followed by a wait-time of zero seconds. Furthermore, five of the teacher's questions (22.7%) were followed by a wait-time of one second. (See appendix I)

In very few questioning instances (18.2%), the teacher provided an appropriate wait-time of length three and four seconds. However, this is very insignificant compared to the total number of questions posed by the teacher in the recorded class period, as indicated in Transcript one.

Though it seems a bit better, the second transcript also showed a similar situation. Among the thirty-seven questions posed, thirteen of them (35.1%) were followed by a wait-time of zero second. This shows that the teacher mostly did not give students the opportunity to think on the questions. Rather, teachers cut off students' thought by making quick reactions, unnecessary repetitions and restatement of the questions. Such reactions are likely to demotivate students and make them stop attempting questions. As the summary of Transcript 2 presented in the above table shows, for seventeen questions (45.9%) only a wait-time of one to two seconds were given, which again are not sufficient enough for undergoing the necessary thoughts.

As shown in the table, six questions (16.2%) were followed by appropriate wait-time duration of three to five seconds, which is believed to be fairly long duration.

The table (Transcript 2) also shows at that there was a wait-time that lasted for six seconds following one of the thirty seven questions (2.7%). Such over extended wait-time, according to Stahl (1990), may lead students to confusion

and frustration. Nevertheless, as six seconds is not far beyond the given limit in the literature, a student was seen giving a correct answer to the teacher's question instead of being confused.

Thus, it is evident from the figures in the table (Transcript 1) that, the majority of the questions, 18 among the 22, (81.8%) were followed by a wait-time that lasted for not more than two seconds. Similarly, thirty of the thirty seven questions (81%) in the table (Transcript 2) were followed by a wait-time that lasted for not more than two seconds. The figures, hence, reveal that the majority of the questions from both teachers were followed by insufficient wait-time. Records have shown that teachers often interrupted students' by rephrasing /explaining the question and sometimes answering them by themselves.

This hampered students from having enough wait-time to cognitively process the question and respond to it in a speculative manner. Scholars like Rowe (1986) and Stahl (1990) stress that if teachers do not manage to extend their wait-time to at least three to five seconds, students can not properly process the teacher's question in their mind and formulate a thoughtful response.

Literature on the area shows that, there are plenty of pedagogical merits that a teacher could make use of provided that three to five seconds of wait-time is frequently used after questions. Yet, it is unlikely to say that the teacher gave sufficient wait-time in the whole instruction, as these durations were observed only on very few instances. Only 18.2% of the questions from the first transcript and 16.2% from the second were followed by the recommended time duration (three to five seconds).

From the discussion so far, it can be deduced that the majority of the teachers' questions in the two transcripts were not followed by adequate wait-times which let learners make the necessary cognitive process. Teachers, thus, denied

their students the opportunity to process a proper thought, which could help them to react to the questions successfully.

#### 4.1.2 Within Students' Response Pause-Time.

The duration indicating the pauses within students' responses are summarized in the following tables.

Table 2: WSRPT in Second.

##### *Transcript 1*

<b>WSRPT in sec</b>	<b>No of responses</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
2 sec	1=	33.3%	010
1 sec	2=	66.7%	016 and 049
	Total=3		

##### *Transcript 2*

<b>WSRPT in sec</b>	<b>No of responses</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
3 sec	2=	66.7%	072 and 154
4 sec	1=	33.3%	097
	Total=3		

As the summary of Transcript 1 shows, the teacher waited for students only one and two seconds to complete their responses. After waiting for a maximum of 2 seconds, the teacher was observed interrupting students' thought in different ways. He completed the answer by himself, nominated another student to answer and rephrased the question for clarification.

However, scholars strongly condemn such practices by teachers. Tobin (1987), for example, argues that if teachers do not tolerate the pause within students' response for a range of three to five seconds, students would not be able to think properly and complete their answers by themselves. Tobin (Ibid) also pointed out that it has to be the student him/herself and no one else, to interrupt the pause.

With regard to the summary of transcript 2, the situation seems better. The teacher waited for the pauses within students' responses for three and four seconds, which is within the appropriate time range stated in the literature. Consequently, it was seen that students had completed their response by themselves. Thus, when a teacher tolerates the pauses within students' response, he/she is paving a way for students to formulate their thought, make self-correction, reconstruct their response and complete the pause by themselves in appropriate manner. However, in the observed lessons, instances showing extended students' response, which can allow to properly measure the pauses in it, were very minimal.

#### **4.1.3 Post Students' Response Wait-Time.**

Twenty-four lines from the first transcript and eight lines from the second transcript (See Appendix I and II) demonstrated the duration of the pauses following students' response. Summary of the transcripts regarding this point is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: PSRWT in Second

*Transcript 1*

<b>PSRWT in sec</b>	<b>No of responses</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
0 sec	9	39.1%	024,029,035,046,056,068,086, 094 and 102
1 sec	10	43.5%	014,020,039,044,065,071,084, 089,091 and 096
2 sec	2	8.7%	060 and 063
3 sec	2	8.7%	045 and 100
	Total=23		

*Transcript 2*

<b>PSRWT in sec</b>	<b>No of responses</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
0 sec	16	69.6%	023,030,036,052,058,065,072, ,075,092,099,118,120,122, 124 and 132
1 sec	5	21.7%	046,056,067,145 and 147
4 sec	2	8.7%	043 and 054
	Total= 23		

As shown above, the first transcript indicates that, in most responding instances, nineteen among the twenty-four (82.6%), the teacher offered a PSRWT of zero and one second. Similarly in two instances (8.7%), a PSRWT of two seconds was observed. (See Appendix I)

These figures, thus, shows the fact that the teacher did not let learners have the opportunity to have time to think over their friends' responses, and thus they were not volunteers to comment and react on them. Rather, the teacher

was observed reacting to the students' response by himself. The teacher repeated students' response, nominated/pointed to another student, rephrased the students' response and gave the correct answer by himself.

Moreover, summary of Transcript 1 shows that there was a PSRWT that lasted for three seconds, which is the minimum criterion stated in the literature. However, this occurrence, two out of the twenty-three (8.7%), was very insignificant to be mentioned.

Summary of transcript 2 also showed similar findings. Of the twenty-three responses, sixteen (69.6%) were followed by a zero second wait-time. Five other responses (21.7%) were followed by a wait-time of one second. This may indicate teacher's serious denial of opportunity for students to think and comment on each other's response. Though a wait-time of four seconds was observed after two student's response (8.7%), the majority of the students' responses (91.3%) were not brought to others for comments.

Both teachers, thus, did not extend appropriate pauses following students' responses, as it should suppose to be. Literature on the area by Stahl (1994) and Duell (1994) highlights that the pause following students' responses plays plenty of pedagogic roles. For example, it helps students' to consider one another's response and interact with each other. It also motivates students to make volunteer reactions and give comment on the responses from their friends. This, in turn, enhances classroom interaction and the dialogue between and among students. Sufficient uninterrupted time following students' response also creates several merits to teachers. Proper duration of PSRWT helps teachers to know what course of action to take based on students' response. Actions could be reacting/paraphrasing students' response, providing explanations or moving to another topic.

#### **4.1.4 Student Pause-Time**

According to Chaudron (1988), it is natural that second/foreign language learners, unlike first language learners, make pauses/hesitations while making different self-initiated statements in a classroom. However, in the case of the observed, it was not possible to properly measure the student pause time. Students simply gave short and chorus responses to the questions posed by teachers. No student was observed initiating classroom talk and making extended utterances. No kind of question, statement or comment was seen with the student initiative. (See Appendix I and II)

It was only in one instance, line 074 of the first transcript, that a student asked a question though it was inaudible and the researcher couldn't see the pause.

As could be inferred from the literature in chapter two, there exists a similarity between SPT and WSRPT. Thus, it is possible to relate the discussion in this section to the discussion made under WSRPT.

#### **4.1.5 Teacher Pause Time**

As it can be viewed from the transcripts (See appendix I and II), the researcher spotted out places in the instructional sequence where teachers' pause could possibly be seen. Accordingly, fourteen lines from the first transcript and eight lines from the second are marked to measure the teachers' pause-time. Table 4 below presents the summary.

Table 4: TPT in Second.

*Transcript 1.*

<b>TPT in sec.</b>	<b>No of times</b>	<b>percentage</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
0 sec	6	42.8%	047,052,057,072,097 and 103
1 sec	2	14.3%	095, 101
2 sec	3	21.4%	021,040 and 087
3 sec	1	7.1%	085
4 sec	1	7.1%	073
5 sec	1	7.1%	114
	Total=14		

*Transcript 2*

<b>TPT in sec.</b>	<b>No of times</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
0 sec	3	25%	004, 139 and 142
1 sec	3	25%	025,084 and 093
2 sec	6	50%	049,069,079,102,107 and 114.
	Total=12		

As depicted in the summary of the first transcript, most of the teacher pause instances (42.8%) were characterized by a zero second pause time. Two instances (14.3%) indicate a one second of TPT and three instances (21.4%) indicate a two second of teacher pause time.

These instances might suggest that the teacher was not considerate enough to examine ongoing classroom situations. This, in turn, has its own harmful effects on the teacher as well as the students. For example, Tobin (1987) states

that lack of sufficient teacher pause makes the teacher unable to properly consider what to take place and thus unable to know what the next verbal behavior should be. Besides, Carlsen (1991) adds that a teacher having insufficient pause time would be unable to answer imaginative questions and provide further clarification or better example to students query.

Summary of Transcript 1 further shows that in three cases (21.3%) teacher pause time lasted for three to five seconds. This range, as per the literature, is long enough to help teachers consider what happens in the class, what the present situation looks like and what to do or say next. This, however, is insignificant as observed in the first sample lesson extract.

Summary of Transcript 2 also reveals a similar result. Among the twelve lines marked to measure teacher pause time, three of them (25%) lasted for zero second and three other (25%) lasted for two seconds. Most of the pauses (50%) lasted for two seconds.

As mentioned in chapter two, if teachers managed to extend their pause time to at least three seconds, they would be able to bring marked changes in their discourse characteristic, which is a vehicle for learners' cognition. Yet, the teachers in the lesson transcript did not manage to do that. Thus, the result may be an indicative of teachers' inconsiderate of how TPT could facilitate the teaching-learning process in a classroom.

#### **4.1.6 Within –Teacher Presentation Pause Time**

From the recorded lessons, the researcher marked eight lines from the first lesson transcript and five from the second which showed WTPPT. Table 5 below presents summary of the transcripts.

Table: 5 WTPPT in Seconds

*Transcript 1*

WTPPT in sec.	No of times	Percentage	Line of move
0 sec	5	71.4%	066,069,075,076 and 092
2 sec	2	28.6%	001 and 030
	Total=7		

*Transcript 2*

WTPPT in sec.	No of times	Percentage	Line of move
0 sec	1	33.3%	006
1 sec	1	33.3%	085
3 sec	1	33.3%	001
	Total=3		

As indicated in the above table (Transcript 1), among seven of the pauses within teacher presentation, five of them (71.4%) lasted for zero second, which means there was no gap within teacher's presentation. Similarly, two of the WTPPT (28.6%) lasted for an insufficient duration of just two seconds.

The result of the second transcript is also similar to that of the first. Thirty three percentage of the WTPPT showed a zero second pause time. Similarly, another 33.3% showed a one second pause time. Again, one other WTPPT (33.3%) showed a three second pause time, which is fairly long though its occurrence is rare.

These figures indicate that the recorded teachers don't have the practice of making pauses in their instruction. As can be understood from the transcript, the teachers simply present information without giving students time in between to momentarily consider information and consolidate their thought.

The students, thus, do not get the opportunity to consider what has been said and assimilate new knowledge with previously learned ones.

It is indicated by different writers that teachers should be able to consciously manage to stop information flow during lectures so that students can have time to shortly process portion of information in the lecture. If not, it is very likely that students would be overloaded with information and get panicked without grasping anything from the teacher's presentation. For this reason, the pace of teachers' information presentation has to be accompanied by pauses so as to do it in accordance with the learners' cognitive capacity. Yet, the teachers in the lesson transcripts seemed to be unaware of this fact.

From the available literature it can be inferred that the pause-time within teacher presentation has some features to share with TPT. Thus, for clarity and easy understanding the discussions under the two sections can be compared to each other.

#### **4.1.7 Student Task Completion Work-Time.**

In the two lessons recorded and transcribed, the teachers dealt with three and two different tasks respectively. The amount of time students were made to work on the three tasks is presented below.

**Table 6: STCWT in Minutes and Seconds.**

*Transcript 1*

<b>Task No</b>	<b>STCWT</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
Task 1	9 min & 27 sec	007
Task 2	5 min & 12 sec	081
Task 3	3 minutes	105

*Transcript 2*

<b>Task no</b>	<b>STCWT</b>	<b>Line of move</b>
Task 1	10 min & 12 sec	001
Task 2(repetition of task 1)	4 min & 35 sec	021
Task 3	2 min & 9 sec	117

The second teacher (transcript 2) was seen adding extra minutes when students fail to accomplish the task in the given time. Thus, he seemed to be conscious of time to be allotted for tasks. However, as the literature doesn't state particular time duration for a specific kind of task, it is impossible to interpret the figures above.

#### **4.1.8 Impact pause-time**

As stated by Stahl (1994) impact pause time is a silence period applied in a classroom to focus students' attention to the lesson by creating different cognitive or affective impacts like anticipation, expectation, suspense and uncertainty on students. However, in the observed classes, none of the teachers employed and took advantage of this instructional pausing technique.

#### **4.2 Data from teachers' questionnaire**

As indicated in chapter three, the teachers' questionnaire comprised of 20 items. Each item was designed to elicit teachers' response on the different kinds of pauses in an instruction. The obtained data is discussed item by item as follows.

Before directly looking at the pauses in an instruction, it seems feasible to collect teachers' view on the importance of pauses in an instruction. Thus, item

one was designed to investigate what teachers felt about the importance of pauses at different places and time of classroom instruction. The teachers' responses are presented in the Table 7 below.

Table 7: Importance of Silent Periods.

Responses	No of teachers
Yes	12
No	0
Total	12

As indicated in the above table, all the teachers believe that pause periods have important pedagogical values. This is absolutely consistent with what is often discussed in the related literature. Though teachers reported this in the above table, data from recorded lesson reveal that they don't give appropriate pause times during interactions in the class.

Item two was intended to elicit the teachers' reason for accepting the importance of pauses in an instruction. The teachers gave different reasons which are summarized as follows:

- students will have time to build confidence.
- classroom interaction is enhanced
- students will have time to think and organize their ideas/thoughts
- students would have time to prepare their answers
- students' responses become elongated
- students are motivated and thus respond to teachers' questions correctly
- students develop discussion skills as a result of interaction
- students' communicative competence in authentic situations would be developed

- students' involvement in the classroom task and activities would increase.

This shows that teachers are aware of the importance of pausing at different place and time of classroom instruction.

In item 3, the teachers' were asked to report for how long they wait after posing a question. Table 8 below presents their responses.

**Table 8: Post Teacher Question Wait-Time**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
1-3 sec	1
3-5 sec	2
5-7 sec	4
- about 15 seconds	1
-depends on question's nature	1
-depends on available classroom time	1
-no specific time limit	1
- can't state in sec	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>

As Table 8 above shows the teachers differ in their use of PTQWT. As shown in the table only two teachers said that they gave three to five seconds. One teacher, who chose the first interval, did not give adequate PTQWT. Four other teachers, on the other hand, gave over extended duration. The rest five teachers gave different justifications. Two of the five teachers claimed that the wait-time duration depends on the nature of the questions and the available classroom time. One teacher argued that he didn't have any specific limited time. One teacher stated that he could possibly wait for 15 seconds, though it mostly

depended on the type of question. Moreover, one teacher asserted that he could not measure it in seconds but he usually tried to wait for his students as much as they wanted.

Therefore, it is possible to infer that the majority of the teachers seemed to be unaware of the standard criterion, 3-5 seconds, which most scholars such as Rowe (1986), Tobin (1986) and Stahl (1990) have agreed to be enough for students to undergo the necessary cognitive process and provide speculative replies to questions. Hence, teachers didn't give the needed wait-time to students to make the necessary thought on questions. An examination of the lesson transcript also revealed that teachers in most instances, waited only zero to two seconds after posing a question.

Item four was meant to verify whether teachers patiently wait for the pauses/hesitation during students' response/explanation or not. Table 9 below summarizes Teachers' response.

**Table 9: Within Students' Response Pause Time.**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
Yes	7
No	3
Others	2
Total	12

As the figures in the above table indicate majority of the teachers, seven, said that they patiently wait for the pauses during students' response. Three other teachers said that they don't patiently wait for the pauses/hesitations that occur during students' response/explanation. Examinations of the lesson transcript also demonstrated that teachers interrupt the pauses in the few

students' responses observed. Two other teachers gave their own views. They said that they sometimes wait patiently and interrupt in some situations. For example, one reported that he usually interferes when students need help or are short of ideas/words.

The view of large number of teachers above is consistent with the scholars' view in the literature. Stahl (1982), for example, states that as such pauses are thinking time, they shouldn't be interrupted by teachers unless it is done by the student him/her self.

In item five, those teachers who chose 'yes' in item four (7), were asked to find out what they think about the duration of the pauses within students' response. Table 10 below presents their responses.

**Table 10: Within Students' Response Pause Time**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
1-3 sec	1
3-5 sec	5
I do not interrupt unless it is done by the student him/herself	0
I interrupt when students fail to get the idea.	1
Total	7

As the above table depicts, five teachers said that they give three to five seconds, which is the appropriate criterion time interval set by scholars. However, as we saw earlier in the analysis of the lesson transcripts, teachers rarely extend WSRPT to three seconds.

As it is also shown in the Table, one teacher responded that he waits for students' pause for the duration of one to three seconds. One teacher gave his own views. He claimed that he interrupts by rephrasing the question if he suspects that the student didn't get the idea.

Item six was intended to investigate whether teachers give time for students to make volunteer comment/reaction on their friends' response/ statements or not. Their responses are presented in the following table.

**Table 11: Post Students' Response Wait-Time**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
Yes	10
No	1
Sometimes	1
Total	12

As it is clearly revealed in the above table, majority of the teachers said that they give time for students to make volunteer comments on other students' responses in the class. However, data from the lesson transcript contradict this. Majority of the PSRWT measured in the transcript lasted a maximum of one second. Hence, what teachers reported in the questionnaire and what was observed in the actual classroom were not in agreement. One teacher says that he doesn't give time for students to make volunteer comment on their friends' response. One teacher, reports that he sometimes gives and sometimes he does not. Generally, it can be inferred that the teachers didn't let students have time to comment on their friends' response.

Item seven was designed to find out PSRWT duration of teachers who chose yes in item six above. Table 12 below presents their views.

**Table 12: Duration of PSRWT**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
At least 3 seconds	9
At least 6 seconds	-
At least 9 seconds	1
15 sec to 1 minute	1
Total	11

As can be noticed in the table, the majority of the teachers said that the duration of PSRWT lasts for at least three seconds. One teacher, however, said that duration of PSRWT lasts nine seconds, which is an extended wait-time. One teacher claimed that PSRWT could last more than 15 seconds and sometimes it could even be extended to a minute.

All this shows that most of the teachers claim to give learners the opportunity to comment on each other's response and conduct dialogue/discussion between and among themselves.

Item eight was intended to find out whether teachers wait for pauses occurring in students' self-initiated statement. The teachers' responses are presented in Table 13 below.

**Table 13: Teachers' Opinion On WSRPT**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
Yes	10
No	2
Total	12

As shown in the above table, ten of the teachers reported that they wait for the pauses to take-place within students' self-initiated speech/statement. However, two teachers said that they don't wait for the students' pause-time.

In item nine, teachers, who responded yes in item 8, were asked to indicate the duration of SPT. The responses from the teachers are presented in the table below.

**Table 14: Duration of SPT.**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
At least 3 sec	3
At least 6 sec	3
At least 9 sec	2
-always ready to wait	1
- cant say in seconds	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

As can be seen from the table, teachers, who reported “yes” in Table 13, gave different durations. Three said that it lasts for at least three seconds, the duration that the literature supports. Three again said that it lasts for at least six seconds, and two claimed that it lasts for at least nine seconds. The rest two gave different opinions. One said that he/she is always ready to welcome pauses, while the other said that he/she can not give comment.

Item ten asked teachers whether there are intentional/purposeful pauses in their instruction or not. Table 15 presents their responses.

Table 15: Intentional Pauses.

Responses	No of teachers
Yes	10
No	1
sometimes	1
Total	12

As presented in the table, ten teachers said that they intentionally use pauses in their instruction: However, one said that he/she does not use pauses deliberately. This teacher claimed that pauses are natural phenomenon not to be made intentionally. One said he/she makes intentional pauses only sometimes. Despite all these, in the recorded lessons, no intentional pause was seen.

Item eleven asked teachers to report situation in which they make intentional/purposeful pauses. To this item, teachers gave different responses which are summarized as follows:

- when students require further clarification /explanation
- after students' questions
- when students want to complete their statements
- when students hesitate while answering a question
- when students need time to analyze the issue and react accordingly
- at any possible time when the need arises
- when teachers move from one main topic to another
- when teachers want students to settle.

Most of the responses from the teachers have a lot to share with the possible places of making purposeful pauses mentioned in the literature. However, what teachers report here was not seen in the recorded lessons.

Item twelve asked teachers to give reasons why teachers make purposeful pauses in their instruction. Accordingly, some of the teachers gave the following:

- To let students have time to think over a problem
- To let students take their time to respond
- To facilitate their learning by giving them time for critical thinking and evaluation
- To consider classroom situations and decide what to do next.

Item thirteen was designed to find out the duration of intentional/purposeful pauses. Table 16 below presents the result.

**Table 16: Length of Teachers' Pause-Time.**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
1-3 sec	3
3-5 sec	2
5-8 sec	4
Other	3
Total	12

As it is revealed in the above table, the teachers had different opinions. Three of the teachers said the duration lasts for one to three seconds. Two teachers claimed it lasts for three to five seconds, which is believed to be the appropriate time duration. Four other teachers felt that the duration lasts for five to eight seconds, which as per the scale in the literature, seems to be a bit over extended.

Three other teachers gave different opinions. One claimed that TPT can last up to more than 10 seconds. The other argued that pauses are natural phenomenon, thus they can not be measured in seconds. The third teacher

claimed that he can't state the time for sure. Yet, all these three different opinions are in contrary to the views reflected in the literature.

Item fourteen asked teachers to report whether they sometimes stop the flow of information in their instruction or not. Table 17 presents their responses.

**Table 17: Within Teacher Presentation Pause Time**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
Yes	11
No	1
Total	12

The above table shows that almost all the teachers say that they make pauses in their lesson. It is only one teacher who claimed not to make pauses in the middle of information flow. Yet, actual classroom practices, as observed in the record, pauses were rarely seen.

In item fifteen, those teachers who respond 'yes' for item 14 were asked to report the length of the pauses within their presentations. Their responses are presented in the following table below.

**Table 18: Duration of WTPPT**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
At least 3 sec	4
At least 6 sec	3
At least 9 sec	1
-depends on the activity	1
- more than 10 seconds	1
- can't choose any	1
Total	11

As the above table demonstrates, four teachers said that they make pauses that last for at least three seconds in their presentation. Three claimed that it lasts for at least six seconds, and one said that it takes the duration of at least nine seconds. The rest three teachers gave different opinions. One claimed that it depends on the activity under-treatment. The other said that WTPPT can be more than 10 seconds because, as he claimed, he wants his students to understand him.

Among the eight lines marked to show WTPPT in the first transcript (See Appendix I), five of them lasted for a zero second and three lasted for two seconds. This situation holds true in the second transcript though there is only one line showing a pause of three seconds. Thus, teachers' classroom performance seems to be inappropriate.

In item sixteen the teachers were asked to report whether WTPPT is important or not. Table 19 below summarizes teachers' responses.

**Table 19: Importance of WTPPT**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
Yes	11
No	1
Total	12

Table 19 shows that almost all the teachers believe that WTPPT is important within instructional presentation. Thus, it is possible to conclude that teachers are aware of the importance of WTPPT in their lessons.

In item seventeen the teachers were asked to give their reasons for the fact that they report in Table 19, WTPPT is important. To this question, the teachers gave the following reasons:

- It gives teacher time to think and check
- It allows students to consolidate their thinking
- It helps students to momentarily consider the information in the teacher's presentation than being overloaded with excess information at once.

Item eighteen asked teachers to report whether silent periods have impact on classroom environment or not. Table 20 summarizes the teachers' responses.

**Table 20: Impact of Silent Periods on Classroom Environment.**

<b>Responses</b>	<b>No of teachers</b>
Yes	11
No	1
Total	12

As the table indicates, almost all the teachers believe that silent periods have impacts on classroom environment.

In item nineteen, those who said silent periods have impact on classroom environment, were asked to give their reasons, which are summarized as follows:

- Minimize discipline problems
- Provides students time to think
- Avoid monotony
- Catches students' attention by creating anticipation, expectation and suspense on students.

In item twenty the teachers were asked to give their comments on the amount of time students should stay on task. Their comments are summarized as follows.

- Time to be given should commensurate the difficulty level, type/nature of the task.
- Individual students' level, the learners need and teachers' objective should be taken as a factor in determining time to be allotted for a task.
- Amount of time allotted for a course needs to be considered. In relation to this, the teachers commented that time is usually insufficient; hence teachers are sometimes obliged to stop students from their enthusiastic discussion.

In all the observed classes, students' engagements on tasks, both group and individual works, were made to be stopped by teachers' request. Otherwise, students might have kept on working on the tasks. The researcher felt that mostly teachers gave fairly enough time but the students were not good enough to timely accomplish the tasks successfully.

What is stated in the literature is similar to the responses obtained from the teachers. It is entirely the teacher's responsibility to consider the different possible variables and adjust appropriate duration to classroom tasks.

# CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

- a. A bulk of evidence in the study suggests that teachers are not conscious of the pauses in their instruction. The use of instructional pauses is in general unskillful in terms of its potential to empower students' cognitive competence. To be more specific, teachers are not considerate of pausing patterns and hence students are not given sufficient uninterrupted periods of time to complete the cognitive tasks needed at different time and place of classroom instruction.
- b. Teachers do not for wait students for a period of time after posing a question. Though the teachers claim that they give a considerable amount of time, the empirical evidence from classroom records, proved it to be an assumption. The majority of PTQWT, as objectively indicated, lasted for not more than two seconds. Thus, it is possible to conclude that teachers used very short lapse of time that does not take into account the cognitive demands of the posed questions.
- c. Data for the study reveal that teachers are not patient enough for the pauses that occur within students' response. The pauses within the few students' response are not properly extended to the needed duration of three to five seconds. Teachers interrupt students from completing their responses.

- d. Despite its great value of promoting classroom discussion, PSRWT is broadly found to last for zero and one second. Instead of providing students with the opportunity to react and comment on one another's responses, the teachers themselves quickly react to the students' responses.
- e. Teachers do not take advantage by making deliberate pauses during class periods. Majority of the TPT lasts for zero to two seconds. This may lead to the conclusion that the teachers do not consider what takes place, what is going on and what is coming up in their instruction.
- f. Examinations of the recorded lesson, as opposed to the questionnaire, reveal that teachers classroom lesson flow/ presentation of information is nonstop. Appropriate pauses, which let students to shortly consider portion of teacher's input and consolidate their thought, are not seen. Majority of WTPPT lasts for zero seconds, which indicates continuous and consistent information flow from the teachers.
- g. The result of the study also reveals that teachers do not at all utilize the impact pause time in their instruction. Teachers do not use instructional pauses to focus learners' attention by creating cognitive or affective impacts in the classroom.

## 5.2 Recommendations

Based on the above conclusions of this study, these recommendations are given:

- a. Pausing in an instruction is a necessary skill that teachers should work on persistently to come up with better development of learners' cognitive

competence, which results in improved learning opportunity. Thus, teachers should look deep into their pausing behavior and evaluate it from time to time. Teachers need to strive to maintain the pausing patterns in the whole instructional settings. On average, a threshold pause time of three to five second should be manifested at different place and time of instruction (Stahl, 1994).

- b. As Rowe (1986) asserts, teachers' questions should always be followed by pause time which let learners to cognitively process questions and respond to them in a thoughtful manner. Care must be taken by teachers in applying wait-time judiciously. Teachers need to deliberately and consistently manipulate the duration and frequency of pauses (wait-time) following their questions. Wait-time should also need to be studied against the cognitive level of questions.
- c. Teachers should develop the practice to patiently wait for the pauses to occur within students' response or explanation. When students hesitate/make pauses while giving a response or an explanation, it should be noted that they are calling for greater cognitive activities, which can help them respond/explain successfully.
- d. Teachers need to give due consideration to pauses following students' responses. Evidence in the literature tells us that by extending the pauses after students' response, we can create an opportunity for learners to comment and negotiate on one another's response (Duell, 1994). So, teachers should always be aware of their practice by consciously extending PSRWT to three or more seconds. Teachers should not affirm answers immediately and should tell their students to react to other students' answers.

- e. It should be noted that pauses/hesitations during students' self-initiated statement/question are natural features of second/foreign language learners. Teachers, thus, need to warmly welcome and tolerate such pauses in the classroom.
- f. The cognitive processing model formulated by Stahl (1982) highlighted the importance of actively processing stimuli within the first few seconds of receipt. Hence, if learners are to be benefited from the teachers' instruction, sufficient time for active cognitive processing should be given to learners immediately after every "bite-sized" chunks of information (input) from the teacher. Thus, regular intervals of silence should be given in teachers' presentation and explanation, if not information are likely to fade and be lost.
- g. Teachers should develop the practice of making deliberate and regular intervals of pauses in their instruction, which help them to examine the ongoing classroom situations. Teachers should ensure that all students perceive the disturbance free silence so that both the students and teacher can consider and process relevant information and act accordingly.
- h. Taking different factors into account, teachers should allot appropriate work-time duration for classroom tasks.
- i. Subsequent investigation in the future should look more closely at the impacts of extended instructional pauses on different classroom variables affecting the teaching- learning process.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alemayehu Jote. (2004). "Teachers' Questioning Behaviors in EFL Classrooms."  
Unpublished M.A thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Amdesellassie G/Kirkos. (1999). "Procedural Principles of Questioning  
Techniques". *Educational Journal*. Vol. 4, No. 8 : 72-96.  
Ministry of Education.
- Blancheffe, J. (1999). *Textual Interactions Handbook: Computer mediated  
Conferencing. Learning technologies in distance education*.  
Edmonton, University of Alberta.
- Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of  
educational goals*. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York:  
David Mckay Company.
- Carlsen, W.S. (1991). "Questioning in Classroom: A Sociolinguistic  
Perspective". *Review of Educational Research*. Vol.61,  
No.2: 157-178. American Educational Research Association.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classroom: Research on Teaching and  
learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duell, O. K. (1994). "Extended Wait Time and University Student Achievement".  
*American Educational Research Journal*. Vol.31, No.2: 397-414.  
American Educational Research Association.

- Fowler, T.W. (1975). "An investigation of the teacher behavior of wait-time during an inquiry science lesson". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED108872)
- Kissock, C. and Iyortsuun, P. (1982). *A Guide to Questioning: Classroom Procedures for teachers*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Lake, J.H. (1973). "The influence of wait-time on the verbal dimensions of student inquiry behavior". Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 6476-A. (University Microfilms No. 74-08866)
- Malamah-Thomas. (1987). *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marzano, R.J. (1993). "How Classroom Teachers Approach the Teaching of Thinking": *Theory into Practice*. Vol.32, No.3: 154-160. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Perrott, E. (1982). *Effective Teaching: A Practical Guide to Improve Your Teaching*. London. Longman Group Limited.
- Rowe, M.B. (1972). "Think-time and rewards as instructional variables": (*Paper presented at the National Association for Research in Science Teaching*). Chicago.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1974). "Pausing phenomena: Influence on the quality of instruction". *Journal of Psycholinguistics Research*. Vol 3, No.3: 203-224.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1986) "Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up". *Journal of Teacher Education*. Vol. 37, No.1. : 43-50.
- Rice, D.R. (1977). "The effect of question asking instruction on preservice elementary science teachers". *Journal of Research on Science Teaching*. Vol 14, No 5. : 69-91.
- Sadker, M. P. (1997). *Teachers, Schools, and Society*. New York: A division of the Mc Graw-Hill Companies.
- Seime K. (1999). "An exploration of the relationship between uptake and classroom questioning: A case study." (Ph.D. Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002). "An Exploration of the Relationship among Types of Teacher Questions, Student Proficiency and Wait time: A case study". *The Ethiopian Journal of education*. Vol.22, No. 2: 1-32.
- Stahl, R.J. (1982). *How humans process information: A way of viewing how individuals think and learn*. Tempe: Arizona State University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1990). *Using "Think-Time" Behaviors to Promote Students' Information Processing, Learning, and On-Task Participation: An Instructional Module*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994). Using "Wait-Time" and "Think -time" Skillfully in the Classroom. *ERIC Clearinghouse for social studies/ Social Science Education Bloomington IN*.
- Tobin. K (1986). "Effects of Teacher Wait Time on Discourse Characteristics in Language and Mathematics Classes". *American Educational*

*Research Journal*. Vol.23, No.2. : 191-200. American Educational  
Research Association.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1987). "The Role of Wait-Time in Higher Cognitive Level Learning".  
*Review of Educational Research*. Vol.57, No. 1. : 69-95.

## APPENDIX I

Following are the Transcripts of the Lessons' Extracts Along With Accompanying Commentaries.

### Key to symbols.

- Instructor (teacher): T
- Student: S
- Students (in unison): SS
- Pause: [ ] in seconds\minutes.
- Researcher's Comments: ( )
- Post Teacher Question Wait-time: PTQWT
- Within-Student's Response Pause-time: WSRPT
- Post Students' Response Wait-time: PSRWT
- Student Pause-time: SPT
- Teacher Pause-time: TPT
- Within-Teacher Presentation Pause-time: WTPPT
- Students Task Completion Work-time: STCWT
- Impact Pause-time: IPT

### LESSON ONE

001 T: Well, students today we are going to look at a new unit, unit 4, which is on Psychology. It is about students and stress; particularly it focuses on coping with stress. As you are freshman, it is obvious that you face various strange situations in the university environment. So these situations may make you feel stressful. So you need time to cope with the situation and the educational system. There is what we normally called in Amharic". It is a normal phenomenon, especially in freshman-----"but how can we solve (alleviate) this situation? How can we cope with stress? That is the issue of the unit. What cause stress? How it can be solved? Is it a psychological or social problem? All these questions will be answered from the unit.

[WTPPT 2 sec]

- 002 T: Now let's proceed to part one, brain storming activity on page 69.
- 003 T: Task one: assessing advice about how to live a stress free life. Life with little stress, if not all.
- 004 T: A lot of proverbs are often used in English as a guide to avoid anxiety and lead a happy/relaxed life.
- 005 T: What do the following proverbs mean? (Teacher read out three of the ten Proverbs in the text book)
- Tomorrow is another day.
  - Don't cross that bridge until you come to it.
  - There is no use crying over spilt milk. It goes on like that till the 10<sup>th</sup> one.
- 006 T: Now discuss with your partner\group and explain what each proverb Mean?
- 007 T: (Move around each group trying to assist students' discussion)  
[STCWT 9 min and 27 sec]
- 008 T: All right, as we are in a race against time lets discuss on the proverbs one by one. So what does the proverb "Tomorrow is another day" mean?  
[PTQWT 1 sec] what does the proverb entail? [PTQWT 1sec]
- 009 T: Can you guess? (asks one S) [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 010 S: That means [WSRPT 1 sec] we don't have to worry about today because Tomorrow---- (pause) [WSRPT 2 sec]
- 011 T: will be better.
- 012 S: Yes.
- 013 T: Ok fine another one? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 014 S: Tomorrow is another day means, do what you should do for today.  
[PSRWT 1sec]
- 015 T: Yes, sensible. Another?
- 016 S: Today is in hand, use it and never---- (pause) [WSRPT 1 sec]
- 017 T: worry about tomorrow.
- 018 S: Yeah.
- 019 T: Ok, fine any body else? You (T points to one S) [PTQWT 3 sec]

- 020 S: Don't worry about today's mistake but learn from it for tomorrow. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 021 T: Yeah, that is better I think. Tomorrow might bring better things for you. So  
don't worry about today. Be optimist, be hopeful. That is the meaning  
[TPT 2 sec]
- 022 T: Ok the next one "Don't cross that bridge until you come to it"
- 023 T: (nominate a student) can't you try? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 024 S: Every thing has its own step. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 025 T: Everything has its own time. (T rephrases student's response) Yes, fine.
- 026 T: Another attempt? Please try to participate!
- 027 S: Everything has time, place and condition. [PSRWT 2 sec]
- 028 T: Well, sensible. Different answer?
- 029 S: Don't worry about the future. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 030 T: Ok good, that is alright. The meaning is, don't worry about problems which  
doesn't need an immediate solution. Worry about problems only when the  
right time comes. [WTPPT 2 sec]
- 031 T: Ok the third one, "There is no use crying over spilt milk" yes, any body?
- 032 T: Bethlehem! , how do you interpret this proverb?  
[PTQWT 3 sec] (Teacher nominating the only female student in the class)
- 033 Bethlehem: (remain silent).
- 034 T: Ok another person? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 035 S: Don't worry about lost things. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 036 T: Ok, don't worry about lost things. Yes you!
- 037 S: (raised his hand) "shall I say in Amharic?"
- 038 T: Yes you can.
- 039 S: (Replied in Amharic.) [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 040 T: Ok good attempts. The meaning is we shouldn't get upset about the past.  
Things which are not reversible shouldn't worry us. They are already  
passed. [WTPPT 0 sec] is that clear? [TPT 2 sec]
- 041 T: Good, next" Two heads are better than one" can you try? (asks one S)  
[PTQWT 2 sec]
- 042 S: (remain silent)

- 043 T: Can I come to you? (Points to another S) [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 044 S: Unity is strength. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 045 T: very good, you have got the concept, but try to see it in relation to solving a problem.
- 046 S: It is good to share a problem. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 047 T: Yes, that is right. It is to mean working in group could help us solve problems more easily. [TPT 0 sec]
- 048 T: The next one is "Don't make a mountain out of a molehill "What about this Proverb? [PTQWT 3 sec] .A molehill is a small pile of earth thrown up on the surface of the ground. So what do you think the proverb mean? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 049 S: Don't take silly things as---- [WSRPT 1 sec]
- 050 T: Exaggerated.
- 051 S: Yes.
- 052 T: Yes the message is, never exaggerate the seriousness of things which are easily solvable. [TPT 0 sec]
- 053 T: Let's come to the next one "Don't hit your head against a wall" any body? [PTQWT 2 sec] No body? [PTQWT 1 sec]
- 054 S: (hesitates) Do---do not worry about the past. [PSRWT 3 sec]
- 055 T: Okay, another?
- 056 S: Do not try to solve a problem which is impossible. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 057 T: Yes that is correct. Do not try to solve a problem which is totally impossible, but not difficult. [TPT 0 sec]
- 058 T: Ok, next "The grass is always greener on the other side of the mountain" what does this imply? [PTQWT 4 sec]
- 059 S: If there is a bad thing in our life, there is also a good thing. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 060 S: Be optimist. [PSRWT 2 sec]
- 061 T: Okay. What about you? At the back?
- 062 S: (silence) (S seems he is not sure of the answer)
- 063 S: Work for other opportunity. [PSRWT 2 sec]
- 064 T: Okay, fine. Any other answer?
- 065 S: Appreciate what you have. [PSRWT 1 sec]

- 066 T: Yes, I think "Appreciate what you have" is better. You may think that others are leading a better life, but the reality is different. You, yourself have a better life; you simply appreciate what you have for yourself.  
[WTPPT 0sec]
- 067 T: What about this one "Never Underestimate Yourself".  
How do you understand it? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 068 S: Be confident. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 069 T: Yes that is correct, the implied meaning is to have confidence on oneself.  
Know that you are good enough to do things. [WTPPT 0 sec]
- 070 T: Okay, what about the last proverb? "It is never too late" Who can try its meaning? [PTQWT 4 sec]
- 071 S: Do things on time. Plan your time and do things based on the plan.  
[PSRWT 1 sec]
- 072 T: Yes, that is right. It is to mean you still have time to change things  
[TPT 0 sec]
- 073 T: Ok that is good. Good explanations. Do you have any questions before we go to the next section? Questions please [TPT 4 sec] (Teacher points towards a student who raised his hands)
- 074 S: Do proverbs ----- (inaudible)? [SPT 0 sec]
- 075 T: No! Proverbs can be interpreted in various ways depending on their different context, however, there is a generally agreed interpretation.  
[WTPPT 2 sec]
- 076 T: Well, now it is vocabulary. You are going to read a certain passage. But first look at the following words. Ostrich, Eagle, Owl, Pigeon. (While writing on the black board) [WTPPT 0 sec]
- 077 T: Can you see anything in common among these words? [PTQWT 1 sec]
- 078 SS: Yes
- 079 T: What's that?
- 080 SS: They are all birds.
- 081 T: Well, just like that there are four set of words below which you encounter in the Passage you are going to read. Look at them, read the passage and

- Identify what similarity\ relationship of meaning exists among them.
- 082 SS: (Silent and individual reading)  
[STCWT 5 min & 12 sec]
- 083 T: Ok, this much is enough. The first sets of words are: stressful, excess, Ulcers and symptoms. What do you think is similar among them?  
[PTQWT 2 sec]
- 084 S: They show abnormal mental situation. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 085 T: Ok! Fine, any other? [TPT 3 sec]
- 086 S: They are terms in health education. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 087 T: I do agree with the previous answer. They seem to show abnormal mind\psychological situation. [TPT 2 sec]
- 088 T: The second set of words contain: appraise, evaluate, speculate and Perceive. Yes, come on! Any similarity among them? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 089 S: They are opinion words. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 090 T: yeah, another?
- 091 S: They express mental situation of the speaker. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 092 T: Yeah, you are almost close to the answer. These are judgmental words showing peoples intention. [WTPPT 0 sec]
- 093 T: The third set of words contains: compulsive, agitated, impatient and relaxed. What similarity do they have? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 094 S: They are adjectives. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 095 T: Yes of course they all are adjectives. I mean their meaning. [TPT 1 sec]
- 096 S: They show people's mood. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 097 T: That is right they show personality traits like mood. As time is running, let's sum up quickly. [TPT 0 sec]
- 098 T: The fourth set is: handle situations, cope with events and encounter situations.
- 099 T: Ok you at the back. (Teacher points towards the nominated student)
- 100 S: Adopting/struggling with new situations. [PSRWT 3 sec]
- 101 T: Yes, sensible. What else? [TPT 1 sec]
- 102 S: They entail how to resist new situations. [PSRWT 0 sec]

- 103 T: Well it's a good attempt. They show how to manage different life situations. [TPT 0 sec]
- 104 T: The next is Task 5, another subtopic: Reading for details.
- 105 T: (Teacher read the instruction): Read the first section of the text about " *The Nature of Stress*". It is divided in to sub-sections of one or more Paragraphs. Match the following headings to the sub-sections of the text that you think they describe best. Write them down in the order they come in the text. [STCWT 3 min]
- 106 T: So which heading matches with the first paragraph? [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 107 SS: Definition of stress. (Chorus response)
- 108 T: Second paragraph? [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 109 SS: Symptoms of stress. (Chorus response)
- 110 T: The third paragraph? [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 111 SS: Effects of results. (Chorus response)
- 112 T: The fourth paragraph? [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 113 SS: Causes of stress. (Chorus response)
- 114 T: I think this is enough for today. Questions? Questions please. [TPT 5 sec]

## LESSON TWO

- 001 T: Ok. Our point of discussion for today is a continuation of what we did last time; about stress. Particularly we are going to discuss on a passage entitled "*Focus on Research*". The text is about type A behavior and health. So you read the passage and we will do tasks related to it. Notice that there are 12 paragraphs in the passage below. Match the paragraph number with their summary statements in the section: A, B, C, D, E, F.  
[WTPPT 3 sec]
- 002 T: Write the paragraph number in your exercise book. (T read instruction on the book).
- 003 T: Do you know a summary? [PTQWT 0 sec] When you condense \shortened something, it is a summary.
- 004 T: Some of the statements summarizes one paragraph while others summarizes more than one paragraph. What you can do is, you indicate the paragraph\ s number/s they summarize. [TPT 0 sec]
- 005 T: Ok? Is that clear?
- 006 T: How many paragraphs are there? 1, 2, 3, 4---- (teacher counting)  
Yes there are 12 paragraphs. With them are 6 summary statements (A, B, C, D, E, and F). Each statement summarizes one or more paragraphs. (T repeats the instruction) [WTPPT 0 sec]
- 007 T: (Repeats the instruction)
- 008 T: Have you got questions? If yes please put your hands up.
- 009 SS: (remain silent)
- 010 T: Ok Fine. Go on doing it!
- 011 T: (Move around and help individual students) [STCWT 10 min and 12 sec]
- 012 T: Ok, Listen! Let's do it together.
- 013 T: 'Describe how type "A" behavior affects your health'. So which paragraph describes how being type A affects one's health? [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 014 SS: Paragraph 9
- 015 T: Ok different answer?

016 SS: Paragraph 4

017 T: Ok different answer?

018 SS: Paragraph 11

019 T: Ok any one else?

020SS: Paragraph 5

021 T: Ok you all have different answers so it seems you need some amount of time to look at it more carefully. So take some more time and read it again. [STCWT 4 min and 35 sec]

022 T: Ok now which one is it? Only one paragraph.

023 SS: Paragraph 2. [PSRWT 0 sec]

024 T: Ok let's go to paragraph 2 (T read paragraph 2).

025 T: In paragraph 2 there is a mention of the negative consequences of being Type A personality but mainly this paragraph describes what kind of people are type A. It doesn't specifically indicate the health effect. So you need to find another paragraph (T refuses the answer) [TPT 1 sec]

026 T: Tigist, can you try? Which paragraph mentions the health effect?

027 S: Paragraph 9.

028 T: Let's go to paragraph 9. (T read the paragraph) so this one simply gives an example of someone who is type A. It doesn't tell you the effect on health.

029 T: Yes you. (T giving a chance to a student raising his hand)

030 S: Paragraph 11. [PSRWT 0 sec]

032 T: 11, yes, I accept that. What kind of health effect it describe? Can you state more specifically? [PTQWT 1 sec]

033 SS: Heart disease.

034 T: Yes, heart attack. (Repeat students' answer) Paragraph 11 is the answer.

035 T: Ok let's go to the next one-"gives an example of type B person".

036 S: Paragraph 10. [PSRWT 0 sec]

037 T: Ok fine.

038 T: next "describe the research findings of two heart specialists"

039 SS: Paragraph 3-8

040 T: Yes very good. Paragraph 3-8 describes the research findings.

041 T: Ok next "gives an example of type A person".

042 SS: Paragraph 9

043 T: Do you agree? [PSRWT 4 sec]

044 SS: Yes.

045 T: Well, next which paragraph summarize this idea "Discuss the typical behavior of type A person". [PTQWT 0 sec] Behavior means what they do.

046 S: Paragraph 1 and 2. [PSRWT 1 sec]

047 T: Yes that is right and the last one-"gives the reader some advice".

048 SS: Paragraph 12.

049 T: Yes. [TPT 2 sec]

050 T: Fine, so far were questions from the text book. Now I am going to ask you my own questions. Go back to paragraph one.

051 T: What are some of the behaviors of type A people mentioned in the Paragraph? [PTQWT 2 sec] Read and tell. [PTQWT 6 sec]

052 S: lose their temper easily. [PSRWT 0 sec]

053 T: Yes they loose their temper easily. What does it mean? [PTQWT 1 sec]

054 S: they become angry easily. [PSRWT 4 sec]

055 T: Yes, they don't keep cool, they explode. Another?

056 S: they are mostly interested in winning. [PSRWT 1 sec]

057 T: Yes they are more interested in winning a game. Give me another behavior. [PTQWT 5 sec]

057 T: yes you. (T gives chance to a student ready to answer)

058 S: They stay up half a night perfecting a term paper. [PSRWT 0 sec]

059 T: What does *stay up* mean? [PTQWT 0 sec] What does it mean? [PTQWT 0 sec] .what kinds of people do this? [PTQWT 2 sec]

060 S: Type A people.

061 T: Yes type A, but what other, particularly from students?

062 S: University students.

063 T: Yes that is right. Students like you go to bed late. Yeah? That is the behavior of type A. [TPT 1 sec]

- 064 T: How about type B. What do they do? [PTQWT 3 sec]
- 065 S: They won't lose temper. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 066 T: They are also interested to simply enjoy a game than winning it. Another?
- 067 S: They don't stay up. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 068 T: Yes they go to bed in time.
- 069 T: Ok now let me ask you questions from the next paragraph. It is about type A people. The writer asks some questions and he finds us a response to the question which is 'yes to a degree'. [TPT 2 sec]
- 070 T: What is the difference between answering a question as 'yes' and 'yes to a degree'. [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 071 T: What does the underlined word/phrase show? [PTQWT 1 sec]
- 072 S: To a degree mean [WSRPT 3 sec] --- to some amount. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 073 T: Yes, yes you are right.
- 074 T: So what does the phrase do? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 075 S: It shows chance. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 076 T: Yes it shows that the speaker is not totally sure. It shows uncertainty.
- 077 T: Do you know uncertainty? [PTQWT 3 sec]
- 078 SS: Yes
- 079 T: Yes, you are not certain means, you are not sure. It doesn't happen always, it got exception. This technique is called Hedging. For example you may say "It will definitely rain this afternoon" [TPT 2sec]
- 081 T: Does it show certainty or uncertainty?
- 082 SS: Certainty
- 083 SS: uncertainty
- 084 T: No it shows certainty. But you can hedge it like this. "It will probably rain this afternoon". What about this one? [PTQWT 0sec] It shows uncertainty. So to a degree shows uncertainty. [TPT 1 sec]
- 085 T: Then it says type A people are compulsive. What does it mean? [PTQWT 0 sec] Is it good or bad to be compulsive? [PTQWT 0 sec] If someone is compulsive he/she can't stop it. Like addiction in cigarette. There is some internal urge, force to do it. That person is compelled to

- Keep on doing it. [WTPPT 1 sec]
- 086 T: Ok therefore type A people are compulsive. They can't stop doing something. For example you may have a compulsive liar, gambler, eating.
- 087 T: What do you think a compulsive liar mean? [PTQWT 1 sec]
- 088 T: It is someone who keeps on telling lies because of some psychological Problem.
- 089 T: What about a compulsive gambler? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 090 S: Somebody who is addicted to playing gamble. [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 091 T: Yes that is right. Compulsive eating?
- 092 S: A person who eat much. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 093 T: Sure it means someone who takes a lot of food, a voracious eater.  
[TPT 1 sec]
- 094 T: Another behavior is they go all out to achieve a goal. What does this mean? [PTQWT 0 sec] What does 'they' refers to? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 095 SS: Type A people.
- 096 T: yes, so what does to go all out mean? [PTQWT 4 sec]
- 097 S: To join people for--- [WSRPT 4 sec] work or enjoyment.
- 098 T: (repeats the student's answer) Do you agree? Another answer?
- 099 S: To strive hard. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 100 T: Right it is to mean to make the greatest possible effort.
- 101 T: Look at this sentence and write it down -"They go all out to get exactly what they want"
- 102 T: This means they are prepared to do everything possible to get what they Want. [TPT 2 sec]
- 103 T: Let's go to the next paragraph (paragraph 3), read it fast.
- 104 SS :( individual reading)
- 105 T: Who are the pioneers? [PTQWT 0 sec]What does a pioneer mean?  
Who are they? [PTQWT 0 sec] What kind of person are referred to us a pioneer? (Quick teacher restatement and repetition of question)
- 106 SS :( Remain silent)
- 107 T: It is someone who starts new thing, somebody who breaks the ground,

- the beginner. [TPT 2 sec]
- 108 T: Who pioneers the penicillin first?
- 109 SS: Alexander Fleming.
- 110 T: Yes, correct. So to pioneer mean to break a new group, to open up a way, to initiates. You know what initiates mean? What does initial means? Do you know what your initials are? For example my initials are M.L. Can you tell me your initials (T points to one student). [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 111 S: Mine is D.A.
- 112 T: What is your name? (Teacher asked the student with the previous verbal behavior?)
- 113 S: Daniel Ayele.
- 114 T: Good, so pioneers are people who start/begin new things. [TPT 2 sec]
- 115 T: Ok now you read the next paragraph and I will ask you questions later.
- 116 SS :( reading the paragraph)
- 117 T: Now make a list of the standard risk factors from the paragraph. List them down, enumerate them. [STCWT 2 min] Who can tell us one?  
[PTQWT 1 sec]
- 118 S: Cigarette smoking. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 119 T: Yes one is cigarette smoking. What else?
- 120 S: Lack of exercise. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 121 T: Yes (nominate another student)
- 122 S: Poor eating habit. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 123 T: Another answer?
- 124 S: Obesity. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 125 T: Yes, obesity. What does obese mean? [PTQWT 1 sec] When do we say? that someone is obese.
- 125 SS: (remain silent)
- 126 T: It is to mean extremely fat. Fat in unhealthy way. Another? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 127 S: Excess amount of cholesterol.
- 128 T: What is cholesterol? [PTQWT 0 sec]
- 129 SS: Fat

- 130 T: Yes, too much stored fat.
- 131 T: These are standard risk factors. Why are they called standard? What makes them have this name? Can you try? (Pointing to a student)  
[PTQWT 3 sec]
- 132 S: They are common to everywhere. [PSRWT 0 sec]
- 133 T: Ok (T repeat the answer) anybody else?
- 134 S: Always affect health.
- 135 T: (repeats student's response) another attempt?
- 136 S: They are well known.
- 137 T: (repeats student's answer and nominate another student)
- 138 S: They seriously affect health.
- 139 T: Ok, they are called standard because they are always there. Risk means, they are connected with disease or illness. [TPT 0 sec]
- 140 T: Now read paragraph five carefully. It tells you about an interesting experiment/observation by a upholster. Do you know a upholster?  
[PTQWT 3 sec]
- 141 SS: remain silent.
- 142 T: A upholster is someone who fix soft things on furniture to make them comfortable. Especially on chairs. So a upholster come to the doctor's office and make an interesting observation. What is that?
- 143 SS: He saw the edge of the chair worn.
- 144 T: What does worn mean here? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 145 S: Become useless. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 146 T: Yeah. And you?
- 147 S: damaged. [PSRWT 1 sec]
- 148 T: Yes, damaged, scratched and worn.
- 149 T: So the chair was worn, but which part was worn?
- 150 S: The edge
- 151 T: Yes the edge, but why is this significant? Where were the chairs? Who were sitting on the chair? [PTQWT 2 sec]
- 152 S: (Inaudible)

153 T: Yes fine another one? [PTQWT 4 sec]

154 S: When they come to the doctor's room, they---they--- (student stammer)  
[WSRPT 3 sec] they simply sit at the edge of the chair because they are afraid of  
the doctor. So they don't fully sit.

155 T: Yes that is right and consequently the chair worn out. So the upholster  
came to the doctor's office to redo the chair. What does redo  
means? [PTQWT 1 sec] Can you find a word having the same meaning  
as redo? [PTQWT 2 sec]

156 SS: (remain silent)

157 T: Redo means to do it again, repeat something, to fix it again, to mend it.

## APPENDIX II

### Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teacher,

This questionnaire is designed for a study purpose. Its main aim is to collect data on instructional pauses in language classroom. The success of the study greatly depends on your genuine response to the questions. Please read carefully and respond to the questions honestly and frankly.

Thank you very much for devoting your time.

Instruction: Please read each question carefully and tick (✓) or write as appropriate to you in the spaces provided.

1. Do you think that giving learners' pause/time at different places/time of classroom instruction is important?      a. Yes-----      b. No-----
2. If your answer to question 2 above is "yes", what is your reason(s)?(two or more answers are possible)
  - A. the length of students' response increases \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. classroom interaction is enhanced \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. students' confusion is decreased \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. If any other please specify. -----  
-----  
-----  
-----
3. For how long do you wait a student to respond after you pose a question?
  - A. 1--3 seconds                      B. 3--5 seconds
  - C. 5--7 seconds                      D. If any other please specify \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you patiently wait, with out interruption, for the pauses\hesitations that occur during student's response\explanation?      A. Yes-----      B. No-----
5. If your answer to question 4 above is "yes", for how long do you wait?
  - A. 1--3 seconds \_\_\_\_\_                      B. 3--5 seconds \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. I don't interrupt at all unless it is done by the student him/her self.
  - D. If any other please specify-----

6. Do you give time for students to make volunteer comment\reaction on their friends' response/statement? A. Yes----- B. No-----
7. If your answer to question 6 above is "yes", how long do you think this time lasts?  
 A. at least 3 seconds----- B. at least 6 seconds-----  
 C. at least 9 seconds----- D. if any other please specify-----
8. Do you wait for the pauses occurring in students' self-initiated question, comment or statement? A. Yes----- B. No-----
9. If your answer to question 7 above is yes, for how long do you wait?  
 A. at least for 3 seconds----- B. at least 6 seconds-----  
 C. at least 9 seconds----- D. if any other please specify-----
10. Are there any intentional/purposeful pauses that you make in your instruction?  
 A. Yes----- B. No-----
11. If your answer to question 10 above is yes, at what times/ places of class period do you make so? (two or more answers are possible)  
 A. After students' questions. -----  
 B. When students require further clarification\explanation. -----  
 C. If any other please specify. -----  
 -----  
 -----
12. Why do you make these purposeful pauses in your instruction? (two or more answers are possible)  
 A. to consider what has just taken place in the classroom. -----  
 B. to examine the present classroom situation-----  
 C. to think about what the next verbal behavior could be-----  
 D. If any other please specify. -----  
 -----  
 -----  
 -----
13. How long do these intentional\purposeful pauses lasts?  
 A. 1--3 seconds----- B. 3--5 seconds-----  
 C. 5 --8 seconds----- D. if any other please specify-----

## DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and has not been presented for degree in any other university and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly-acknowledged.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Place \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of submission \_\_\_\_\_

This thesis has been submitted for examination under my approval as a research advisor.

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of submission \_\_\_\_\_