Original Research

Techniques EFL Teachers use to improve students' Oral Output Production: East Wollega Zone High schools in Focus

Endalew Alemayehu[1*], Tekle Ferede[2] & Zeleke Teshome[1]

[1]Department of Language Studies and Literature, Wollega University, P.O. Box: 395, Nekemte, Ethiopia

[2]Department of Language Studies and Literature, Jimma University, Jimma, Ethiopia

Abstract	Article Information
Research in this area has focused on how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) educators encourage student oral production in the classroom. The teachers at the East Wollega zone's high schools were the main subjects. The study was conducted throughout the academic year of 2020–21. A descriptive survey was the research method employed in the study. The researcher used a variety of sampling procedures, such as random sampling for schools, availability sampling for questionnaire samples, and selective sampling for grade levels. The researcher also selected a subset of the students and components to study using a random sampling strategy. Classroom observation and surveys of EFL educators and their students were part of this research. Analyses were conducted on the acquired data using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Thirty EFL instructors and fifty students participated in the study by way of classroom observation and a closed-ended questionnaire. We utilized quantitative and qualitative approaches to analyze the data, and we double-checked the results from each instrument. According to the study's results, English as a foreign language (EFL) instructors' method for helping their students improve their oral output production fell short of both expectations and standards.	

INTRODUCTION

According to Peña and Onatra (2009) and Byrne (1991), OI comprises reacting in a predictable manner while engaging in a process of conversing and listening. If you want more understandable input and better results, you need OI, says Long (1980). The interaction model is similarly derived from Krashen's input hypothesis and Swain's output hypothesis, as pointed out by Gass and Mackey (2007). Although there is consensus among writers that both input and output are necessary for meaningful OI, the focus of this research case is on OO. The output theory was initially put out in the late 1980s by Merrill

Swain, a linguist from Canada. It just came to light, casting doubt on Krashen's input hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), which states that the presence of coherent input is necessary for language development. But according to Swain (1985), unlike passively receiving information, active production of language forces learners to probe the meaning and forms of language more thoroughly, enabling them to put their assumptions about input comprehension to the test. Additionally, as Long (1996) demonstrated in his revised interaction hypothesis, oral production is necessary for the OI to be used meaningfully.

This and related facts highlight the critical importance of EFL teachers' pedagogical approaches in enhancing students' OOP. According to Hughes et al. (2002) and Khadidja (2010), teachers can assist their students improve their communication skills by providing tools that educate them to control their speech, maintain meaningful conversations, and negotiate interactions effectively. Oral phrases used by English teachers to elicit responses from their students can provide new perspectives on the significance of the encounter and sustain the flow of information. In keeping with this, Zhang (2009) defines interaction as a two-way exchange where one party seems to have misunderstood the other and has to pause the conversation so that they can both understand (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Accordingly, the tactics used by EFL instructors to include OI into their lessons may greatly impact the significance of the engagement. If students do not have the means to articulate their thoughts, then strategies must be implemented (Khadja, 2010).

For classroom instruction to have any value and for students and teachers to be able to understand one another, OI is a must. Answering questions, raising queries, and making comments are essential components of OI in English class because they allow students to actively engage in the process of negotiating understandable input and creating understandable output (Dawit & Demis, 2015). Classroom OI may fail in other contexts, such as when students' rights are infringed upon and the speaker takes over the discussion, leading to misunderstandings between the students. Ethiopian English as foreign language (EFL) instructors often dictate class topics and pacing to fit their own preferences and agendas.

This may happen if the EFL teacher doesn't employ a range of techniques to inspire OO production from their students. Students' engagement in OIP, and the quality of education they receive more generally, depend on the methods used by their teachers. In contrast to the level's expectations for OO production in English class, the tactics used by EFL instructors to encourage student participation in OIP in an Ethiopian environment appear sufficient. According to Mukedzi (2013), a teacher's pedagogical approaches, as well as their material, topic, and learning activity choices, are all part of their teaching strategy. Furthermore, in an EFL classroom setting, OO production is closely tied to student engagement, which in turn is influenced by the teacher's approach to instruction. In addition to addressing students' issues with oral communication, Nakatani (2010) argues that effective communication tactics in the classroom can boost students'

oral ability through increasing their engagement in class discussions and other forms of collaborative learning. The aforementioned author went on to say that in order for students to gain self-assurance in their speaking abilities and develop into proficient English communicators, they must be exposed directly to the pedagogical practices employed in English classes. Despite this, the researcher found that both the students' OOP and their involvement in OIP were steadily decreasing. Therefore, the researcher felt compelled to delve deeper into his study in this particular domain.

Students' oral communication (OI) abilities in English classes are declining and underutilized due to the high demand for speaking practice, according to the researcher's own observations and those of other local researchers (Birhanu, 2000; Habtamu, 2017; Mebratu, 2018; Melaku, 2005; Meseret, 2007). So, the study set out to find out if the tactics used by EFL teachers are to blame for the falling OI and OOP scores of their pupils. Finding out how EFL teachers use different inputs to boost their students' oral output production was the original goal of the study, as did determining why OO is useful in OIP for EFL classrooms.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Study Setting

During the 2020–21 school year, researchers in Ethiopia's Oromia regional state visited a small number of public high schools in the East Wollega zone to collect data. Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia, is located 328 kilometers west of the zone. The study's six public high schools were selected at random from among the zone's seventeen woredas. Since some private high schools follow their own unique curricula rather than the one set out by the Ministry of Education, this study mostly looked at public high schools.

Demographics and Experiment

East Wollega High School English teachers and students from the 2020–2021 school year participated in this research. The people who fall into a certain category or a smaller subset of that category make up the research population, according to Salaria (2012). The high schools that made up the sample were randomly selected from among the approximately seventeen weredas that made up the East Wollega zone. The researcher randomly selected EFL instructors and students from Dalo, Gute, Jimma Arjo, Sire, Getema, and Diga high schools because it would have been too tedious to include every subject from every woreda in the zone. For populations under a thousand, Neuman (1992) suggests a 30% ratio, and the data backs up his claim. Additionally, it is highly unlikely that all of the woredas' schools will send participants to the study. This is due to the fact that increasing the number of variables in a sample might lead to less significant results (Dattalo, 2008).

Therefore, the six high schools stated earlier were selected at random, and the grade levels were intentionally picked with the notion that students at this level communicate in English orally. We also used an availability sampling method to select 30 EFL instructors to fill out our survey. Accordingly, Diga and Getema had four teachers, Gute and Arjo had

six, and Dalo and Sire had five. Also, 50 students were chosen at random to fill out the survey; 9 pupils from Sir, Gute, and Arjo, 8 from Dalo and Getema, and 7 from Diga. In addition, portions were chosen at random for the purpose of classroom observation. The following animals were chosen at random for two rounds of observation: 9B = Dalo, 9A = Getema, 10C = Gute, 10D = Arjo, 11A = Diga, and 11C from Sire.

Data Collecting Tools

It is the process of collecting particular evidence utilizing various devices that is known as data collection. So, the researcher observed classes and administered questionnaires to a group of high school EFL instructors and students. According to Fife-Schaw (2006), questionnaires are a great way to get a lot of information quickly and easily without breaking the bank. The researcher achieved this goal by administering an 18-item closed-ended questionnaire to EFL instructors and students. The items are organized into two themes: techniques for different types of inputs (4 items) and strategies for different types of oral output (18 items). We used a five-point Likert scale for all of the theme-related items; 1 means severely disagree, 2 means disagree, 3 means undecided, 4 means agree, and 5 means strongly agree.

Furthermore, the researcher delved deeper into the tactics employed by EFL teachers to enhance their students' oral output production through classroom observation. According to Crado & Brewer (2002), Thomas (2003), and Walliman (2001), classroom observation helps us comprehend people's actions, motives, and social interactions. According to these writers, seeing people in action is a great approach to learn about human behavior. A deliberate and intentional method of observing and/or documenting a natural interaction or phenomena is, thus, what we call an observation. Nunan (1992) argues that understanding the settings, methods, and limitations of real classroom education is best accomplished through observation. Denscombe (2007) points out that classroom observation is more direct and relies on the direct evidence of the eye to see occurrences, rather than relying on people's reported actions or thoughts. Sarantakos (2005) makes a similar point, highlighting that observation provides first-hand information independent of second-hand accounts.

Based on the findings from the literature review and with some adaptations from Meehan et al. (2004) and others, the classroom observation items were constructed. In order to ensure that the data from the instruments were consistent and verifiable, the researcher created items that were identical to the items found in the questionnaires. Researchers do not disagree, according to Kumar (2011), that a range of methods can yield more reliable results. In keeping with this idea, Anderson (1998) points out that researchers can acquire a thorough understanding of the topic at hand by making use of a variety of data sources and approaches. So, this study's researcher adapted these data gathering instruments from previous research in related domains (Mebratu, 2018; Mouhoub, 2016; Sultana, 2015; Wright, 1987) and built them from the ground up.

Endalew A. et al

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July - Sep. 2021, 10(3), 53-66

Techniques for Analyzing Data

The main purpose of this study was to collect data, which was achieved through the use of a questionnaire and interviews. Therefore, the researcher developed 5-point Likert scale surveys and quantitatively tested them with high school English teachers and students. Establishing a criterion for interpreting the Likert scale points is of utmost importance to the researcher, along with ensuring the questions are legitimate and reliable. Despite the debate surrounding the midpoint Likert scale, researchers Kulas et al. (2008) and Raaijmakers et al. (2000) argued that it is essential to have a clear midpoint scale statement. This is because asking respondents to choose between agree or disagree options could lead to misleading conclusions. "Neither agree nor disagree," "undecided," "don't know," or "no opinion" can be indicated by midpoints, according to some academics (Raaijmakers, et al., 2000).

When respondents could provide a good rationale for their position, they would choose "agree" or "disagree" on the continuum; however, when they were unsure or couldn't provide a good rationale, they would select "undecided" (Krosnick. et al., 2002). Hence, "poor understanding" was the current researcher's definition of the midpoint scale (3= unsure). Along with the questionnaire, the researcher also employed classroom observation to acquire data, which was then examined qualitatively. Consequently, data collected from teachers' surveys, students' surveys, and classroom observation was cross-checked with results from a thematic analysis of items under each study question or target. Consequently, descriptive statistics, namely frequency and mean, were applied to the questionnaire data. The majority of descriptive analysis, according to Kothari (2004), involves studying distributions of a single variable. The qualitative data, on the other hand, was derived from interviews and classroom observations.

Important Moral Factors

Many topics were considered from an ethical standpoint by the researcher. The researcher began by sending official letters to the school principals from the office of the research director at Wollega University before visiting the chosen schools to perform the research. Following this, the research's purpose was explained to both the school principals and the students who would be participating in the study. Additionally, the data was collected after conversations were done with EFL teachers to alter the program. The author or sources of the ideas that contributed to the study's success, either directly or indirectly, were also acknowledged by the researcher. In addition, the researcher had faith in and ensured the confidentiality of the participants' data. In a similar vein, Krefting (1991) notes that research initiatives are credible when they capture the participants' actual experiences and perspectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Results

The primary goal of this research was to determine how English as a foreign language (EFL) instructors enhance their students' out-of-class performance (OOP). Therefore, it is crucial to examine the phrase "teaching strategy" according to the perspectives of many scholars before moving on to the data analysis.

Scholars generally believe that strategies are tools that improve communication in a methodical way and are used to deal with communication problems and prevent breakdowns. Issues like "breakdowns" and "gaps" in communication are addressed using a variety of ways. Oral communication strategies (OCS) are tools for maintaining or mending communication, say Brown (2014) and Nakatani (2005). The capacity to effectively navigate interaction and influence conversations is defined by Hughes et al. (2002) as the tactics used by ELF teachers to make learners reveal their OO. Furthermore, in order for interlocutors to achieve their communication goals, instructional tactics revolve upon paraphrase, literal translation, language switching, gestures, and appealing for aid (Chamot, 2005; Rastegar & Gohari, 2016). Accordingly, a substantial body of research (Alibakhshi & Padiz, 2011; Campillo, 2006; Nakatani, 2010; Nguyet & Mai, 2012; Tian, 2011) supports the implementation of speaking tactics across all educational levels with the aim of enhancing students' oral communication skills.

Using the aforementioned theoretical frameworks, the researcher developed 18-item surveys to assess the methods employed by EFL educators to enhance their students' OOP. One item on each survey asked respondents to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a statement using a five-point Likert scale running from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The researcher utilized the alpha measure (Cronbach's alpha) to measure the items' dependability. Then, the researcher thematically examined the items' alpha measures and included them in the table below. Tests of cognitive capacity should not have reliability coefficients below 0.7, according to Heale and Twycross (2015) and Muijs (2004). You may see the items' alpha results organized in a table below.

Table 1

The alpha measures of the items as to their thematic group

Teacher's questionnaire	
S.	Items in theme	Alpha coefficient
1	Strategies of varying inputs	0.879
2	The strategy of using OO for different purposes	0.833
Student's questionnaire		
1	Strategies of varying inputs	0.868
2	The strategy of using OO for different purposes	0.917

Thirty high school EFL teachers filled out the survey, and our data was evaluated using descriptive statistics, namely the percentage, frequency, and mean value. For ordinal data, a standard deviation is not a good choice. "It is meaningless to use standard deviation with nominal or even, strictly speaking, with ordinal data," Denscombe(2007) adds, lending credence to this claim. We have no idea what makes ordinal data sets different or how much variation there is between them. The following are the item analyses as shown in the table: The researcher followed the opinions of several scholars when interpreting the results of the mean value after analyzing the items under the theme using SPSS. The following is how EFL educators view oral production:

Table 2

Description of EFL Teachers' Questionnaire on Teaching Strategies

Items on strategies of varying inputs	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
I ask students different questions to let them give OO differently.	8	26.7	18	60	4	13.3	-	-	-	-	1.87
I make learners use minimal responses to attract their attention to ward producing OO for what is initiated.	1	3.3	17	56.7	8	26.7	2	6.7	2	6.7	2.57
I vary topics for OI practice to increase learners' OOP.	7	23.3	19	63.3	4	13.3	-	-	-	-	1.90
I use different contents in English class so as to participate all the learners in OI practice.	8	26.7	18	60	4	13.3	-	-	-	-	1.87
Grand Mean											2.05
The strategy of using OO for d/f purposes	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
I use comprehension-checking expressions to increase my students' OOP.	7	23.3	15	50	8	26.7	-	-	-	-	2.03
I make students produce OO in the form of a request for clarification.	7	23.3	16	53.3	5	16.7	2	6.7	-	-	2.06
When learners don't understand the question, I prefer to change the direction of the discussion rather than stay silent	8	26.7	14	46.7	7	23.3	1	3.3	-	-	2.03
I use a repetition strategy to increase learners' participation in OOP.	7	23.3	14	46.7	7	23	1	3.3	-	-	2.17
I ask probing questions (like why, how, and others) to increase learners' OOP through reasoning.	6	20	14	46.7	8	26.7	2	6.7	-	-	2.20
When my learners need to think of what to say, I encourage them to use fillers pertaining to the context to gain time.	9	30	13	43.3	8	26.7	-	-	-	-	1.97
I engage myself in group discussions in order to maximize students' OOP.	10	33.3	13	43.3	6	20	1	3.3	-	-	1.93
I paraphrase my idea to enable the learners to produce OO.	11	36.7	11	36.7	8	26.7	-	-	-	-	1.90
I give individual learners chances to produce OO so as to improve their OI skills.	9	30	14	46.7	6	20	1	3.3	-	-	1.97
To make individual learners give OO voluntarily, I raise questions for the whole class.	12	40	13	43.3	4	13.3	1	3.3	-	-	1.80
I raise questions for a few students when I think others will benefit from it.	12	40	14	46.7	3	10	1	3.3	-	-	1.77
I raise questions for all students turn by turn to improve their OOP.	12	40	12	40	5	16.7	1	3.3	-	-	1.83
I strictly correct students' pronunciation mistakes while they speak.	13	43.3	10	33.3	5	16.7	2	6.7	-	-	1.67
I use avoidance strategies to interrupt learners' troubles in OOP.	11	36.7	13	43.3	3	10	3	10	-	-	1.93
Grand mean											1.95

Keys,1 =Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Undecided 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree, OO=oral output, OOP = oral output production, OI =oral interaction, OIP = oral interaction practice

Items pertaining to the methods employed by EFL educators to enhance their students' capacity for producing oral output are included in Table 2. There are a total of 18 things that fall into two categories: strategies for working with varied inputs and strategies for applying OO to various tasks. The result falls somewhere on the disagreement continuum, and the first set of items reflects that. In particular, nearly 80% of people who took the survey did not agree that EFL instructors employed a range of resources to boost their students' OOP. Respondents' dissatisfaction with the theory was further reinforced by the group's grand mean of 2.05, which is located on the disagreement side of

the middle point scale of 3.00. It was also found during the classroom observation that teachers did not use a range of inputs to increase students' OOP. Unless CO1T3, CO1T6, and CO2T2 utilized very few responses to encourage students to actively participate in OOP, the professors did not use a variety of questions, subjects, or contents to increase students' OOP.

In regards to the second theme, fourteen questions were utilized to collect information regarding the various uses of students' oral comments. The majority of instructors did not agree with the students' assertion that OO serves several functions in OIP, according to the results. The majority of respondents (75%) in every instance were opposed to the idea. In a similar vein, the theme's grand mean (1.95) verified that the learners' OO was not utilized for other objectives. It was also found during the classroom observation that students' OO was not utilized for various reasons. Students did not actively participate in responding to teachers' spoken instructions in the vast majority of classroom observation cases. Among OO's many applications are better input generation, syntactic processing, OI breakdown maintenance, comprehension testing, automaticity development, personal voice development, and many more. (Individuals cited in Bygate, 2001; DeKeyser, 1997; Swain, 2005; Tuan & Nhu, 2010). With the exception of CO1T1, CO2T3, and CO2T4, where it served approval, rejection, remedial, and evaluational functions, the results of the classroom observation indicated that the students' OO was not utilized for either of these goals. A lot of people did use yes/no, right/wrong, yes/but, and other similar terms.

Items in Table 3 of the student survey pertain to the methods employed by EFL instructors to enhance their OOP in the classroom. The 18 components that make up the set are organized into two main categories: strategies for working with different inputs and strategies for utilizing OOs for various goals. The result falls somewhere on the disagreement continuum, and the first set of items reflects that. Regarding the claim that EFL instructors utilised a range of resources to enhance their students' OOP, over three quarters of the people polled held this view. Similarly, the grand mean of 1.95 verified that the respondents were in opposition with the proposition. It was also clear from the classroom observation results that teachers weren't utilizing a variety of inputs to boost students' OOP. With a few exceptions, such as when CO1T3, CO1T6, and CO2T2 utilized limited responses to pique students' interest in verbal response production, the teachers did not employ a variety of questions, subjects, and contents to increase students' OOP. In addition, contrary to what is said in the literature, the results of the classroom observation demonstrated that the students' OO was not utilized for a variety of objectives. Among OO's many applications are better input generation, syntactic processing, OI breakdown maintenance, comprehension testing, automaticity development, personal voice development, and many more. (Individuals cited in Bygate, 2001; DeKeyser, 1997; Swain, 2005; Tuan & Nhu, 2010).

Table 3

Description of Students' Questionnaire on Teaching Strategies

Items on strategies of varying inputs	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
My teacher asks me d/f questions to let me give OO differently.	23	46	15	30	8	16	4	8	-	-	1.86
Our teacher makes us use minimal response to begin practicing OOP.	14	28	22	44	8	16	5	10	1	2	2.14
We use different topics in OIP to increase our oral output production.	20	40	18	36	11	22	1	2	-	-	1.86
We use different contents in English class so as to participate in OIP.	18	36	20	40	9	18	3	6	-	-	1.94
Grand Mean											1.95

The strategy of using OO for d/f purposes	1		2		3		4		5		Mean
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
We practice oral output production by requesting clarification on what is not clear.	20	40	16	32	14	28	-	-	-	-	1.88
When we fail to understand the message & OI it tends to be broken down, and the teacher changes the direction of the discussion to ease it.	13	26	21	42	8	16	7	14	1	2	2.24
The teacher encourages us to use the repetition strategy to increase learners' participation in producing OO.	14	28	23	46	11	22	2	4	-	-	2.02
Our teacher asks questions like why and how to increase the learners' level of OP by justifying their answers.	17	34	17	34	9	18	3	6	4	8	2.20
The teacher takes part in group discussions in order to maximize students' OOP.	19	38	17	34	11	22	2	4	1	2	1.98
Our teacher gives individual learners chances to improve their OOP & OIS.	20	40	15	30	10	20	5	10	-	-	2.00
The teacher modifies his/her message on the basis of feedback received.	19	38	15	30	14	28	2	4	-	-	1.98
The teacher directs most of the questions to shy learners to build their confidence in producing OO.	18	36	19	38	10	20	2	4	1	2	1.98
The teacher puts learners at ease to freely produce OO.	18	36	17	34	10	20	4	8	1	2	2.06
When I don't understand the speaker, my teacher initiates me to ask the speaker what it means.	21	42	14	28	10	20	5	10	-	-	1.98
When learners don't understand something, the teacher encourages them to ask other students for help.	18	36	18	36	10	20	3	6	1	2	2.02
When learners need to think of what to say, the teacher encourages them to use fillers (like) to gain time.	24	48	12	24	11	22	3	6	-	-	1.86
My teacher paraphrases his expressions to help the learners produce OO.	22	44	16	32	7	14	3	6	2	4	1.94
My teacher uses idea-shifting strategies to overcome confusion problems in OOP.	20	40	18	36	11	22	1	2	-	-	1.86
Grand mean											2.00

Endalew A. et al

Sci. Technol. Arts Res. J., July - Sep. 2021, 10(3), 53-66

Both of these goals were not met by the students' OOs, according to the results of the classroom observations. With the exception of CO1T1, CO2T3, and CO2T4, students rarely verbalized their responses to the teachers' comments.Approval, denial, correction, and evaluation were the functions they served. A lot of people did use yes/no, right/wrong, yes/but, and other similar terms. The second theme involved the researcher using the students' spoken responses for various reasons and administering 14 items to collect data. The majority of students did not agree that OO serves several functions in OIP, according to their responses. The majority of responders (72%) were opposed to the idea, as shown in Table 3 up above. Similarly, the fact that the learners' OOs were not utilized for various objectives was corroborated by the grand mean of the theme (2.00).

DISCUSSION

In order to better understand how EFL teachers enhance their students' OOP, the study utilized a total of eighteen components. As seen in Table 2 and Table 3 above, the items were categorized into two themes for both the instructor and student situations. As a result, the first set of researchers looked at methods that involve changing inputs based on the students' backgrounds in order to boost their OOP; they found that EFL instructors didn't do this. Also, classroom observation results show that EFL teachers didn't use input variation to boost students' OOP; limited responses were also rarely used.

On the other hand, Kennedy (2007) asserted that students' critical thinking skills are associated with their participation in various extracurricular activities. Language instructors must be astute enough to connect the material to their students' interests and situations, as pointed out by Villalobos (2015), who also said that the level of personalization in speaking activities is always significant because it is an effective attention-getter. Teachers' beliefs and pedagogical styles are evident in the activities they choose to use in the classroom (Sánchez et al., 2016). Whether an activity is valuable, engaging, essential, or motivating for students is based on the teacher's expectations for what the students should learn. Similarly, Leaver and Stryker (1989) stressed the importance of tailoring lessons to each student's individual level and addressing their emotional and cognitive requirements. Increasing students' OOP is a goal of many researchers, and one approach is to use a variety of inputs. However, classroom observation and teacher and student surveys both pointed to the fact that EFL instructors didn't utilize a wide range of inputs—including contents, themes, assignments, exercises, and more—to boost students' OOP.

The second type of questions asked by both the instructors and the students in the two sets of surveys relate to the final uses of the students' oral presentations. Teachers and students alike were led to believe that their instructors were not making use of their students' spoken work for a variety of objectives, according to survey data. Table 3 and Table 2 showed that 72% of students and 75% of professors were against the plan. Similarly, the findings from the classroom observation confirmed that OO pupils are less

likely to be utilized for other reasons when OI is not meaningfully done and when short, binary answers like "Yes," "No," "Correct," or "Wrong" are used. Asking for clarification, confirmation, repetition, comments, checking understanding, recasting, and many more purposes are basically what OO in the OI class is used for. "Sundari" (2018) writes. Not only that, but Bygate (Bygate, 2001; Kid Sense, 2017; McDonough, 2005; Swain, 1985; Tuan & Nhu, 2010) and others have highlighted the many uses of OO, including but not limited to: input generation, hypothesis testing, automaticity development, discourse skills, personal voice, OI adjustment, and many more. Class observation and instructor surveys showed, however, that students' spoken replies were utilized for neither of the aforementioned goals. According to the study, there were two main causes for this. To begin with, with the exception of a few of instances where they gave "yes or no, agree or disagree, right or wrong" answers, the pupils could not muster OO. Secondly, even with such restricted responses, the teacher's ineffective teaching methods greatly hindered their ability to utilize them for various objectives.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors work to improve their students' oral presentation skills. The study's primary goals were to(1) establish ways for using oral output for different purposes and(2) evaluate EFL teachers' tactics for using varied inputs to improve students' OOP. Using a variety of inputs to enhance students' OOP is not something that EFL teachers do, according to the results. In situations where the structural and communicative activities are meant to be used equally, they seldom employ minimal response activities. Furthermore, OIPs could only cover material included in the textbook; nonetheless, instructors were encouraged to tailor the materials to the specific contexts in which their students found themselves. Just like students didn't utilize OO for varied goals, professors didn't employ tactics to indirectly maximize their engagement in OOP. However, in order to keep pupils talking, professors must ask for their explanation, assess their understanding, or serve some other function.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DECLARATION

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article materials.

REFERENCES

Alibakhshi, G., & Padiz, D. (2011). The effect of teaching strategic competence on speaking performance of EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(4), 941- 947.

Anderson, A., & Garrod, S. (1987). *The dynamics of referential meaning in spontaneous dialogue: some preliminary studies.* Communication failure in dialogue and discourse, 161-183, Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers.

Berhanu, Bogale. (2000). *Verbal interaction in group work*. (Unpublished Ph. D thesis) Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning & teaching*, (6th edition) Pearson Education, ESL

Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. Researching pedagogic tasks. *Second language learning, teaching and testing,* 23-48.

Byrne, D. (1991). *Teaching oral English.* London: Longman.

Campillo, P. S. (2006). The use of circumlocution in the foreign language context. *Porta Linguarum*, *5*, 7-15.

Chamot, A.U., 2005. Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25,* 112-130.

Crado, W.D. & Brewer, M.B. (2002). *Principles and methods of social research,* (2nd edition). New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Dattalo, P. (2008). *Determining Sample Size: Balancing Power, Precision, and Practicality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Dawit, T.A. & Demis, D. (2015). Causes of students' limited participation in EFL classroom: Ethiopian public universities in focus. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology, 6*(1), 74-89.

DeKeyser, R. M. (2001). *Automaticity and automatization In P. Robinson, Cognition and Second Language Instruction,* 125-151, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denscombe, M. (2007). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects.* (3rd edition). McGraw Hill, New York.

Fife-Schaw, C. (2006). *Questionnaire Design. In Breakwell, G. M. et al. Research Methods in Psychology* (3rd edition). London, Sage.

Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*, (2nd edition), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. New Jersey.

Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence-based nursing, 18*(3), 66-67.

Hughes, R., & Reed, B. S. (2016). *Teaching and researching speaking*. Taylor & Francis.

Kennedy, R. (2007). In-class debates: Fertile ground for active learning and the cultivation of critical thinking and oral communication skills. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education, 19*(2), 183-190.

Khadidja, K. (2010). *The effect of classroom interaction on developing the learner's speaking Skill,* (M.A thesis), Mentouri University.

Kid Sense (2017). https://childdevelopment.com.au/

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, (2nd edition), New Delhi, New Age International P. Ltd.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 45*, 214- 222.

Krosnick, J. A., Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Carson, R. T., Michael Hanemann, W., Kopp, R. J.,& Conaway, M. (2002). The impact of" no opinion" response options on data quality: non-attitude reduction or an invitation to satisfice?. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 66*(3), 371-403.

Kulas, J. T., Stachowski, A. A., & Haynes, B. A. (2008). Middle response functioning in Likert-responses to personality items. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 22*, 251-259.

Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. Sage Publications Ltd., London.

Leaver, B.L.& Stryker, S.B. (1989). Content-based instruction for foreign language classrooms. *Foreign Language Annuls, 23*(3), 269-275.

Long, M. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition.* Handbook of second language acquisition.

Long, M. H. (1980). *Input, interaction, and second language acquisition.* University of California, Los Angeles.

Mulatu, M., & Bezabih, W. (2018). Perceptions and practices of EFL teachers in implementing active learning in English classes: the case of three selected secondary schools in Dawro zone, SNNPRS, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Education, 10*(2), 88-94.

Melaku, T. (2005). *Implications of classroom interaction with reference to oral communicative focused tasks.* (Unpublished M.A. thesis), Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

Meseret, G. (2007). *Classroom interactional implication in teaching oral communication through the use of tasks*. (Unpublished M.A. thesis), Addis Ababa University. Ethiopia.

Mukeredzi, T. G. (2013). Professional development through teacher roles: Conceptions of professionally unqualified teachers in rural South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 28*(11), 1-16.

Mouhoub, A.A (2016). *Investigating the Role of Oral Presentation Projects in Enhancing EFL Learners' Oral Proficiency*. (Unpublished M.A. thesis). Bejaia University, Algeria.

Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*, London: Sage

Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 116-136.

Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 76-91.

Nguyet, A., & Mai, L. (2012). Teaching conversational strategies through video clips. *Language education in Asia, 3*(1), 32-49.

Nunan, D. 1992. *Research methods in language learning. Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press.

Neuman, W.L. (1992). Gender, race and age differences in student definitions of sexual harassment. *Wisconsin Sociologist, 29*, 63–75.

Peña, M., & Onatra, A. (2009). *Promoting Oral Production through the Task-Based Learning Approach*, A Study in a Public Secondary School in Colombia.

Raaijmakers, Q. A., Van Hoof, J. T. C., t Hart, H., Verbogt, T. F. M. A., & Vollebergh, W. A. (2000). Adolescents' midpoint responses on Likert-type scale items: neutral or missing values?. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 12*, 208-216.

Rastegar, M., & Gohari, S. S. M. (2016). Communication Strategies, Attitude, and Oral Output of EFL Learners: A Study of Relations. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 6,* 401-419.

Salaria, N. (2012). Meaning of the term-descriptive survey Research method: International *Journal of Transformations in Business Management, 1*(6), 1-7.

Sánchez, S. N., et.al. (2016). Students' preferences for communicative activities and teachers' frequency of communicative activity use in Tijuana. *Plurilinkgua, 12* (1), 15-33.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). Social Research (3rd edition). Palgrave Macmillan, London. Sultana, R. (2015). *The survey on using oral corrective feedback in ESL classroom in Bangladeshi context* (Doctoral dissertation), BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Sundari, H. (2018). Analyzing Interaction Practices in a Typical EFL Classroom Setting: A Case of Indonesia. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 11*(2), 181-192.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence, Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition, 15*, 165-179.

Tian, M. (2011). Communication strategy training: A step to strategic competence in L2 interaction. *ABAC Journal, 31*(3), 21-26.

Thomas, R. M. (2003). *Blending qualitative and quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations*. Corwin Press.

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

Villalobos, O. B. (2015). Action Research: Fostering Students' Oral Production in the EFL Class. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas, (23)*, 349-363.

Walliman, N. S., & Walliman, N. (2005). *Your research project: a step-by-step guide for the first-time researcher*. SAGE Publishers India Ltd.

Wright, T. (1987). *Roles of Teachers & Learners*, Oxford University Press, London.

Zhang, S. (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency. *English language teaching, 2*(4), 91-100.