DOI: https://doi.org/10.20372/star.v13i2.11
ISSN: 2226-7522 (Print) and 2305-3372 (Online)
Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal
Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., April. – June 2024, 13(2), 156-173
Journal Homepage: https://journals.wgu.edu.et

Original Research

The Oral Interaction Practices of EFL Instructors and Students at Gambella University

Mekonnen Tolera, Tamiru Olana*, & Ebissa Bekele

Department of English Language and Literature, Wollega University, P. O. Box 395, Nekemte, Ethiopia

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to investigate typical oral interaction patterns between Gambella University second-year EFL students and their teacher. One EFL teacher was recruited by purposive sampling, and 32 students from the Department of English Language were selected through random selection using a descriptive study methodology. The tools used to gather the data were quantitative observation and a 12-item closed-ended questionnaire. Utilizing the Flanders interaction analysis category system (FIACS), the quantitative observation data was examined. Moreover, SPSS version 24 and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the questionnaire data. The information gathered from the questionnaire and the classroom observation was then triangulated. The EFL teacher employed lecturing the most, according to the findings. The findings furthermore disclosed that the teacher did not use the alternative patterns deemed to be more participatory in order to promote spoken communication among the pupils. The results also demonstrated how seldom the students used the majority of the spoken interaction strategies. Lastly, it was suggested that in order to provide students a enough opportunity to practice their oral English engagement with peers and instructors, the study participants' oral interaction patterns be balanced.

Article Information

Article History:
Received: 10-04-2024
Revised : 14 -05-2024
Accepted : 26-06-2024

Keywords:
Oral interaction Patterns, teacher talk., student talk, category

*Corresponding Author: Tamiru Olana

E-mail: olanatamiru58@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Ethiopia has seen the English language's domination as a medium of instruction at all educational levels and as a communication tool in commerce and diplomacy during the last several decades (Tekeste, 2006; Olana, 2015). In addition, the English language is now useful for individuals to manage their academic disciplines, find work, and adapt [science and technology as well as for the country to build diplomatic and economic relationships with other nations (Birhanu, 2012, p. 9). Therefore, being able to communicate in English is essential in a variety of contexts and at all educational levels.

The importance of interaction techniques has been highlighted in a number of earlier research. For instance, Allwright (1984) argues that increasing student discussion time and minimizing teacher talk is essential to sustaining

student interest in the classroom. According to Chaudron (1988), a considerably more emphasis has been placed on the interactive components of speech engagement in the classroom. Byrne (1987) suggests that educators use a student-student interaction pattern to provide adequate opportunity for students to practice the target language and enhance their oral proficiency. Jora (2019, p. 786–787) emphasizes the significance of interaction practices and contends that interactions between students and teachers help them acquire the target language. Additionally, Nelson (1985) contends that when students converse with native speakers of the language, they acquire the language. As a result, it makes sense to conclude that interaction is crucial in EFL classes as it provides the framework for students to employ the language they are learning in practice.

However, the research indicates that there are several issues with applying the theory in real-world settings. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001, p. 1), for instance, there were several shifts in language education over the 20th century, along with the rise of various ideologies. One thing that all second language training methods have in common is that learning a second language is a very participatory process. The interactions that take place between students and instructors take up a large portion of the instructional time (Richards & Lockhart, 1996, p. 138).

Furthermore, Tuan and Mai's research (2015, p. 16) revealed that during oral communication sessions in EFL classrooms, students said very little or nothing at all. According to Tsui (1995), the predominance of teacher speak in interactions between young learners in the classroom seems improper in the teaching of foreign languages since it does not provide students enough opportunities to practice the language. The results of Afrin's (2018) research on classroom interaction also showed that students were receiving less conversation time from instructors and that there was little genuine speech contact practiced in the classroom.

Wubalem (2019, p. 8) noted that while English was given as a service topic for two semesters, university students' language skill was very low locally. He continued by saying that the kids' incompetence was becoming worse. Students do not actively participate in oral interactions in the target language, claims Adaba (2017, p. 1).

Based on the researchers' professional experience, oral interaction studies were not conducted in Ethiopian higher education institutions because students were not provided with enough opportunities to participate in interaction activities, which could have negatively affected their speech performance. They find it difficult, for instance, to introduce themselves to others, share ideas, seek advice and explanation when needed, and engage in spoken group communication activities. The amount of oral contact was the focus of even a small number of research, whereas the patterns that encourage learners to participate in oral interaction received less attention.

The aim of the research was to investigate the kind and degree of oral interaction practices between the EFL lecturer and students at Gambella University during class. The researchers developed the following study questions in order to achieve their goal:

1. What kinds of oral communication techniques does the EFL teacher use?
2. How much does the EFL teacher use the oral interaction patterns?
3. What kinds of oral communication strategies do the pupils use?
4. How much do the pupils apply the spoken interaction patterns?

The Concept of Practice

Practice, according to Richards and Schmidt (2013), is the process of honing a talent by exposure or repetition. Every language skill must be practiced in order to become fluent in the sense that psycholinguistic processes run smoothly. As a result, practice is a crucial responsibility for both teachers and students in order to advance language proficiency.

Regarding the function of practice in learning, Baker (2006) suggests that participants' interactions with what they learn lead to long-lasting change rather than plans and blueprints alone. This illustrates that learning success cannot be ensured by a work plan by itself until it is implemented. Moreover, classroom interaction is necessary to achieve the main objective of language acquisition, which is to use the language for written or spoken communication of ideas (Tuan & Nhu, 2010, p. 29). According to the interactionist approach, language learners may concentrate on meaning, bargain to make information understandable, and experiment with novel language forms while they generate language when they are involved in meaningful conversation in a second language (Gass & Mackey, 2006).

The Patterns of Oral Interaction in a Classroom

Tuan and Nhu (2010, p. 30) discuss verbal interaction patterns in the classroom and point out that interactions may take place either individually or collectively between students and between students as well as between students and the instructor. There are many methods for students and instructors to communicate. For example, the teacher may act as a facilitator for the group projects. Furthermore, he may assist pupils in working in pairs or exchanging ideas with other students and the class at large.

Students may work in groups or in pairs on tasks in learner-learner interaction patterns. A single student may oversee or lead the group discussion in this type of interaction, or they may give an oral presentation to the whole class.

Each oral contact style offers benefits of its own for English language instruction. Teachers and students primarily transmit ideas, feelings, opinions, attitudes, perceptions, etc. based on facts via interaction. Interactions between students and instructors are essential for the development of language proficiency in learners, claim Rahimpour and Marsupium (2011).

Students may have a great opportunity to express themselves in English via interaction, and others can also have the opportunity to learn something. Furthermore, the way instructors and students engage and communicate has a big influence on how successfully a lesson is delivered, according to Yanfen and Yuqin (2010). As a result, educators must make an effort to maintain a healthy balance in their relationships with both students and themselves.

Teacher Talk Time (TTT) Vs. Student Talk Time (STT)

The amount of time students spend using the language they learn in class is called "student talk time" (STT). Similarly, the amount of time instructors spend conversing in a classroom is known as teacher talk time, or TTT (Chaudron, 1988).

A competent instructor enhances the STT and lowers the TTT, claims Harmer (1983). The quantity of TTT and the scope of students' interaction possibilities, however, are inversely correlated; that is to say, the more TTT, the less chances students have to

practice their L2 in class, which lowers the efficacy of their language usage (Slimani, 2001). Teachers should be advised by Malik, Jalall, Abbasi, and Rashid (2023) that excessive TTT lowers STT. They thus contend that it is critical for educators to be aware of these difficulties and work proactively to lower their TTT and raise STT.

Moreover, several TTT studies were conducted in an attempt to more thoroughly examine the connection between TTT and the student's learning process (McDonough & McDonough, 2014). Many others also believed that in EFL sessions, TTT—rather than STT—is more crucial. For instance, Haliti (2019) discovered that, in L2 classrooms, instructor speak often accounted for around two thirds of the talking time, which she deemed appropriate in an L2 setting.

Interaction Analysis Category System of Flanders (FIACS)

Interaction analysis, also known as interaction process analysis, is any of a number of techniques used to measure and describe how instructors and students behave in the classroom, according to Richards and Schmidt (2013). Using a categorization system or interaction analysis model, the many forms of student and instructor activity are categorized in interaction analysis, which involves observing classroom behavior. Because Flanders' (1970) Interaction Analysis Category System (FIACS) is more pertinent to this study than the other studies the researchers have studied (e.g., Brown, 1975), that is why they chose to concentrate on it.

The most popular and widely used technique for assessing verbal interaction in the classroom was first presented by Flanders (1970) (Pujiastuti, 2013, p. 164). This technique was used, among other things, by Putri (2015, p. 1) to gauge teacher chatter and the elements of classroom engagement. In the model, seven types of teacher speak were recognized. These include asking questions, lecturing, offering instructions, embracing or exploiting students' ideas, appreciating or supporting students' sentiments, and criticizing (justifying) authority. FIACS also includes the discussion types that students initiate and respond to. Position 10 is occupied by a quiet or perplexed time. When there is a quiet moment, there could be pauses, momentary silences, and moments of confusion when the spectator can't make out what is being said.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Design of the Research

Because it offers a comprehensive knowledge of a case, process, or interactional dynamics within a unit of study, a descriptive case study approach was used. As per Kumar's (2018) assertion, a descriptive case study is incapable of drawing any broad conclusions about a population that goes beyond the scope of the research.

The Study's Participants

Thirty-two second-year students from Gambella University's Department of English Language and Literature, which is located 390 kilometers away from Wollega University, and one EFL teacher participated in this research. Bailey (1994) suggests that a questionnaire's sample should include at least 30 participants from a statistical perspective,

however they stress that this is not a hard-and-fast rule. In order to fully understand the relevant and significant topics under investigation, case study research requires the intentional selection of cases with abundant material (Patton, 2002). In order to increase the variety of data acquired and increase the possibility of finding various realities at the institution in order to get such insights, a purposive sample approach was used.

Tools for Collecting Data

The research used quantitative approaches, combining observational data with answers to a closed-ended questionnaire. Combining several types of data may provide information about a phenomena that cannot be obtained by using just one kind of data (Bhattacherjee, 2012, p. 35).

Observation of a Classroom

An interaction analysis model and an observation checklist were used in the research to gather quantitative observation data. As a result, a modified version of Flanders' (1970) twelve-category interaction analysis category system (FIACS) was used to gather quantitative observation data. The patterns and volume of classroom interaction between the EFL teacher and the students were evaluated using the model. Flanders' interaction analysis category system is one of the observational techniques used to gauge teacher speaking and the elements of classroom interaction (Putri, 2015).

Knowing the following information is crucial for effectively using FIACS: Ten kinds of interaction patterns are included in the original Flanders observation instrument sheet. The model was changed to include twelve categories for the present investigation. Teacher discourse is the first major pattern, and it consists of:

A. Indirect influence includes things like (1) asking questions; (2) giving compliments or encouragement; (3) adopting or using students' ideas; and (5) lecturing.

B. Direct influence; examples include (6) providing instructions and (7) challenging or defending authority.

Student discourse has two primary patterns. These include:

(8) Student talk-response; (9) Student talk-initiation; (10) Silence or perplexity; (11); (12); and peer feedback are sub-patterns. Mendonca and Johnson (1994) assert that students utilize a variety of strategies during peer talks, including restating what their peers have written, adding clarifications, asking questions, and fixing mistakes.

Ten categories are observable or measurable in the original Flanders (1970) methodology. The model was adjusted for the present research, adding twelve areas that all contribute to achieving the study's goals. As a result, the observer recorded the tally beneath the classroom's interaction pattern every three seconds. The observer continually noted the tally whenever the classroom interaction patterns were repeated. As a result, by calculating the number or frequency of the tally, the patterns used in the classroom and the amount of time spent on each interaction pattern were determined.

Survey Questionnaire

Questionnaires are a very useful tool for

rapidly collecting data from a large number of responders (Boynton & Greenhalgh, 2004). Data for the research was gathered from second-year students in the Department of English Language and Literature at the chosen institution using a closed-ended questionnaire consisting of twelve questions. The researchers thus modified a 12-item, closed-ended questionnaire so that it might support Flanders' FIACS. Subsequently, a five-point Likert scale was used to score the oral interaction practices of the EFL teacher and students.

Procedures for Gathering Data

Data gathering began with classroom observations. The observations were made during spoken English I (EnLa 203) lessons in the designated EFL classroom. To ensure that all relevant data would be properly gathered, notes were made and audio recordings of the data were made during the observations. Second, a survey with a closed-ended format was used.

Techniques for Analyzing Data

Concurrent analysis was conducted using this strategy. To examine the quantitative classroom observation data, percentages were computed by counting the number of tally marks for each spoken interaction pattern every three seconds. Descriptive statistics were also used to assess the quantitative data that were gathered via the questionnaire. Following that, the gathered data were coded, categorized topically, and examined.

Applicability and Dependability of the Tools

The validity of the study's results was ensured by the use of many strategies. For instance, TEFL scholars provided input on the instruments' relevancy, wording, and question sequence. In addition, the data and the methods used to obtain it were triangulated. In this regard, Patton (2002, p. 247) observes that the research is improved by using a variety of data types via triangulation. To assess the inter-item reliability of the questionnaire items, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used. As a result, according to Dornyei (2002, p. 112), Cronbach's alpha showed > 0.70, which lay between zero and one. As a consequence, the reliability analysis result for the survey was accurate as it was.872 (according to Mallery & George, 1998).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The findings address two sub-sections in order to fulfill the study's purpose. By examining the information gathered from the classroom observation, the first subsection examined "Teacher Talk." Additionally, data from the students' questionnaire was evaluated. By examining the information gathered from the classroom observation, the second subsection illustrated "Student Talk." The information from the students' questionnaire was also covered.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the EFL Instructor Employed

Results from the Observation Data

The kinds and range of oral interaction patterns used by the EFL teacher are shown in Table 1. Patterns 1 (accepting emotions), 2 (praising or encouraging), 3 (accepting or employing students' ideas), 4 (asking

questions), 5 (lecturing), 6 (providing directives), and 7 (criticizing) are included in the table. As a result, Table 1's pattern types and the EFL instructor's use of them were examined, and Table 2's questionnaire data was triangulated with it.

Table 1

The Observed Oral Interaction Patterns Used by the EFL Instructor

Observ.	Instructor Talk															
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1							125	2.16	659	11.37	71	1.22			855	14.75
2							95	1.64	518	8.94	41	0.71			654	11.30
3							168	2.89	672	11.59	113	1.95			953	16.44
4			52	0.90			52	0.90	731	12.61	42	0.73	31	0.53	908	15.67
5			39	0.67			49	0.84	715	12.33	39	0.67			842	14.51
6			32	0.55			65	1.12	692	11.94	54	0.93	22	0.38	865	14.92
Total			123	2.12			554	9.55	3987	68.78	360	6.21	53	0.91	5077	87.59

Key: (F: *Frequency of the Occurrence of Patterns and Percent of the Amount Out of 100%)*

According to the observation data, the EFL teacher used pattern two—one of the seven patterns indicated in Table 1—for 123 (2.12%) of the class period to compliment or uplift pupils. The chart also showed that the teacher asked questions during pattern four, which accounted for 554 (9.55%) of the class time, with the goal of getting the students to react orally. Additionally, the information in the table showed that the teacher used pattern five 3987 (68.78%) of the class period for lecturing, presenting the subject of the lesson, providing information or viewpoints on the subject, and breaking down concepts. Furthermore, Table 1 showed that the EFL teacher guided students or gave instructions on how to do the class tasks during pattern six, which accounts for 360 (6.21%) of the class time. Lastly, the data in the table showed that the teacher reprimanded and gave commands to the class 53 (0.91%) times throughout pattern seven. Overall, the data showed that throughout the six observations, the EFL teacher employed five of the seven patterns shown in the table, using 5077 (87.59%) of the *5796 (100%) class time.

It should be noted that *5796 (100%) was obtained from the total amount of time spent in class, which includes 5077 (87.59%) for the EFL teacher and 719 (12.24%) for the students (Table 3).

Results from the Questionnaire Data

Table 2 summarizes the replies from the students about the kinds of oral engagement patterns that the EFL teacher used. The researchers used the value range allocation and interpretation of the Likert scale, as produced by Pimentel (2010, p. 110), in the following manner: 1.00–1.50: Never; 1.51-

2.50: Seldom; 2.51–3.50: Occasionally; 3.51–4.50: Frequently; and 4.51–5.00: Consistently; and examined the survey results in Tables 2 and 4.

Table 2

The EFL Instructor's Use of the Oral Interaction Patterns as Perceived by Students

No	Items	Likert Scale										Mean
	Our instructor:	1		2		3		4		5		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
1	Accepts the feelings of students	7	21.87	21	65.62	2	6.25	2	6.25	-	-	1.97
2	Praises students' actions or behaviors.	4	12.50	23	71.87	3	9.38	2	6.25	-	-	2.09
3	Uses students' ideas and develops them.	8	25.00	20	62.50	-	-	4	12.50	-	-	2.00
4	Asks questions with a good indentation	3	9.38	6	18.75	20	62.50	2	6.25	1	3.13	2.75
5	Lectures about the content of lessons.	-	-	-	-	4	12.50	7	21.88	21	65.62	4.53
6	Gives directions, or orders students to do what they are expected to do.	-	-	-	-	20	62.50	4	12.50	8	25	3.63
7	Criticizes the students for bad behavior.	2	6.25	1	3.13	20	62.50	4	12.50	5	15.63	3.28
	Average mean score											2.89

Table 2's questionnaire data findings showed that the EFL teacher used a lecture style without giving the students any chance to practice the other interaction styles mentioned in the table. Despite the fact that the teacher attempted to apply the seven interaction patterns shown in the table, as seen by the dispersion of his use of the patterns. Simply expressed, Item 1's 1.97 mean score meant that the teacher acknowledged the students' emotions. With a mean score of 2.09, item 2 also demonstrated that the teacher supported the students' spoken communication. With amean score of 2.00, item 3 in the table also demonstrated how the teacher used the thoughts of the pupils. With a mean score of 2.75, Item 4 further demonstrated that the teacher questioned the students with the expectation that they would respond to the questions and enhance their oral communication. Additionally, Item 5 (which had a 4.53 rating) disclosed that the teacher lectured or provided information or viewpoints about the subject matter or methodology of the classes. Additionally, Item 6 (mean score of 3.63) revealed that the teacher instructed, directed, or ordered the pupils to do the tasks at hand. Last but not least, with a mean score of 3.28 on Item 7, the kids felt that the teacher corrected them when they misbehaved.

The results of the questionnaire thus showed that the instructor employed patterns such as acknowledging students' feelings, supporting them, utilizing their ideas, posing questions, lecturing, providing instructions, and reprimanding them. This suggests that the results of the questionnaire and the observation data were somewhat consistent with one another.

The Extent of Oral Interaction Patterns the EFL Instructor Used

The researchers divided the data into three categories—the types of oral engagement the teacher used most often, less frequently, or not at all—in order to make it evident how much the instructor employed oral interaction.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the EFL Instructor Used Most Frequently

As can be shown in Table 1, the EFL teacher spent, on average, 68.78% of the six observations' class time using pattern five, which is lecturing. As can be seen in Table 2, the students' perception of the EFL instructor's most common method of instruction was lecturing, with a mean score of 4.53. Thus, there is a similarity between the data from the observation and the questionnaire in that the EFL instructor's most common oral interaction mode in both instances was lecturing.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the EFL Instructor Used Less Frequently

Results from the classroom observation

Table 1 presents the results of classroom observation data, which indicate that the EFL instructor used oral interaction patterns less frequently. These patterns included asking questions, which accounted for 554 (9.55%), giving directions or instruction, which made up 360 (6.21%), encouraging students, which accounted for 123 (2.12%), and criticizing students, which accounted for 53 (0.91%) of the total class time. The instructor's utilization of these patterns pales in comparison to lecturing (68.78%).

Results from the Questionnaire Data

As for the questionnaire findings, answers to Items 1 through 7 showed an average mean score of 2.89, which may be taken to signify that the teacher employed the patterns "sometimes." The teacher offered instructions, issued commands, and reprimanded pupils when they misbehaved, as seen by the mean scores of 3.63 and 3.28 in Items 6 and 7, respectively. These results fell within the "often" category. The mean score of 2.75 for Item 4 suggested that the teacher asked the class "sometimes." Lastly, the instructor's use of these patterns was classified as "Rarely" based on the mean scores of 2.00, 2.09, and 1.97 for Items 2, 3, and 1, respectively. Therefore, it was able to draw the conclusion that the EFL teacher dominated class time since she used the aforementioned patterns less often than she lectured. Overall, the results from the two data sets were comparable in that they showed identical oral interaction styles that the EFL teacher used less often in each instance.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the EFL Instructor Did Not Use

The EFL teacher did not employ patterns one (accepting students' sentiments) or three (using students' ideas) at all, according to Table 1's classroom observation data. Conversely, Table 2's data showed that the instructor used the patterns shown therein because the respondents could have been reluctant to provide a critical assessment of their teacher. Because the observation data matched what was really seen, the researchers were thus inclined to believe it.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the Students Employed

The kinds and range of spoken contact patterns that the students used are shown in Table 2. The following patterns may be seen in the table: one is accepting sentiments; two is praising or encouraging; three is accepting or using students' ideas; four is asking

questions; five is lecturing; six is providing instructions; and seven is criticizing. As a result, Table 1's pattern categories and the EFL instructor's use of them were examined, and Table 2's questionnaire results were compared.

Results from the Observation Data

The observation data (Table 3) showed that the oral interaction patterns that the students were expected to use were patterns eight and nine, respectively, including answering questions from the teacher, starting a conversation, negotiating meaning, and giving feedback to peers. As a result, Table 3's pattern categories and students' use of them were examined, and Table 4's questionnaire results were combined with the analysis.

Table 3

Observed Patterns of Student talks to the instructor and the peer

No. of Observ.	Student Talk to instructor				Silence		Peer talk					
	8		9		10		11		12		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	36	0.62									36	0.62
2	27	0.47									27	0.47
3	168	2.90									168	2.90
4	104	1.79					31	0.53			135	2.33
5	88	1.52	20	0.34			29	0.50			137	2.36
6	162	2.80	32	0.55			22	0.38			216	3.73
Total	585	10.10	52	0.89			82	1.41			719	12.41

Key: (F: *Frequency of the Occurrence of Patterns and Percent of the Amount Out of 100%).*

Table 3 shows that, on average, during the six classroom observations, students employed pattern eight, or student discussion replies, for 585 (10.10%) of the allotted class time. Additionally, it demonstrated that they initiated student talks using pattern nine, 52 (0.89%) of the class period. Additionally, they used pattern 11, implying that 82 (1.41%) of the class period was devoted to peers bargaining over meaning.

Overall, the data showed that throughout the six observations, students employed threeof the five patterns shown in the table, using 719 (12.41%) of the *5796 (100%) class time.

It should be noted that *5796(100%) of the class time was obtained by adding together all of the uses of the time, which includes 5077 (87.59%) of the EFL instructor's use (Table 1) and 719 (12.41%) of the students' use (Table 3).

Results from the Questionnaire Data

Table 4 provides an overview of the information gathered from the questionnaire on the students' use of oral interaction patterns.

Table 4

Items Indicating Patterns of Student Talks to the Instructor and the Peer

No.	Items: Our instructor:	Likert Scale 1 F	1 %	2 F	2 %	3 F	3 %	4 F	4 %	5 F	5 %	Mean
8	We respond to our instructor's questions.	4	12.50	3	9.38	21	65.62	2	6.25	2	6.25	2.84
9	We initiate a talk by asking questions, expressing own ideas or opinions.	1	3.13	24	75	2	6.25	3	9.38	2	6.25	2.41
10	We sometimes pause, keep silent, or become confused.	4	12.50	25	78.13	3	9.38	-	-	-	-	1.97
11	We negotiate for meaning among ourselves.	3	9.38	25	78.13	4	12.50	-	-	-	-	2.03
12	We give feedback to each other.	2	6.25	26	81.25	3	9.38	1	3.13	-	-	2.09
	Average Mean											2.63

Source: *Pimentel (2010, p.110)*

Table 4 displays the findings of the questionnaire, which show that the students used Item 8 to answer questions from their teacher. Additionally, the students utilized Item 9 to start a conversation by asking queries and offering their own opinions. Additionally, the results showed that students engaged in intramural bargaining using pattern 11. Nonetheless, it was required of the students to use pattern 12, that is, to provide feedback to one another. Generally speaking, the students attempted to apply patterns eight, nine, and eleven in the two data sets, despite discrepancies in what was seen and noted in the questionnaire.

The Extent of Students' Patterns of Oral Interaction Use

The researchers divided the data into three categories the oral interaction patterns that the students used most often, less frequently, or never at all in order to make it evident how much the students employed these patterns. The observation data in Table 3 and the questionnaire data in Table 4 were utilized by the researchers as references.

[

The Oral Interaction Patterns the Students Used Most Frequently

In the observation data (Table 3), there was no pattern of oral interaction that the students used most frequently. The questionnaire data in Table 4 also indicated that, on average, the students used a 2.63 mean score, which fell in the range of 'sometimes'. Therefore, it could be inferred that the students used none of the interaction patterns most frequently.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the Students Used Less Frequently

The results from the classroom Observation

According to the observation data (see Table 3), the students utilized patterns eight, or

student talk response, for a reduced amount of oral contact. This means that they used it for just 585 (10.10%) of the class period. Additionally, the data revealed that they used pattern nine, or student conversation start, 52 (0.89%) of the class periods. This is not very noteworthy. The students only engaged for 82 (1.41%) of the class period in pattern 11, or peer negotiation for meaning, suggesting that it was extremely little. Based on the six observations, the total amount of time that the students utilized the interaction patterns in class was only 719 (12.41%), suggesting that they employed the patterns less often.

The Results from the Questionnaire Data

As can be seen in Table 4, the questionnaire results revealed that pattern eight had a mean score of 2.84. This indicates that pattern eight was used by the pupils within the range of "sometimes." Additionally, the students used patterns 11 and 9 "rarely," as shown by their respective mean scores of 2.03 and 2.41. Overall, the results of the two instruments showed that the students used patterns eight, eleven, and nine less often.

The Oral Interaction Patterns the Students Did Not Use at All

The students did not utilize patterns 10 (quiet, pause, or bewilderment) or 12 (peer feedback) at all, according to Table 3's observations from the classroom. The mean of each answer, according to the student reports from Table 4, Items 10 and 12, was 2.09 and 1.97, respectively, indicating that the mean scores were in the "rarely" category. The researchers chose to assume that the students did not employ the suggested patterns even though there seemed to be some differences between the data from the observation and the students' answers to the questions. As a result, the researchers validated the information from classroom observations.

Discussion

The study's goal was to find out what kinds of interaction patterns students and the EFL teacher utilize. This section included the findings of the data from the two instruments.
Talk by the instructor: It was clear that the teacher controlled the class based on the kinds of classroom engagement patterns that she used. Consequently, there was a greater emphasis on one-way or unidirectional communication from the teacher to the pupils in these patterns. Regarding this discovery, Tsui (1995) voices his concern that it seems unfair for teachers to speak a lot in the classroom during EFL lessons since it prevents students from using the language in oral communication. As a result, the results agree with the body of current research.

The second study question's findings demonstrated that the EFL teacher mostly lectured without taking the students' comments into consideration. According to Afrin (2018), who concurs with this conclusion, students' lack of speak time and instructors' monopoly over talk time are the reasons for the low level of genuine classroom engagement. Additionally, the experts contend that students learn more in all studies the more they collaborate and converse in the target language.

The findings also demonstrated how seldom the EFL teacher used some of the interaction styles. In light of this discovery,

Pratiwi (2019) makes a strong case that, depending on the requirements of the students, it is preferable to minimize teacher talk time and enhance student talk time since, as she notes, excessive teacher talk would lower student talk time and enthusiasm for learning. Nonetheless, the present researchers think that if the teacher purposefully cut down on his lecture time, the results and the literature may line up. However, we vehemently contend that in this research, the teacher made it from his propensity to "lecture" a lot rather than by cutting down on his speaking in order to give students more student talk time. Indeed, this feeling may have originated from the teacher's own educational experiences.

Although the students said that the teacher utilized every pattern in Table 4, the findings showed that the instructor did not employ all of the patterns. What was seen in the classroom did not match the pupils' testimony. Consistent with this discovery, Klayman (1995) argues that under these conditions, there may exist a response bias to characterize various scenarios in which participants tend to give erroneous or fraudulent responses to self-reported questions, like those posed in surveys or organized interviews. Though he avoids drawing fast conclusions, the scholar's theory is also supported by the present researchers. Because the observation data matched what was really seen in the actual classroom observation, the researchers were thus more likely to trust it.

Student Talk: The topic of this discussion's subsection was how and when students used oral interaction patterns in EFL classes. Utilizing a foreign language is the most effective approach to both learn and teach it. The findings from the two data sets showed that the students had attempted to use some oral interaction patterns, particularly by observing that they were not silent and that there was no hesitation or uncertainty on the one hand, and that they provided feedback to one another during the interaction even though it was not seen that they were doing so. Conversely, as explained by Gass and Mackey (2006), language learners can concentrate on meaning, negotiate to make input understandable, and experiment with novel language forms as they produce language when they are involved in meaningful communication in a language. As a result, rather of just stating what they would like to do, the current researchers would like to commend the literature that already exists and encourage students to observe what they actually do.

Three levels of discussion are devoted to the findings about the degree to which students employ spoken interaction strategies. It was discovered from the results that none of the most common interaction patterns were used by the students. Is it the pupils or the educator who is at fault? According to a very recent study (Malik, Jalall, Abbasi & Rashid, 2023), too much teacher talk time (TTT) can result in less student talk time (STT), which reduces the opportunity for language practice and interaction for the students. As a result, they recommended that it was critical for educators to recognize these difficulties and take proactive measures to lower their TTT. The questions made by the scholars are also supported by the researchers working today.

Additionally, the data showed that several of the interaction styles were employed less frequently by the students. According to

Harmer (1983), a competent instructor optimizes the STT and decreases the TTT in light of this conclusion. Stated differently, Harmer sought to disclose that educators can be deemed unqualified if they provide a small STT. The current researcher intends to assert that the more TTT, the less opportunities students have to practice their L2 in class, which lowers the effectiveness of their language use. She is doing this by following Slimani's (2001) techniques as well. In the meanwhile, they recommended that educators recognize these difficulties and take proactive measures to lower their TTT and raise their STT.

Moreover, numerous TTT analyses were conducted in an attempt to more thoroughly examine the connection between TTT and the student's learning process (McDonough & McDonough, 2014). Many others also believed that in EFL sessions, TTT—rather than STT—is more crucial. For instance, Haliti (2019) discovered that, in L2 classes, instructor talk frequently accounted for roughly two thirds of the talking time, which she deemed appropriate in an L2 setting.

Last but not least, there were differences between the two sets of data about the pupils' lack of use of various interaction styles. Nonetheless, the researchers stuck to the observational data because they believed that people do not have a negative self-evaluation because that is how the classroom truly operated. Therefore, as brought out in the conversation, the students did not apply some of the interaction patterns because of the instructor's dominance or for other reasons.

CONCLUSIONS

The results section demonstrated that the instructor made an effort to incorporate oral contact, however class time was mostly devoted to instructors talking. Students' chances for language creation and interaction are negatively affected by this. In order to help students acquire a new language, the study stresses the significance of student-centered interactions in language classes. Implementing activities that promote group work and peer-to-peer conversation and offering feedback on language use can help achieve this goal. All things considered, teachers can do a better job of assisting their students' language development and building classroom community if they strive to create an atmosphere that is both supportive and engaged.

Regarding the level of spoken interaction patterns used, it may be said that the teacher did use some patterns, but clearly not to the expected extent. There was an imbalance between TTT and STT, thus even though he used them sparingly, they were not interactive. In order to improve language learning outcomes in EFL classes and encourage student engagement and proficiency, teachers should avoid using TTT excessively, either by controlling the class or by using the patterns nominally without student involvement. A more balanced approach that includes varied interaction patterns would be ideal.

No additional interaction patterns, such as the instructor utilizing or accepting student ideas, were mentioned. The researchers were led to believe that the instructor did not appear cooperative or share his thoughts with others when he exploited STT. One could go even farther and say that he would facilitate debates, role-playing exercises, and group discussions to boost language fluency and active involvement if he were that kind of reactive teacher.

Given that the lesson was not student-centered, it is reasonable to assume that students did not utilize the interaction patterns

to the intended extent or even at all, according to the overall review of the findings. Although students may not participate in class for various reasons, it is the instructor's responsibility to foster a more dynamic and collaborative environment so that students can actively participate in their language learning journey. As a whole, a student-driven method can improve language acquisition since it allows for more chances for real-life conversation and skill application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is expected that the instructor will be careful of his talking time and work towards creating a more balanced connection with students, since he is the one who should be shouldering all matters pertaining to the classroom.
2. It is recommended that he use a range of teaching strategies to engage pupils, accommodate diverse learning styles, and keep them actively involved in learning the language. Once again, the teacher may help students put their language abilities to use in the actual world by establishing an engaging and immersive classroom setting.
3. Students should work on their communication skills in a range of circumstances and with diverse partners to increase their proficiency in oral interaction patterns and their level of usage. All things considered, students need to put in more time practicing the target language in order to become more proficient in it.

.Finally, the researchers suggested ways to improve language interaction in general and how teacher dominance affects student participation in language acquisition. They also suggested tactics to boost student engagement and autonomy in the classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers would like to express their appreciation to Gambella University community for their cooperation during the study period. Particularly, we would like to thank the EFL instructor who was offering the course Spoken English I (EnLa 203) and the second year students in the department of English language and literature for their willingness to participate in the study during the data collection.

DECLARATION

There was no conflict of an interest between the authors.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Upon request, the corresponding author will provide the data used to support the study's conclusions.

REFERENCES

Adaba, H. W. (2017). Exploring the practice of Teacher-Student classroom interaction in EFL to develop the learners' speaking skills in Tullu Sangota Primary School Grade eight students in focus. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, *08*(04). https://doi.org/10.4172/2151-6200.1000295

Afrin, T. (2018). The role of classroom interaction in improving learners' speaking skills: A case study of private universities (Unpublished MA thesis in TESOL), Brac University, Brac, Bangladesh. http://hdl.handle.net/10361/10319

Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning*. *Applied Linguistics*, *5*(2), 156–171. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin /5.2.156

Bailey, K. M. (1994). The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(1), 209. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587214

Baker, J. A. (2006). Contributions of teacher–child relationships to positive school adjustment during elementary school. *Journal of School Psychology*, *44*(3), 211–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/ j.jsp.2006.02.002

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social science Research: principles, methods, and practices*. http://repository.out.ac.tz/504/

Boynton, P., & Greenhalgh, T. (2004). Selecting, designing, and developing your questionnaire. *The BMJ*, *328*(7451), 1312–1315. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj. 328.7451.1312

Brown, G. (1976). Microteaching: A Programme of Teaching Skills. *British Journal of Educational Studies 24* (2), 180. https://doi.org/10.2307/3120386

Byrne, D. (1987). *Techniques for classroom interaction*. http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/ BA03765551

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms. Research on Teaching and Learning.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo978113952446 9

Dornyei, Z. (2002). Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, Administration, and Processing. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/ mono/10.4324/9780203864739

Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teacher behavior*. London: Harper and Row. https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_196112

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output. *AILA Review*, *19*, 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.03gas

George, D., & Mallery, P. (1998). *SPSS for Windows Step by step: A simple guide and reference*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED425201

Haliti, T. (2019). "Teacher Talking Time VS Student Talking Time: Encouraging Speaking in EFL Classroom- A case study at the 'Sami Frasheri' Gymnasium in Prishtina." *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, *47*(2), 12–21. https://gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicA ndApplied/article/ download/10064/4402

Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching*. http://archives.umc. edu.dz/handle/123456789/112039

Jora, M. B. (2019). ELT in Nepal: Exploring the Paradigm shift. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, *9*(1), p8597. https://doi.org/ 10.29322/ ijsrp.9.01.2019.p8597

Klayman, J. (1995). Varieties of confirmation bias. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* (pp. 385–418). https://doi.org/10.1016/s0079-7421(08)60315-1

Kumar, R. (2018). *Research Methodology : A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. SAGE Publications Ltd - Torrossa. https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/ an/5018508

Malik, A. H., Jalall, M. A., Abbasi, S. a. R., & Rashid, A. (2023). Exploring the impact of excessive teacher talk time on participation and learning of English language learners. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, *11*(2), 46-55. *www.vfast.org*.https://doi.org/10.21015/vtess.v11i2. 1519

McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (2014). Research methods for English language teachers. In *Routledge eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315832548

Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer Review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(4), 745. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587558

Nelson, K. (1985). Making sense : the acquisition of shared meaning. CiNii Research. New York: Academic Press.https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1130000795377744640

Olana, T., & Beriso, I. (2015). Teachers' help of students to use English in selected secondary schools at Nekemte, Ethiopia. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal*, *3*(4), 179. https://doi.org/10.4314/star.v3i4.26

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rdedition.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/qualitative-research-evaluation-methods/book232962

Pimentel, J. L. (2010). *A note on the usage of Likert Scaling for research data analysis - USM R & D 18(2): 109-112 - Studocu*. https://www.studocu.com

Pratiwi, W. R. (2019). Teacher talk and instructional language choice: Two problems encountered in EFL classroom. *Exposure Journal, 7*(2), 214-227. DOI: 10.24252/Eternal.V51.2019.A15

Pujiastuti, R. T. (2013). Classroom interaction: An analysis of teacher talk and student talk in English for young learners. *Journal of English and Education, 1*(1), 163-172. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/193252-EN-classroom-interaction-an-analysis-of-tea.pdf

Putri, S. (2015). The analysis of teacher talk and the characteristic of classroom interaction in English as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of English and Education, 3*(2), 16-27. file:///C:/Users/wu/Downloads/4752-9214-1-SM.pdf

Rahimpour, M. & Magsoudpour, M. (2011). Teacher-Students' Interactions in Task-Based vs Form-Focused Instruction. *World Journal of Education, 1*(1), DOI: 10.5430/wje.v1n1p171

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://www.mku.edu.tr /files/132-93d901d4-2c17-49d2-83a9

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd edition.). UK: Pearson Education Limited. DOIhttps://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835

Simegn, B. (2012). *A study of secondary school EFL teachers' pedagogical beliefs and classroom practices*. https://oatd.org/oatd/record?record=oai%5C%3Alocalhost%5C%3A123456789%5C%2F4304

Slimani, A. (2001). Evaluation of classroom interaction. *English Language Teaching in its Social Context. London: Routledge*, 287-303.

Tekeste N. (2006). *Education in Ethiopia: From crisis to the brink of collapse*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet. file:///C:/Users/wu/Downloads /Education_in_Ethiopia_From_Crisis_to_the.pdf

Tsui, A.B.M. (1995). *Introducing classroom interaction.* London: Penguin. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1168987

Tuan, L.T. & Nhu, T. K. (2010). Theoretical review on oral interaction in EFL classrooms. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *1* (4), 29-48.

Tuan, N. H. & Mai, T. N. (2015). Factors affecting students' speaking performance at Le Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research, 3* (2), 8-23. www.cscanada.org

Wubalem G. (2019). History of education and English language teaching in Ethiopia: A brief survey [Unpublished PhD thesis]. KIIT Deemed University Bhubanswar, India. https://www. researchgate.net/ publication/ 331412029

Yanfen, L., & Yuqin, Z. (2010). A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. *Foreign Language Teaching & Research Press, 33*(2), 76-86.