Teachers' Wait-time Behaviour in English as Foreign Language Classes in Wolkite University

Esubalew Getenet*

Received: 29 November 2019; Accepted: 11 December 2020

Abstract: The major objective of this study was to investigate the nature of English language teachers' wait-time behaviour at Wolkite University. Participants were 31 EFL teachers and 230 students. Data were collected using classroom observation, interview, and questionnaire. The data obtained from the participants were analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitative data were analysed using ant-Conc and Open-code 4.02 software programs; whereas, the quantitative data were analysed using SPSS software program. The result showed that wait-time I that teachers were pausing after they asked questions and the wait-time II that EFL teachers took turns after students' responses to questions were inadequate and often less than a second. Therefore, teachers should deliberately and constantly wait for 3-5 seconds or longer at times depending on the type and/or nature of the question. They should ensure that all students also preserve disturbance-free silence so that both the students and the teachers can consider and process relevant information and then act accordingly. Moreover, the wait-time strategy should be given due attention during question and answer sessions. Teachers have to ask proper questions and listen to their students carefully to get their meanings so as to help them in their learning difficulties. Thus, teacher training institutions or teacher educators should give training for EFL teacher trainees on the concept of how to provide their learners sufficient time to respond and/or to express their ideas, feelings and opinions depending upon the purpose of the question since wait-time provides students with adequate time to think and answer questions.

Keywords: Pause-time, Think time, Wait-time I, and Wait-time II

*Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, College of Social Sciences and Hunmanities, Wolkite University, Email: getesu212@gmail.com

Background of the Study

The concept of “wait-time” as an instructional variable was invented by Rowe (1972). The “wait-time” periods she found—periods of silence that followed teachers’ questions and students’ completed responses—rarely lasted more than 1.5 seconds in typical classrooms. She discovered, however, that when these periods of silence lasted at least 3 seconds, many positive things happened to students’ and teachers’ behaviours and attitudes. To attain these benefits, teachers were urged to “wait” in silence for 3 or more seconds after their questions and after students completed their responses (Casteel and Stahl, 1973; Rowe, 1972; Stahl, 1990; Tobin, 1987).

Stahl (1985) constructed the concept of “think-time,” 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 label “think-time” is preferred over “wait-time” because of three reasons (Stahl 1990): (1) It names the primary academic purpose and activity of this period of silence—to allow students and the teacher to complete on-task thinking. (2) There are numerous places where periods of silence are as important as those "wait-time periods" reported in the research literature. (3) There is at least one exception, labelled “impact pause-time,” that allows for periods of less than 3 seconds of uninterrupted silence.

In ordinary conversation, pauses between speakers are minimised. Jefferson (1988) found that, almost exclusively, these pauses were less than a second in length. Where pauses were longer than one second, they were usually interpreted by participants as an indication of trouble in the interaction. Participants in interactions often react to this trouble by speaking even though the turn is not theirs, usually by rephrasing the previous turn or adding additional information (Macbeth, 2004; McHoul, 1990).

As a teacher in Wolkite University, the researcher tried to consider his classes and observe other EFL teachers' wait-time behaviours. He realized that the classroom interaction was most clearly distinctive from an ordinary conversation in the structure of turn-taking, which has been considered by a number of authors. Cazden (2001) considered the power imbalance and the different rights and obligations of teachers and students in classroom discourse, drawn from their relative social positions. Although teachers do not necessarily use the rights that they have, achieving more equitable speaking rights can be difficult (Cazden, 2001), and this is one of the concerns of the dialogic teaching approach.

Statement of the Problem

The researcher's informal observation prior to conducting the actual research gave the impression that the amount of time a teacher waited after asking a question and before getting a response was inadequate. It looked very short, even less than a second. Besides, the researcher was a Higher Diploma Program (HDP) instructor for EFL teachers in the University (Wolkite University, Ethiopia), and he had made formal classroom observations when the EFL teachers taught Communicative English Skills course. During that time, some teachers were observed replying to their questions themselves without waiting for an answer from the learners. Some others were noticed quickly moving on to another respondent. Thornbury (1996) found that even a slight increase in wait-time results in an increase in the quantity and quality of learners' contributions and their questions. Student-initiated talk was rarely practiced in the observed lessons. Perhaps, teachers may have trouble in using appropriate interactional strategies or may fail to give students suitable think-time and/or wait-time to formulate ideas, which fit the nature of tasks and activities given. To the knowledge of the researcher, no research has investigated teachers' wait-time behaviours and their learners' involvement in EFL classes in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions. Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' wait-time behaviour in EFL classes.

Objectives of the Study

General Objective

The general objective of this study was to investigate the duration of the pause and/or the amount of English language teachers' wait-time in EFL classes at Wolkite University.

Specific Objectives

To this end, the specific objectives of this study were to:

i. explore teachers' wait-time I for students' response, and
ii. examine teachers' wait-time II for students' response

Research Question

How much time do teachers give for students to provide response?

Definition of Terms

Think Time: This is a distinct period of uninterrupted silence by the teacher and all students so that both can complete appropriate information processing tasks, feelings, oral responses and actions.

Wait time I: Is the period of the pause following a teacher's question but before a student's answer.

Wait-time II: Is the duration of the pause following a student response but before the next turn of the teacher's utterance.

Review of Related Literature

Wait-Time

Wait time is strictly connected to improvements in student's achievement and more exactly it increases the length of student's responses. It stimulates the variety of responses offered and decreases students' failure to respond. After students complete an answer, teachers often begin their reaction or their next question before a second has passed. The increase of the pause after a student gives an answer is equally as important as increasing wait-time (Tuan, 2010). Rowe (1986) identifies two types of wait-time: Wait-time I is the period of the pause following a teacher's question but before a student's answer. Wait-time II is the duration of the pause following a student response but before the next turn of the teacher's utterance for every type of questions, except rhetorical questions, which do not need any answer. The use of the crucial three-second wait-time can have positive effects on students in content classrooms (Rowe, 1986).

In the EFL classroom, Mengwang (2011) stated that increasing wait-time from three to five seconds could increase the amount of students' involvement as well as the quality of that involvement. He added that EFL teachers usually use short, simple, and grammatically correct sentences. Teachers need to take into account the wait-time. Tuan (2010) added that after asking a question, teachers typically wait for only a second or less for student response. If the response is not forthcoming at that time, teachers rephrase the question, ask students to answer it, or answer it themselves. They should allow a few seconds of silence after posing a question. In any case, a suitable pause should last 3-4 seconds of uninterrupted silence; however, different types and/or nature of questions could be asked.

When teachers try to increase both types of wait-time mentioned above to more than three seconds, Rowe (1986) contends that wait-time II has a significant effect on the length of student responses and

increasing numbers of unsolicited student responses. With the extended wait-time, there is a lower rate of student failures to respond. However, usually, on average, before calling upon a student to answer, teachers wait for less than a second, and only a second is allowed for this student to respond before the teacher's subsequent intervention. Therefore, many researchers claim that it is necessary to help teachers extend their average wait-time to help elaborate students' verbal outcomes (Nunan, 1991; Rowe, 1986).

Some researchers often find out that there is a relationship between the cognitive level of questions and wait-time I and II. The more complex mental processes required by higher-order questions ask for and produce a longer wait-time, both in type I and type II. Gambrell (1983) also points out that asking higher-order questions could be an effective comprehension strategy only when students are given adequate 'think-time' to reflect and process the necessary information before responding to teacher solicitations. Conversely, Rowe (1986) argues that extended wait-time may be inappropriate for lower-order questions. The researcher believes that there is an existing wait-time threshold phenomenon for lower-level questions, and the cognitive demand made on students who respond to lower-level questions does not ask for extended time for processing.

Finally, Tuan (2010) and Walsh (2011) stated that extended wait-time has been found to increase the frequency and quality of students to think, formulate and give a response, which leads to longer answers and more learner contribution. Besides, the duty of the teacher is to provide guidance and inspiration, decide what questions to ask and how to ask them, and create learning situations, which stimulate learners to listen, read, write, discuss, ask questions, perform tasks, solve problems or engage in other activities whereby learners will have more opportunities to express their ideas, join classroom activities, and interact with the teacher. Although most research findings showed improvement in performance using extended wait-time, Baysen (2010) found that extended wait-time did not improve students' performance

and it can lower higher cognitive achievement in university students. Another study showed that wait-time could cause teacher anxiety during a question and answer exchanges/interactions (Matt and Shannon, 2007).

“Increased wait time after a teacher question is very important in ESL classrooms for it allows for improved student answers” (Chaudron 1988: 128). Sadker and Sadker (1987 stress that both the quality and quantity of student answers improve if the teacher waits three to five seconds (instead of the usual one second) before jumping back to restate, offer clues, provide the answer, or call on another student. Ingram and Elliott (2015) state that extending the wait time certainly helps the students who need time to formulate an answer, who are shy, or who are not sure of the answer. Sadker and Sadker make another interesting point that wait-time should also be extended after the student answer, in order for the teacher to form a proper response (1987: 35). The overwhelming use of acceptance responses in their study shows that the teachers may need another second or two to provide helpful and precise feedback.

The researcher wants to argue for a more nuanced understanding of wait-time on the part of teachers, teacher educators and policy writers. The desired nature and quality of interaction needs to be considered when making decisions about the need for and length of wait-time, following both a teacher’s turn and a student’s turn. For example, the role of wait-time would be different in dialogic student-teacher talk and exploratory student-student talk within whole-class interactions (Myhill, 2006). The importance of this type of ‘metacognitive awareness’ has been promoted by Edwards-Groves and Hoare (2012, p. 98) as being key to establishing a good dialogue in the classroom.

Brown (2001) stated that one way to look at your role, as an initiator of interaction in the classroom is to look at yourself (and other teachers) in terms of a well-known taxonomy for describing classroom interaction. Classroom interaction can be observed by using categories

of teacher's talk, students' talk and teacher-students' talk in the classroom known as FLint (Foreign Language interaction). The FLint model includes seven categories for teacher talk and two for student talk, and it helps to set a learning climate for interactive teaching that includes wait-time behaviours. Thus, to code the recorded classroom interaction, an interaction analysis system was used in this study. This model contains a list of categories, each with a different code symbol. Such categories represent the different classroom events like wait-time I, wait-time II, and think time behaviours. The purpose of this system is to code different classroom behaviours to facilitate the process of finding certain patterns of interactional behaviours and to examine teachers' wait-time and students' responses in EFL classes. Below are theories of Flanders' category of teacher's talk and Moskowitz Foreign language interaction analysis categories which this study takes as a paradigm.

Interaction Analysis

Interaction analysis is rooted in behavioural psychology. It is often viewed as an objective method of analysing classroom discourse (through observation and specific coding systems) as it can establish reliable classroom profiles through quantitative statistical procedures, which are generalisable (Magdalena, 2013:141). Among several coding systems developed within the approach, Flanders' FIAC (Interaction Analysis Categories), Moskowitz's FLint (Foreign Language Interaction), Fanselow's FOCUS (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings) and COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) are probably the most well known and most frequently used by researchers. There are many coding systems, in fact, at least 200 according to McKay's (2006). Therefore, in this study, some of the well-known schemes are reviewed because going over all of them is beyond the scope of the present study. One of the earliest instruments was developed by Bellack and his associates (Bellack *et al*., 1966) who identified several pedagogical moves, including the three-part exchange, *soliciting*, *responding,* and *reacting*, which would be the

direct antecedent of Fanselow's (1977) *FOCUS* coding system and indirect precursor to Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) well-known discourse model of interaction. According to Allwright and Bailey (1991), however, the starting point for much of the work on L2CD was Flanders' (1970) pioneering work on interaction analysis. His ten-category *FIAC* (Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories) schedule was designed for general education purposes to give teachers scores reflecting the directness (e.g., criticizing or using authority) and indirectness (e.g., accepting or using learners' ideas) of their teaching styles.

By modifying Flanders' *FIAC* model, Moskowitz (1971) developed a 22-category coding system that she called *FLint* (Foreign Language Interaction), specifically for FL/L2 teaching. This scheme aimed to identify good language teaching and to provide feedback for teacher education purposes (Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Nunan and Bailey, 2009). Another familiar observation scheme is Fanselow's (1977) *FOCUS* (Foci for Observing Communications Used in Settings) system that made considerable modifications to and expansions on Bellack *et al.*'s (1966) analytic system (Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Chaudron, 1988). While Fanselow's (1977) scheme was developed for language teacher training, Allwright and Bailey (1991) point out that it could be used for research on any human interaction as it is not limited to specific categories for teachers and students.

Finally, a departure from the earlier schemes is *COLT* (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) (Allen, *et al*., 1984; Spada and Fröhlich, 1995), which aimed to 'capture differences in the communicative orientation of classroom instruction and to examine their effects on learning outcomes applied' (Kumaravadivelu, 1999:456). The instrument has 73 categories, to enable the observer to make a connection between teaching methodology and language use. This instrument is directly linked to communicative methodology and considers how instructional differences affect learning outcomes. It was devised in two parts. Part A focuses on classroom organization, tasks,

materials and levels of learner involvement, while part B analyses learner and teacher verbal interaction, considering such things as evidence of an information gap, the existence of sustained speech, the quantity of display versus referential questions. The authors also recognise that the instrument has limitations: 'if one is interested in undertaking a detailed discourse analysis of the conversational interactions between teachers and students, another method of coding and analysing classroom data would be more appropriate' (Spada and Frohlich, 1995:10).

Flanders' Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC)

Flanders interaction analysis categories are one of the earliest systems that were generated to examine interaction in the classroom. The process of teaching is taking place in the classroom context, the observation, as well as, description occurs in real-time. The particularity of this process is that the presence of an observer examining interaction in a classroom has been assumed to have effects on the latter. One of the critics addressed to FIAC is that it focused on observing language classrooms, while in fact it has been devised to scrutinise content classrooms. FIAC is also criticised for it focuses more on teacher talk and gives little concentration to students or pupils' talk. Put in a different way, in using the FIAC instrument for observation, the researcher finds himself biased towards scrutinising teacher talk and gives a minor interest to learners' owing to the fact that it is classified into mainly two types as attached in the appendices section. Language classroom is not merely a place where the teacher is the only one supposed to take roles and tasks i.e., there is a kind of equality and fairness in allotting roles to both teachers and students.

Moskowitz's Foreign Language Interaction Analysis System

This scheme was an extension to the work or the category presented by Flanders explained above. By adding and devising the Flanders' categories, Moskowitz made a more sophisticated twenty-two category

instruments that would fit better FL classrooms. The objectives of this scheme are basically three: to identify what is "good" language teaching, to provide feedback to trainee-teachers, and to label a classroom as teacher or student-centered. The categories brought innovations that they account for some methodological considerations and implementations which were not taken into account formerly; for instance, the utilization of choral and vocal drills, exercise and teacher drawings on tape recorders. Since FLINT scheme is a complex one, Moskowitz recommends that the observer has to master the Flanders system beforehand using the former because it is a modified version of Flanders coding scheme.

Research Methodology

Research Design

The purpose of this research was to investigate EFL teachers' wait-time behaviours in Communicative English Skills classes at Wolkite University. The study is a descriptive case study. Yin (1989) categorised case studies into an exploratory, descriptive and explanatory designs. From these, the study at hand was a descriptive case study. A case study of this kind is richly descriptive because it is grounded in deep and various sources of information. It also requires the researcher to spend more time in the environment being investigated than is the case with other types of research. Thus, a case study is characterised by consecutive and sequential engagement, and it may be either qualitative, quantitative, or both (Dornyei, 2007). A mixed-method (both qualitative and quantitative) was chosen for this study due to the complex nature of issues raised in the study. A mixed methods research involves the collection or analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study with some attempts to integrate the two approaches at one or more stages of the research process (Dornyei, 2007: 148). It also "has practical value when we want to examine an issue that is embodied in a complex educational or social context" (p.149). Moreover, the rationale for mixed methods is that it

offers a potentially more comprehensive means of legitimizing findings than do either QUAL or QUAN methods alone by allowing investigators to assess information from both data types (Dornyei, 2007).

Mixing qualitative and quantitative methodologies in classroom research can foster a good understanding of the intricate tapestry of a classroom (Dornyei, 2007). Many researchers (such as Creswell, 2003; Creswell *et al*., 2010) also contend that the use of a combination of methodologies is most effective in answering research questions. The use of a range of data sources in such a study was a means of data triangulation (Creswell, 2003). This triangulation of a range of data coupled with methodological triangulation or the use of multiple methods to examine a distinct problem was considered decisive to validate and strengthen research findings (Creswell, 2003).

This study specifically employed a concurrent triangulation approach, which is probably the most familiar major mixed methods. The triangulation design is a one-phase design in which the researcher implements the qualitative and quantitative methods during the same timeframe and with equal weight; however, priority may be given to either. In other words, in a concurrent triangulation approach, the researcher collects both qualitative and quantitative data concurrently and then supports each other to determine if there is convergence, difference, or some combination. Some authors refer to this comparison as confirmation, disconfirmation, cross-validation, or corroboration (Creswell, 2012, Cohen, *et al*, 2011; Gray, 2004). This model generally uses separate qualitative and quantitative methods as a means to offset the weaknesses inherent within one method with the strengths of the other. Conversely, the strength of one adds to the strength of the other. In this approach, the quantitative and qualitative data collection is concurrent, happening in one phase of the research study. Ideally, the weight is equal between the two methods, but often in practise, more priority may be given to one or the other (Cohen *et al*, 2011). Accordingly, in this study, more weight is given to qualitative

data analysis. This study is, therefore, more qualitative and less quantitative.

The single-phase timing of this design is the reason it has also been referred to as the concurrent triangulation design (Creswell, 2012). It generally involves the concurrent, but separate, collection and analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data so that the researcher may best understand the research problem. The researcher attempts to merge the two data sets, typically by bringing the separate results together in the interpretation or by transforming data to facilitate integrating the two data types during the discussion phase. The rationale of this method is to end-up with valid and well-substantiated conclusions about a single phenomenon.

Research Site, Population and Sampling

The research site was Wolkite University, which is located in Gurage Zone, Southern Nations and Nationalities, Ethiopia. It is 158 km far from Addis Ababa. The university was established in 2011, and the number of students enrolled during its establishment year was 556. The University began its teaching-learning process in three different colleges. These colleges were the college of Engineering and Technology, Informatics and Computational and Natural Sciences. Currently, the number of colleges increased to eight. These are Social Sciences and Humanities, Agriculture, Health Science and Medicine, Business and Economics and School of Law and Governance. The total number of students enrolled in the 2017/18 academic years was three thousand twelve.

The target populations of the study were EFL teachers' who taught Communicative English Skills course in the 2017/18 academic year and their first-year students' of the same year. The University was selected because it is convenient for the researcher since he is a staff member of the university and colleagues who could help him, and a

clear elucidation is made to describe the participants and the sampling techniques below.

Teachers

The total population of English language teachers during the 2017/18 academic years was forty-one. From these, five teachers who were included in the pilot study were excluded from the main study. For classroom observation, a simple random sampling technique was employed, and through this sampling technique, seven teachers who were teaching Communicative English Skills course in the University were chosen. These teachers were limited due to the nature of frequent classroom observations and the transcription (data) has to be managed. Attempt was made to include teachers with teaching experience from five to seventeen years. The steps used to choose these teachers were:

i. Each teacher's name was written on a piece of paper with similar size and colour.
ii. Each piece was enwrapped in a similar way.
iii. The enfolded pieces were mixed properly.
iv. Then another person picked up the enfolded pieces one by one.
v. Those teachers whose names were selected were included in the study.

From the four departments/sections that each instructor was teaching (i.e., twelve credit hours), through a simple random sampling technique, one class was chosen for observation. These teachers' classes were recorded, videotaped and observed for an average of forty minutes'. Each class was observed twice with two and three days of interval. Besides, by excluding those teachers who participated during the pilot study, purposefully, thirty-one teachers who were teaching the course filled in the questionnaire. Finally, a face-to-face interview was conducted with purposively selected seven teachers whose classrooms were observed.

Students

The total population of first-year students in the University in the 2017/18 academic year was three thousand twelve. For the interview, fourteen students were randomly selected: two interviewees from each selected teacher's class. These fourteen students were selected randomly through the lottery method; after giving them tentative numbers in each of the seven departments; a neutral person was asked to pick one piece of the folded paper in all the sampled classes taught by these seven teachers. The total number of students interviewed, therefore, was fourteen. Classes of these participants were observed in advance. The type of interview was semi-structured, and they were interviewed face-to-face. For the questionnaire, 230 students were selected from the seven teachers' classes where the observations were made first through a stratified sampling technique. In other words, the seven teachers taught these students. Thus, these departments were different and the number of students varies from department to department. During selection, to avoid biases, the researcher used a stratified sampling technique and they were taken randomly considering their proportion. These departments are shown in the table below.

Table 1. Departments from which participants in the questionnaire were sampled

No.	Department	Total no. of students	No. of sampled students	Remark
1.	English Language and Literature	27	19	
2.	Information Science	45	32	
3.	Governance	56	39	
4.	Architecture	48	34	
5.	Health Officer	50	35	
6.	Chemistry	42	29	
7.	Accounting and Finance	60	42	
Total		**328**	**230**	

Data Gathering Instruments

The study employed three different data collection instruments. These were classroom observation, interview and questionnaire. Observation technique yielded data that pertain directly to a typical behavioural situation, and one can gain some knowledge of factual rather than reported behaviour. Watching and listening are the best way to describe what is happening and to capture the most important events, which tend to be taken for granted in a setting (Morse and Richards, 2002). By being there, the researcher can get a feel of the atmosphere of the setting in a multi-dimensional way (Ford and Fassnacht, 2005). The observations were made using checklists adapted from Allwright and Bailey, 1991. Co-observers made observations to check the reliability and validity of the data. There also were interviews on the behaviours both teachers and students considered influenced the wait-time behaviours. Using interviews, the researcher was able to gather data that were not possible to collect through observations. Finally, questionnaires were prepared for both teachers and students to crosscheck and strengthen the data obtained through both instruments. A questionnaire is an invaluable tool for grasping teachers' understanding of particular classroom practises that may reveal desirable behaviour.

Data Analysis Techniques

According to Creswell (2010), the qualitative and quantitative data were analysed independently as the study employed a mixed-methods approach. This was done to elucidate each component, minimise the influence of one component on the role of the other and to obtain substantiated findings. In this regard, Dornyei (2007) recommends this approach, and the analysis of the data should proceed independently for the QUAL and quan phases, and mixing should occur only at the final interpretation stages. In many cases, it may be better to keep the analyses separate and only to mix the QUAL and quan results at a late[r] stage to illuminate and corroborate each other.

SPSS version 22 software program was used, and then data were analysed using simple descriptive statistics of frequencies and percentages. In the questionnaire of both teachers and students, items examining their opinions were subsumed thematically from five scales to three scales for ease of analyses. A stopwatch was used to analyse wait-time behaviours of teachers for students' responses and turn-taking procedures.

Analyses and Findings of Wait-Time Behaviour

Wait-time behaviour was the other research question that this study aimed to answer. Thus, teacher 'A' was rarely giving learners to respond to extended wait-time (an average of 2-3 seconds) to think, plan and share their ideas. He did not take single extended turns frequently as explanation or instruction. He used transitional markers (*ok, yes, now, alright,* etc.) that support acceptance of topic development and joint construction to seek attention or show the beginning and end of a lesson stage. These backchannellings or transitional markers (discourse markers) might alert learners to the fact that the lesson moved on and pedagogical goals had been realigned with a shift in focus to a new activity. Extract 1.1 below shows this behaviour.

Extract 1.1

47. *S: Mothers breast-feeding is more important than the ehh others.*

    [1s]

48. *T: Ok. Very good! Very good! How did you know that? [1s] How did you know that? [1s] What is ehh what are the indicators? [1s] Who says? [1s] What are the signs?*

    [1s]

49. *S: Teacher*
50. *T: Ok! Hana [1 s] emm Henok [1 s] ok Hana*

[3s]

51. *S: As it is seen on the picture, it is mark X. On the other hand, out of his mother's breast. =*

[1s]

52. *T: Ok Very good! Very good! It is marked! Eh? So, if you look at the picture, there is a mother breast-feeding a child, and there is a bottle. Isn't it? ….*

[1s]

53. *S: Teacher*
54. *T: Yes*
55. *S: I may ehh*

[1s]

56. *T: I may what?*

[0.5s]

57. *S: Emm*
58. *T: Ok. Let us pass to her.*
59. *Hana: Few mothers*

[1s]

60. *T: Few mothers. Why do you think?*

[3s]

61. *Hana: Because few mothers have job. Because of that {they} feed their child bottle milk because of that they changed bottle that is why they have to change the feeding system.*
62. *T: Ok, she said, they feed for few moments and they have to go to their job. Ok. What else? Is it the only fact?*

    [3s]

63. *S: Teacher*
64. *T: Ok*
65. *S: The mothers because of their factors they don't feed their breast….*

    [0.5s]

66. *T: Ok, very good! What else? [1s] What else? [1s] Anyone? [1s] Anyone?*

    [1s]

67. *S: Teacher*
68. *T: Yes*
69. *S: Many people before they go to their job, but they put their milks on the bottles.*

    [0.5s]

70. *T: Ok. Very good!*

(Extract 1.1 was taken from Teacher A)

In episode 1.1 above, in turn 62, the teacher asked the girl specifically, and the whole class to think other responses, saying, *"Is it the only fact?"* so that the student in turn 65, provided more brief, elaborated and long extended answer. This is possibly because the pause to think

about the reply was 3 seconds. At the end of her response, in turn 66, the teacher praised that student who gave the answer, and again he said, *"What else?"* This was to get more elaborated responses, which in turn urge students to practise the target language.

In turn 50 of extract 1.1, the time the teacher paused after asking a question was less than a second (*"Hana emm Henok ok Hana ok ehh")*. As can be seen in this turn, the teacher nominated first Hana then quickly moved on to another respondent (Henok) then again, he nominated Hana, and finally, he pointed his finger towards the third respondent. Lastly, this student answered the question. The wait-time that the teacher gave for students to react to a question was less than a second. This teacher usually allowed only one second replying to a question and if none was forthcoming, he took back the conversational floor. This teacher restricted the respondents' forthcoming modification. However, increasing wait-time might contribute to a more varied student involvement. Providing students with a 3 to 4-second average wait-time of uninterrupted silence after asking a question is appropriate because extended wait-time might increase the quality and quantity of students' responses and might contribute to more involvement and greater confidence on the students' part.

This teacher provided extended wait-time from turn 60-69, and learners successfully managed the turn-taking and topic management with no intervention by the teacher. This possibly increased the number of learner responses and often resulted in more answers that are complex and led to an increase in learner-learner(s) interaction. This, in turn, maximised learning opportunities. Teacher 'A' most of the time used students' thoughts to expand and elaborate further and have greater coherence in the development of ideas; higher-order teacher questions were cascaded from the first contribution of students.

Extract 1.2

84. T: Do you agree? (1s) He said that in rural area mothers stay at home as a result they tend to breast feeding while in urban

area since mothers are busy, they tend to substitute into other kinds of foods. [1s] *Do you agree?*
[7s]

85. *SS: Murmuring*
86. *T: Yes?*
[1s]
87. *S: Teacher*
88. *T: Ok*
89. *S: In rural areas, I don't know exactly under the first thing. I believe that is not for the children they are feed {feeding} the baby, but they have lack of awareness in urban areas. So, in my groups, they have knowledge and they are like this.*
[1s]
90. *T: Which one do you think is preferable?* [1s] *What is practicing in urban areas?*
[1s]
91. *S: They are good in terms of feeding their kids, but they have lack of awareness. In urban area, they have awareness. When we compare them, the urban is better than from the rural parts. There is {are} no alternative foods.*
[2s]

(Extract 1.2 was taken from Teacher A)

In extract 1.2 above, the teacher paused first a second and gave extended wait-time, pauses of 7 seconds (from turns, 84-85) that allowed learners time to think, formulate and give a response. The pause could create space in the interaction to allow learners to take turn-at-talk; allow thinking or rehearsal time to enable learners to formulate a response. In turn 84, he asked the whole class to evaluate the learner's contribution. But evaluating the response might discourage the respondent. This learner in turn 89 expressed his stretched response. Except for this, the teacher was asking several types of questions that function to elicit a response, check understanding and concept, promote learners' involvement and guide

towards a response. Due to this, the responses that learners replied were short, restricted and simple, often comprising one or two words because the teacher was interrupting learners while they were trying to express their ideas without waiting for them properly. Instead of opening space for learning, he tended to close it down and result in a conventional, almost mechanical type of interaction that was exemplified in IRF/E sequence. In this context, it is possible to say that proper questioning strategies need an understanding of the role of a question with what is being taught with proper wait-time given for the questions forwarded. The long pause given in turn 85 possibly seemed unsuccessful to involve learners.

In the second observed class, Teacher B dominated the classroom talk. He rarely offered learners chances to involve in the lesson. In the transcription, in turns 254 and 261, the student responded, and then the teacher again (See from turns, 255-260 and 262-359) took the floor of the talk. However, as can be evident in the transcription, he did not offer learners the necessary context to practise the target language; rather he dominated the classroom talk except that he asked them rhetorical types of questions with less than a second of wait-time. As could be referred to from the transcriptions, the pause Teacher B had given for his learners to respond to the questions was not enough because he was entirely lecturing the principles of public speaking.

Extract 1.3

68. T: … *As I have said, there are two ways of introduction. What are these? [.5s] Tell me the two ways of introduction?*

[1s]

69. S12: Formal and informal

[1s]

70. *T: Yeah of course. They can be based on the status of the individual. We can make it formal and informal, but the introductions can be practised or performed in two ways. One eh*

    [.5s]

71. *S13: Introducing oneself*

    [1s]

72. *T: Very good! We can introduce oneself eh*

    [1s]

73. *S: Murmuring*

    [1s]

74. *T: What? (.) Introducing oneself or introduced by Kebede so these are the two ways.*

(Extract 1.3 was taken from Teacher D)

As it could be specified above, in turn 68 the teacher asked a question, but he waited for half a second and continued asking the question in a modified form. This could not give time-space for the students to react on. The wait-time (II) of teacher 'G' after student 12 gave his answer was a second in turn 69; the teacher immediately took the turn, in turn 70, after the respondent finished his idea. It was not noticed when the teacher waited for long pauses (3-4/5 seconds). Taking turn before the necessary duration of pause might hinder a learner's chance to continue her/his speech if s/he had ideas to say. Similarly, in turn 72, the teacher took turn in half a second from student 13 and praised (evaluated) the replier. If the teacher could have waited for the respondent, more ideas could have been added.

Similarly, teacher ‘E’ waited for less than a second after he asked a question, and the duration of the pause after students reacted to the question (in L1/FL) was less than a second. He was reacting soon after the student stopped speaking. If a teacher took the floor immediately, it might limit students’ ideas if they wanted to speak further. From all the observed classes, teachers ‘B’ and teacher ‘E’ were waiting for almost less than a second after they asked a question. They were taking turns immediately after learners gave responses without further waiting for any response from learners. Sometimes they were even responding to their own questions when students kept quiet for a moment. This implied that either they were rushing to cover the daily lesson, or they might not expect the correct answer from the learners. If so, this might hurt students’ morale. As it could be understood from Teacher B’s lesson transcription of round 2, particularly, he seemed helpless to continue the lesson. The reason why Teacher B used much more time seemed possibly because he rarely allowed students to engage in group and pair works, and students were sited in permanent groups without proper group work tasks. Even in the teacher-fronted tasks, he did not give students sufficient waiting time that only a few active students communicated or responded to the teacher’s questions.

In turn 196 below, the teacher first gave opportunities for volunteers, but since nobody volunteered to react, he nominated a student (i.e., Dawit). When Dawit kept silent, he moved on to call another learner (Beshir). The wait time to move from Dawit to Beshir was less than a second, which in turn may hinder Dawit’s efforts. If the teacher could have waited for three or more seconds of uninterrupted silence, the learner could have made more efforts to get it.

Extract 1.4

196. T: Be released! Exactly! You are perfect! Perfect! Let this man be released! Interesting! Dawit

[1s]

197. Dawit: No!

[1s]

198. T: Eh! Who can try? [1s] Stop writing! Yes, who can try? [1s] Ok Beshir

[1s]

199. Beshir: Let

[.5s]

200. T: Let

[.5s]

201. Beshir: Let writing

[.5s]

202. T: Let (3x) stop writing, therefore, eh

[3s]

203. SS: Let murmuring

[1s]

204. T: Let eh

[.5s]

205. Beshir: Let you write.

[1s]

(Extract 1.4 was taken from Teacher A)

Instead of filling all gaps with repetitions of the same elicitations, Teacher A could give the students longer wait-time, i.e., pausing a few seconds of ideally three to five seconds before pursuing with another question or nominating a student. It seemed that the students needed time to process the question, formulate an answer, and organise the language. Rapid-fire questions (for instance, in turn 48 below) might

lead to short, incomplete and thoughtless answers and students' frustration. In the next episode, Teacher A was witnessed when he moved on from one student to the other nominating all three respondents within less than 5 seconds.

Extract 1.5

41. *T: Ok. Very good! Very good! How did you know that? [1s] How did you know that? [1s] What is ehh what are the indicators? [1s] Who says? [1s] What are the signs?*

    [1s]

42. *S: Teacher*

    [1s]

43. *T: Ok! Hana [.5s] emm Eliyas [.5s] ok Hana [.5s] ok ehh [the teacher nominated another student]*

    [0.5s]

51. *S: As it is seen on [in] the picture, it is mark X [marked X]. On the other hand, out of his mother's breast.*

(Extract 1.5 was taken from Teacher A)

The extract vividly portrayed that the teacher quickly moved on from Hana to Eliyas, and then to another student pointing his finger. It could have been better if the teacher gave Hana enough time so she could think and share her idea. Hana was exasperated the moment her name was called. Subsequently, he nominated Elias and then another student though he did not wait until Eliyas had time to think and share points. The third student in turn 51 answered the question. In turn 50, the teacher moved on very quickly from Hana to Eliyas and when

Eliyas kept silent, the teacher again shifted toward Hana. These nominated students were denied proper wait-time to react to the question asked. This implied that the teacher was moving fast possibly because he wanted to cover the daily prepared lesson, or did not have trust in the students' ability to answer precisely.

As the extracts illustrated, often teachers did not give learners enough wait-time to think and share ideas. As a result, learners failed to express properly what they were asked to respond to.

Analysis of the Interview Data

Teachers were asked about the wait-time. In this regard, Teacher 1 stated, "I do not want to spend much time waiting for the answer from a single student. This is because I have to cover the day's lesson; if I give sufficient time, I will not cover it, and offering excess time after asking a question results in loss of speed to cover the lesson, and it increases learners' anxiety." However, wait-time enables turn-taking to go slower helping to make learners feel more comfortable and less stressed. Besides, they were asked about the duration of the pause or the turn-taking after students' responses and they said they immediately continued talking. It was also noticed when teachers took turns soon after students responded.

To offer a reply, students were given less than two seconds of pause (wait-time) after the question. In this regard, Student 3 said, "I would keep silent if I did not know the answer so that the teacher could move on to another student or answer it himself." This revealed that the reason might be due to the students' poor speaking ability that he disliked extended responses. Unlike the questionnaire result, which confirmed enough time was provided to students to respond to a given question (i.e., wait-time I), the result gained from the observation showed that teachers' wait-time II and their turn-taking after the students' response was immediate.

Analyses and Findings of Teachers' Wait-Time Behaviour

In Tables 1 and 2 below, the teachers' wait-time behaviours during turn-taking procedures (question and answer exchanges) were enquired through six related but different items.

Table 1: Wait-time Behaviour 1

No.		How often do you:							
		1. give a chance for another student to reply if a student waits for a moment (5 seconds)?		2. call on someone else to reply when a student takes more than 5 seconds to respond to a question?		3. answer the question yourself if a student takes time to reply?		4. wait/pause less than a second until a student starts to think, formulate ideas and answer a question?	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
5	Always	5	16.1	3	9.7	2	6.5	2	6.5
4	Often	7	22.6	7	22.6	4	12.9	8	25.8
3	Sometimes	8	25.8	11	35.5	11	35.5	5	16.1
2	Rarely	6	19.4	4	12.9	8	25.8	4	12.9
1	Never	5	16.1	5	16.1	5	16.1	12	38.7
		31	100	30	96.8	30	96.8	31	100

As can be seen above, 25.8% and 22.6% of the teacher-respondents respectively confirmed that they sometimes and often moved on to another student to reply in case a student waited for five seconds of duration. Further, 19.4% and 16.1% of them respectively reported that they rarely and never waited for the specified number of seconds. The remaining 16.1% said they always gave the chance to another student if the nominated one does not answer in 5 seconds. Teachers were also asked if they nominated someone else to get the right answer. For this item, 35.5% of them showed that they sometimes nominated someone to reply, and 22.6% said that they often called on another learner to give the answer. This reveals that instructors called on other students to get the response to a question but they gave the answer themselves if they did not get any respondent. In the third item,

instructors were asked how often they gave responses provided a student could not answer within the given time. In response to the question, 35.5% said they sometimes did this. The remaining 25.8%, 16.1% and 12.9% respectively verified that they rarely, never and often gave answers if a student could not answer a question within the time given. This shows that when students take more time than the one given, instructors themselves respond to the questions without giving learners any clue or hint to arrive at the exact answer. This type of situation restricts the learners' engagement in the lesson.

In item 4, teachers were further asked if they gave students extended time to think, formulate and share their own ideas. 38.7%, 12.9% and 16.1% respectively reported they never, rarely and sometimes gave students extended time to think, formulate and forward their ideas. On the other hand, 25.8% and 6.5% of the respondents respectively pointed out that they often and always gave extended time for students. This depicts that most of the instructors did not provide students with enough time to think, formulate and respond to questions.

Table 2: Wait-time Behaviour 2

No.	How often do you:				
		5. wait/pause between 1-2 seconds until a student starts to answer your question?		6. wait/pause between 3-5 seconds until a student starts to answer your question?	
		F	%	F	%
5	Always	6	19.4	7	22.6
4	Often	6	19.4	13	41.9
3	Sometimes	8	25.8	7	22.6
2	Rarely	7	22.6	3	9.7
1	Never	4	12.9	1	3.2
	Total	31	100	31	100

The fifth item asked how often teachers gave learners 1-2 seconds of wait-time. In response, 25.8% and 22.6% of the informants respectively

said they sometimes and rarely waited for 1-2 seconds. Those who always and often waited for 1-2 seconds accounted for 19.4% each. The remaining 12.9% confirmed they never waited for that amount of time. Finally, teachers were asked how often they waited for 3-5 seconds for a student to answer a question. In answering this item, 41.9% and 22.6% of them respectively disclosed that they often and always provided students with this amount of seconds while 22.6% said they sometimes gave learners the specified amount of wait-time. This shows that teachers do not give learners enough time to think, formulate ideas and answer questions. This further indicates that teachers take turns immediately after the students' response, which again may restrict learning potentials.

Analyses and Findings of Students' Wait-Time Behaviour

Below are Tables 3 and 4 which present the wait-time behaviours of students in reaction to the time they were given by their EFL teachers during the question and answer exchanges and/or turn-taking procedures.

Table 3: Wait-time behaviour 3

No.		How often does the instructor:					
		1. allow you enough time to respond after s/he asks you a question?		2. give chance for another student to reply in case you waited for a moment (2-5 seconds)?		3. answer the question him/herself in case you took time to reply?	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
5	Always	105	48.2	53	24.3	72	33.0
4	Often	55	25.2	66	30.3	58	26.6
3	Sometimes	29	13.3	49	22.5	54	24.8
2	Rarely	11	5.0	23	10.6	20	9.2
1	Never	18	8.3	26	11.9	13	6.0
	Total	218	100	217	99.5	217	99.5

In table 20, how often and how long the teachers waited for after they asked a question was enquired. Majority of the students, i.e., 48.2% and 25.2% respectively said that teachers always and often gave enough time to reply whereas 30.3% said teachers often waited for 2-5 seconds. Others (i.e., 24.3%, 22.5% and 10.6% respectively) responded that teachers always, sometimes and rarely nominated another respondent if the earlier took 2-5 seconds. Students were also asked whether teachers called on other students in case the first respondent took 'long' time. For this item, 33%, 26.6% and 24.8% respectively reported that the teachers themselves always, often and sometimes gave answers to the questions they asked.

Table 4: Wait-Time Behaviour 4

No.		How often does the instructor:					
		4. wait/pause for less than a second until you start to answer a question s/he asked?		5. wait/pause between 2-5 seconds until you start to answer a question after s/he asks?		6. give you 'enough' time to talk more and practice orally?	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
5	Always	47	21.6	56	25.7	90	41.3
4	Often	55	25.2	51	23.4	54	24.8
3	Sometimes	56	25.7	53	24.3	50	22.9
2	Rarely	27	12.4	29	13.3	14	6.4
1	Never	33	15.1	29	13.3	10	4.6
	Total	218	100	218	100	218	100

Students were asked how often the teacher waited for less than a second or more (2-5 seconds) until they started answering a question. In response to this question, 25.7% and 25.2% respectively said that their teachers sometimes and often waited for less than a second for them to start answering a question. What is more, 21.6%, 12.4% and 15.1% respectively mentioned that their teachers always, rarely and

never waited for them for less than a second until they started answering a question. In the fifth item, participants were asked how often their teachers waited for 2 to 5 seconds before the students answered a question. In answering this question, 25.7%, 24.3% and 23.4% respectively said that teachers always, sometimes and often waited for 2 to 5 seconds to give us time to think, organise our thoughts and answer. The remaining 13.3% and another 13.3% each reported that teachers rarely and never waited for 2 to 5 seconds until students started answering a question. Likewise, learners were asked how often their teachers gave them 'enough' time to talk more and practise orally. In response, 41.3%, 24.8% and 22.9% respectively said their teachers always, often and sometimes gave them 'enough' time to practise the target language. However, the interviews and observations showed that teachers did not give learners 'enough' time to practise orally.

Similarly, students were asked how often teachers paused for 2 to 4 seconds between a student's response and their taking turn. For this, 32% and 23% respectively reported that their teachers always and often took turns after students' response. The remaining 26%, 10% and 9% of them respectively said that their teachers sometimes, never and rarely waited for from 2-4 seconds of pause. This shows that if students do have some points to add, teachers would not give them enough time after learners' responses. This, in turn, limits their involvement and/or contribution to the lesson.

Discussions

The teachers' wait-time behaviour during the turn-taking procedures was also examined through observation, questionnaire and interview. The result obtained from the questionnaire and interview revealed that enough amount of wait-time was given for learners. On the other hand, from the observation, it was found that wait-time I and II that teachers gave for students after they asked questions were less than the necessary seconds of pause, which restricted learners' reaction. Consistent with this result, Walsh (2011) investigated the teachers'

wait-time behaviour through conversation analysis method and concluded that teachers typically wait for only around a second. They were reacting or taking turns immediately after learners replied without waiting for more than three seconds of undisturbed wait-time. During this time, if learners had any extra idea to add, the teacher did not give them the opportunity. Learners might have something to add if the teacher gave them the necessary wait-time. If teachers waited for three seconds or more, especially, after a student's answer, then there could possibly be pronunciation or content changes in students' use of language (Rowe, 1986:43). The concern here is not that 2.9 seconds is bad and 3 seconds is good, and more than 5 seconds of silence is even better. The concern is to provide a period that will most effectively assist nearly every student to complete the cognitive tasks needed in a particular situation. The teachers' job is to manage and guide what occurs prior to and immediately following a period of silence so that the processing that needs to occur is completed.

Both teachers' and students' questionnaire results revealed that teachers waited for more than the necessary seconds after they nominated a respondent. On the contrary, the result obtained from the observation portrayed that respondents sometimes relied on their L1 (Amharic) to express themselves or resorted to periods of silence because of their classroom predicament or due to their inability to express their ideas in English.

The findings of the interview result indicated that giving students wait-time to reply properly increases their anxiety, and within the allotted time of the lesson teachers wanted to cover the day's lesson. In relation to wait-time, teachers' interviews divulged that they moved on to another student if the first student could not give response, and if the second kept quiet, they themselves answered it. They did not want to force students for the response, so they answered it because they had to cover their planned daily lessons within the allotted time. The findings of the interview also stressed that giving learners' excess amount of time increases their anxiety.

However, wait-time enables turn-taking to go slower helping learners feel more comfortable and less stressed. Besides, they were interviewed about the duration of the pause or the turn-taking after students' responses (wait-time II), and they said that immediately they continue talking. It was also noticed when teachers took turns immediately after the students gave responses. If there were three or more seconds of silence after students gave a response and before the teachers took turns, students might add something to their responses.

The findings obtained from the teachers' questionnaire revealed that they always, often and sometimes (i.e., 16.1%, 22.6% and 25.8% respectively) gave five seconds for the students to answer questions. Similarly, results from the students' questionnaire revealed that teachers gave them enough wait-time to respond to a question. Besides, learners confirmed that teachers always (33%) and often (26.6%) responded to their questions if no student showed an attempt. Further, while 25.7% of the students said their teachers always gave them 2-5 seconds of pause so they respond to a question, 23.4% said they are often given that amount of wait-time. Likewise, results from the teachers' questionnaire disclosed that they often gave learners 3-5 seconds of pause, which, in fact, was not confirmed by the observation result. Consistent with this result, Tsui (1995) found that typically in EFL classroom, teachers wait for less than a second after asking a question or eliciting a response, leaving students insufficient time to respond to a question.

Different from the results of this study, Mengwang (2011) found that more than 3 seconds of pause was obtained in his observed classes. The researcher advised that increasing wait-time from 3 to 5 seconds enhances the amount of students' involvement as well as the quality of that involvement. Consistent with the findings of the current study, he added that EFL teachers usually use short, simple and grammatically correct sentences, and commented that teachers need to take wait-time behaviours into account. In his research, Tuan (2010) also found that after asking a question, teachers typically wait for only a second or

less for student's response, and during this time, if the response is not forthcoming, teachers rephrase the question, ask students to answer it or answer it themselves. The findings of the study at hand also verified this result. Teachers did not allow a few seconds of silence after posing a question. In any case, a suitable pause should last 3-4 seconds of uninterrupted silence. However, usually, on average, before calling upon a student to answer, teachers usually wait for less than a second and only a second is allowed for students to respond before the teacher's subsequent turn-taking happens. Therefore, many researchers suggest that it is necessary to help teachers extend their average wait-time to help elaborate students' verbal outcomes (Nunan, 1991 and Rowe, 1986).

Although most research findings showed improvement in performance using extended wait-time, Baysen (2010) found that extended wait-time did not improve students' performance and can lower higher cognitive achievement in university students. Another study showed that wait-time could cause teacher anxiety (Matt and Shannon, 2007).

Moreover, some researchers found that there is a relationship between the cognitive level of questions and wait-time I and II. The more complex mental processes required by higher-order questions ask for and produce a longer wait-time, both in type I and type II. Gambrell (1983) points out that asking higher-order questions could be an effective comprehension strategy only when students are given adequate 'think-time' to reflect on and process the necessary information before responding to teacher solicitations. Conversely, Rowe (1986) argues that extended wait-time may be inappropriate for lower-order questions. The researcher believes that there is an existing wait-time threshold phenomenon for lower-level questions, and the cognitive demand made on students who respond to lower-level questions does not ask for extended time for processing. Finally, Tuan (2010) found that longer (extended) wait-time has been found to increase the frequency and quality of students to think, formulate and give a response.

When students were given three or more seconds of undisturbed wait-time, there would be certain positive outcomes. Possibly, the length and correctness of their responses could increase. The number of volunteer respondents who could give appropriate answers by larger numbers of students could greatly increase. Teachers' questioning strategies tended to be more varied and flexible, and they could decrease the quantity and increase the quality and variety of their questions.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary of the Findings

This study aimed to investigate teachers' wait-time behaviour and students' involvement in EFL classes. The study employed mixed research methods, and data were collected using classroom observation, questionnaire, and interview. The qualitative and quantitative data obtained through these instruments were analysed, interpreted and presented in the preceding section. The study was conducted in Wolkite University. Participants were EFL teachers and first-year students of the 2017/18 academic year. This section presents a summary of the research findings, conclusions drawn and recommendations given.

Out of the target population, seven EFL teachers were taken for classroom observation and interview, and fourteen randomly selected students were taken for interview. Thirty-one teachers and two hundred thirty students filled in the questionnaire. The data obtained from these sampled participants were analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively.

In summary, meticulous and recurring inspections of the data revealed that majority of the teachers in the study consistently provided their learners with limited wait-time whose implementation and affordance led to the emergence of an obstructive interactional pattern. The wait-

time that teachers gave by pausing after they asked a question (wait-time I) was not enough for students to reply to the given questions. Often it was less than a second. Similarly, the duration of time for wait-time II (teachers' utterance after students' response to a question) was almost none and it was inadequate as it was often less than a second. Teachers were reacting immediately after students gave their responses to a question. Thus, extensive pausing throughout the lesson was rare. Besides, teachers interrupted and closed space when learners were attempting to express extended ideas. Therefore, typically the average wait-time (the length of time that elapsed between a teacher's question and a learner's response, and the pause after a student gave a response and the teacher's turn taking) was insufficient.

It was found out that teachers preferred to move on to another respondent if a learner waited for a second or failed to immediately respond to their question. However, there might be certain positive outcomes if students were given three or more seconds of uninterrupted wait-time. Possibly, the length and correctness of their response could be increased, and the questioning strategies would be more varied and flexible.

Conclusions

Based on the summary of the findings, it may be possible to conclude that the wait-time that teachers allowed by pausing after they asked a question (wait-time I) was insufficient; often it was less than a second. Similarly, the duration of time for wait-time II (teachers' utterance after students' response to a question) was also inadequate. It was also often less than a second. Typically, the average wait-time (the length of time that elapsed between a teacher's question and a learner's response, and the pause after a student gave response and the teacher's turn-taking) was not enough. It is possible to conclude that EFL teachers preferred to move on to another respondent if a learner waited for a second or failed to immediately respond to their question.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were made: Teachers should deliberately and constantly wait for 3-5 seconds or longer at particular times. They should ensure that all students also preserve the disturbance-free silence so that both the students and the teachers can consider and process relevant information and then act accordingly. Moreover, the wait-time strategy should be given due attention during question and answer sessions. Teachers have to ask proper questions and listen to their students carefully to get their meanings so as to help them in their learning difficulties. Thus, teacher training institutions or teacher educators should give training for EFL teacher trainees on the concept of how to provide their learners sufficient time to respond and/or to express their ideas, feelings and opinions depending upon the purpose of the question since wait-time provides students with adequate time to think and answer the questions.

References

Allwright, D., and Bailey, K. (1991). **Focus on the language classroom.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2001). **Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.** Longman. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Casteel, J., and Stahl, R. (1973). **The social science observation record: Theoretical construct and pilot studies.** Gainesville, fl: p. K. Yonge laboratory school.

Cazden, C. (2001). **Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.** Portsmouth, NH: Heinmann.

Creswell, J. (2003). **Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches.** (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (2012). **Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Qualitative and Quantitative Research.** (4th Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Creswell, J., Klassen, A., Clark, V., and Smith, K. (2010). **Best Practices for Mixed Methods Research in the Health Sciences.** The Office of Behavioural and Social Sciences Research (OBSS).

Cullen, R. (1998). *Teacher Talk and the Classroom Context.* **ELT Journal,** *52*(3), 179–187.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). **Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dyre, C. (1995). **Beginning Research in Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Method and Statistics.** USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Ford, C., and Fassnacht, C. (2005). *Analyst eyes and camera eyes: theoretical and technological considerations in "seeing" the details of classroom interaction* (CELA Report No. 11006).

Incecay, G. (2010). *The role of Teacher Talk in young Learners' language process.* **Social and Behavioural Sciences,** *2*(2), 277–281.

Jefferson, G. (2004). *Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction.* (PP. 13-31). In Gene McKay, S. (2006). **Researching Second Language Classrooms.** *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*, 192–208.

Magdalena A. (2013). **Approaches to describing and analysing classroom communication.** Adam Mickiewicz University Press Poznań.

Mengwang, X. (2011). *Action Study of Teacher's Language on EFL Classroom Interaction.* **Theory and Practice in Language Studies,** 1(1), 98–104.

Morse, J., and Richards, L. (2002). **Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods.** Beverly Hills: C: Sage Publications.

Musumeci, D. (1996). *Teacher–learner negotiation in content-based instruction: communication at cross-purposes.* **Applied Linguistics,** 17(3), 286–325.

Nassaji, H., and Wells, G. (2000). *"What's the use of "triadic dialogue"? An investigation of teacher-student interaction'.* **Applied Linguistics,** 21, 376–406.

Ralph, E. (1999). *Oral-questioning skills of novice teachers: … any questions?* **Journal of Instructional Psychology,** 26, 286–298.

Ramanathan, V., and Atkinson, D. (1999). *Ethnographic approaches and methods in L2 writing research: A Critical Guide and Review.* **Applied Linguistics,** 20(1), 44–70.

Rowe, M. B. (1986). *Wait-time: slowing down may be a way of speeding up.* **Journal of Teacher Education,** 1(37), 43–50.

Rymes, B. (2008). **Classroom Discourse: A Tool for Critical Reflection.** Cresskill, NJ: Hamton Press

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., and Jefferson, G. (1974). *"A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation."* **Language Learning,** 50(2), 696–735.

Seliger, H. M. (1977). *Does practice make perfect? A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence.* **Language Learning,** 27(2), 263–278.

Seliger, H.W. and Shohamy, E. (1987). **Second Language Research Methods.** Oxford: OUP.

Selinger, H. W., and Shohamy, E. (1989). **Second language research methods.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J., and Brazil, D. (1985). **Teacher Talk.** London: Oxford University Press.

Stahl, R. (1990). **Using "think-time" behaviors to promote students' information processing, learning and on-task participation. An instructional module.** Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Thornbury, S. (1996). *Teachers research teacher talk.* **ELT Journal,** 50(4), 279–87.

Tsui, A. (1995). **Introducing classroom interaction.** London: Penguin.

Walsh, S. (2002). *Construction or obstruction: teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom.* **Language Teaching Research,** 6(1), 3–23.

Walsh, S. (2003). *"Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom."* **Language Awareness,** 12, 124–142.

Walsh, S. (2006a). **Investigating Classroom Discourse.** London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2006b). **Investigating Classroom Discourse.** London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2011). **Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action.** Oxon: Routledge.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1988). *Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials.* **TESOL Quarterly,** 22(3), 575–592.

Wesche, W., M., and Ready, D. (1985). *Foreigner talk in the university classroom.* In *S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden (Eds.),* **Input in second language acquisition** (MA, pp. 89–114). Rowley: Newbury House.

Wong-Filmore, L. (1982). *Instructional Language as linguistic input: second language learning classrooms.* In *Wilkinson, L.C. (ed.),* **communicating in the classroom** (pp. 283–296). New York: Academic Press.

Yin, K. (1989). **Case Study Research: Design and Methods.** (4th Ed.).London: Sage Publications, Ltd. 26 (1), (93-95).

Yin, K. (1994). **Case Study Research: Design and Method.** London: Sage Publication.

Zahrani and Abdullah Al-Bargi, (2017). *The Impact of Teacher Questioning on Creating Interaction in EFL: A Discourse Analysis: English Language Teaching;* **Canadian Center of Science and Education.** 10 (6) 2017.