Innovations

EFL Teachers' Teaching Strategies to Maximize students' Oral Output Production in English Class: East Wollega Zone High school in Focus

Endalew Alemayehu
Department of English Language and Literature ,Wollega University, Ethiopia
Tekle Ferede (PhD, Associate. Professor.)
English Department; Jimma University, Ethiopia
Zeleke Teshome (PhD, Associate. Professor.)
Department of English Language and Literature ,Wallaga University, Ethiopia

Corresponding Author: **Endalew Alemayehu**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate EFL teachers' teaching strategies in developing students' oral output production in English class: East Wollega zone high school teachers in focus. The study was conducted from in 2020/21 academic year. The research design employed for this study case is the descriptive survey. The researcher used different sampling techniques as random sampling technique to select the schools, purposive sampling for the grade levels and availability sampling techniques to select the sample teachers for questionnaire. Further, the researcher selected sample students and sections for observation by random sampling technique. The data gathering tools used for this study were questionnaires (for both EFL teachers & students) and classroom observation; the data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The researcher employed questionnaire for 30 EFL teachers and 50 students (which is close-ended) and classroom observation. The data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative method and the data from the tools were cross-checked. To this end, the findings of the study indicated that EFL teachers' teaching strategies to develop students' oral output production were below the standard and below what the level demanded.

Keywords: 1.teaching strategy; 2.oral output; 3.oral interaction; 4.oral output production

I. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

Oral interaction involves speaking and listening as a two-way process where responding is expected (Peña & Onatra, 2009; Byrne, 1991). According to Long (1981), Oral interaction is essential for enhancing comprehensible input and yielding desirable output. Similarly, Gass and Mackey (2007) point out that the interaction model is mainly synthesized from Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Swain's Output Hypothesis. Many authors agree that both input and output are very important in making oral interaction meaningful, yet the focus in this research case is oral output.

The introduction for Output Hypothesis has been proposed in the late 1980s by Canadian linguist, Merrill Swain. It was emerged criticizing Krashen's Input Hypothesis that claims language learning occurs only when comprehensible

input is provided (Krashen, 1985). However, swain (1985) argues that producing language enables learners to test hypotheses about comprehension of input and forces learners to process language forms and meanings more deeply than simply exposed to input. Besides, Long (1996) in his modified version of the interaction hypothesis reveals that oral production is necessary for the meaningful implementation of the oral interaction

Due to this and other similar facts, EFL teachers' teaching strategies used is very much vital to improve students' oral output production. The strategies the teachers use help learners to avoid the unnecessary terminations of the oral communication and to manipulate a conversation and negotiate interaction in an effective way (Hughes, 2002& Khadidja, 2010). The oral expressions the language teachers use in English class to make the learners react to what he/she addressed can enable the teacher/speaker to look at the importance of the interaction from different angles and to make the communication continue. In line with this, Zhang (2009) interaction refers to exchanges in which there is some indication that an utterance has not been entirely understood and participants need to interrupt the flow of the conversation in order for both parties to understand what the conversation is about (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Therefore, the strategies the EFL teachers use to involve the learners in OI may have a significant effect on making the interaction meaningful. According to Khadidja (2010) the strategies need to take place when learners cannot express what they want to say because they lack the resources to do so.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Classroom oral interaction is very vital in making the teaching learning process meaningful and in enabling the speaker and listener understand each other. In English class, when the students respond to the teacher's or other students' questions, raise queries, and give comments, they are actively involved in the negotiation of comprehensible input and the formulation of comprehensible output, which are essential to the practice of oral interaction(Dawit & Demis, 2015). However, the classroom oral interaction can be made ineffective and the two parties may fail to understand one another in some cases especially when their right is denied, and when the talk is dominated only by the speaker. In Ethiopian context, most of the time EFL teachers monopolize the process of teaching-learning and shape the lessons in the way they like.

This can be occurred as a result of EFL teacher's failure to use a variety of teaching strategies to initiate the students to produce oral output. Teachers' teaching strategies are important for effective teaching learning process in general and for participating students in oral interaction practice in particular. However, the strategies EFL teachers use to make the students take part in oral interaction practice in Ethiopian context seems in adequate as compared to what the level demands to make students produce oral output in English class. Because teachers' teaching strategy is all about what the teachers teach, how they teach and influence teachers' pedagogic approaches and choice of materials, content, and learning activities (Mukeredzi, 2013). Besides, teaching strategy is important in increasing students' participation in teaching learning process specifically to produce oral output in EFL class context. According to Nakatani (2010), teaching strategies, especially communication strategies not only solve learners' oral communication problems, rather, they enhance their interaction in teaching learning process which in turn improves their oral proficiency. Further, the above author denoted that students need to be exposed explicitly to the teaching strategies used in English class; otherwise, they fail to improve their confidence in speaking performance and to become effective communicators in English.

Contrary to this, the researcher's experience and observation showed that the students' involvement in oral interaction practice and their oral output production was becoming declined continuously. Hence, the researcher was pushed to investigate his study on this area to know

The researcher's experience and observation together with previous local researchers (Birhanu, 2000; Habtamu , 2017; Mebratu, 2018; Melaku , 2005; Meseret, 2007) indicated that the students' oral interaction skills in English class is becoming deteriorated from time to time and is not practiced as the purpose of practicing speaking skills is demanding. Consequently, the researcher was initiated to investigate if the source for the decline of students' oral

interaction in EFL class and oral output production is teachers' teaching strategies. To this end, the study was planned to achieve the following research objectives.

1.3. Objectives

The main objective of the study was to investigate teachers' teaching strategies used in EFL class to maximize students' oral output production.

Based up on the above objective, the following specific objectives were set.

- To find out EFL teachers' strategies of varying inputs to improve students' oral output production
- To identify the purposes of using oral output in oral interaction practice in EFL class

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Setting

The study was conducted in 2020/21 academic year on selected public high schools in East Wollega zone, Oromia regional state in Ethiopia. The zone is located to West of Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia at the distance of 328 km. The Zone has 17 woredas of whcih six public high schools from six woredas were randomly selected for the study. The study mainly emphasized public high schools as some private high schools have their own curriculum which is different from that of the ministry of education in some aspects.

2.2. Population and Sample

The population of this research was East Wollega high schools English language teachers and students of 2020/21 academic year. According to Salaria (2012), population of the study refers to all the individuals of a particular type or a more restricted part of that group. In total, there were about 17 weredas in East Wollega zone from which the sample high schools were randomly selected. As involving all the subjects from the entire woredas of the zone was tiresome, the researcher randomly selected EFL teachers and students from Dalo, Gute, Jimma Arjo, Sire, Getema and Diga high schools for the study. Supporting this, Neuman (1992) suggests a ratio of 30% for small population (which is under 1000). Further, involving all the subjects from all the school of the woredas in the study is unlikely for there can be diminishing returns associated with adding elements to a sample (Dattalo, 2008). Accordingly, six woredas, namely Guto Gida, Wayu Tuka, Sibu Sire, Diga, Leka Dulacha and Jima Arjo were randomely selected woredas from the total of 17 woredas that means it is about 35% which is more than what is suggested.

Consequently, the six high school listed above were randomly selected, the grade levels were purposively selected thinking that students at this level conduct oral interaction in English. Besides, availability sampling technique was administered to select 30 EFL teachers to fill questionnaire. Accordingly, from Dalo and Sire 5 teachers per school, from Gute and Arjo 6 teachers per school and for Diga and Getema 4 teachers per school were selected.   Similarly, 50 students were selected randomly for questionnaire: 9 students per school from (Sire, Gute & Arjo), 8 students per school for (Dalo & Getema) & 7 students from Diga were selected. Further, sections were randomly selected for classroom observation. Accordingly,9B = Dalo, 9A = Getema, 10C = Gute, 10D = Arjo, 11A = Diga and 11C from Sire were randomly selected for observation , and observed for two rounds.

Data Gathering Instruments

Data gathering is the process through which the accumulations of specific evidences are collected using different instruments. Accordingly, the researcher used questionnaire for the sample high school EFL teachers and students and classroom observation. Fife-Schaw (2006) suggests gathering data using questionnaire is important for it is: cost-efficient, for its practicality, its speedy result and for its convenience to collect large amount of data. To this end, the researcher set a close ended questionnaire with 18 items for both EFL teachers and students. The items are designed in to two themes as strategies of varying inputs (4 items) and strategies of using oral output for different purposes (18 items). All the items under the themes were prepared on a five point likert-

scale which is extended from 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

Besides, the researcher used classroom observation to further investigate the teaching strategies EFL teachers use to increase students' oral output production. Classroom observation is used to understand the way people act, their motivations and the nature of social interactions (Crado & Brewer 2002; Thomas, 2003; Walliman 2001). These authors also state that, one way of studying human behavior is by observing people directly as they carry out particular activities. An observation is thus a purposeful and selective way of watching and/or recording an interaction or phenomenon as it takes place naturally. According to Nunan (1992), classroom observation is useful in studying conditions, processes and limitations in actual classroom instruction. In similar way, Denscombe (2007) points out that classroom observation does not rely on what people report they do and they think rather it is more direct and depends on the direct evidence of the eye to witness events. Similarly, Sarantakos (2005) points out that observation offers first-hand information without relying on the reports of others.

The items for classroom observation were prepared in line with the points from the review of related literature and adapted from Meehan et.al (2004) and others. The researcher prepared items in line the items from the questionnaires to cross check the data from the instruments and so as to substantiate one another. In line with this, Kumar (2011) states that there is no argument among researchers on employing varied instruments to secure more reliable and valid information. Sharing this idea, Anderson (1998) points out that the application of multiple data sources and approaches lets the researchers develop in depth knowledge on the topic that is going to be surveyed. Hence, the researcher in this case prepared these data gathering instruments in line with the review of related literature and adapted from previous researchers in similar area as (Mebratu, 2018; Mouhoub, 2016; Sultana, 2015; Wright, 1987)

2.3. Methods of Data Analysis

To achieve the main objective of this study, the researcher used questionnaire and interview to gather data. Accordingly, the researcher designed a 5- point likert scale questionnaires for high school English language teachers and students which were analyzed quantitatively. The researcher believes that besides checking the reliability and validity of the items, making the bench mark for interpreting the points from the likert scale is important. Although there is a debate among researchers on using the midpoint likert scale, Raaijmakers.et al (2000) argued that clear statement of the mid-point scale is essential because it avoids forcing respondents to choose agree or disagree options, that may evoke misleading conclusion. Many scholars agreed that midpoints may have many different meanings such as "neither agree nor disagree", "undecided", "don't know", and "no opinion" (Raaijmakers, et al., 2000). Thus, giving the clear definition of the midpoints is very much important for the researchers to minimize ambiguity during data gathering and interpretation of data (Kulas, et al., 2008). Respondents selected the "agree" or "disagree" continuum when they are capable of reasoning out why they agree or disagree, yet they chose "undecided" when they fail to justify the reason and when their level of understanding is low (Krosnick. et al, 2002), Accordingly, the current researcher defined the middle point scale (3 = undecided) as "lack of adequate knowledge or understanding". In addition to questionnaire, the researcher used classroom observation which was analyzed qualitatively as the other means of data gathering tool.

Thus, items under each objective or research question were thematically analyzed, and what was obtained through teachers' questionnaire, students' questionnaire and classroom observation were cross-checked. Therefore, the data gathered via questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive analysis specifically (frequency and mean), and the analysis were made using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Kothari (2004) suggests that "Descriptive analysis is largely the study of distributions of one variable. This study provides us with profiles of different subjects on any of a multiple of characteristics such as size, composition, efficiency, preferences, etc."   On the other hand the data collected by interview were analyzed qualitatively.

2.4. Ethical Considerations

The researcher gave ethically considerations for many things. First, before conducting this research at the selected schools, the researcher addressed legal letters from Wollega University research director office to the school principals. Next to this, the objective of the research was made clear for the school principals and then to the subjects of the study. Besides, discussions were held with EFL teachers to adjust the schedule for data gathering, and the data were gathered next. The researcher also acknowledged authors or sources for the ideas directly or indirectly used for the success of the study. Furthermore, the researcher trusted and kept the originality of the data gathered from the participants. In line with this, Krefting (1991) points out that research project are trustworthy when it reflects the reality and ideas of the participants.

3. Results

Identifying EFL teachers' teaching strategy in improving students' oral output production in English class was the main objective of this study. Thus, before coming to the analysis of the data, looking at the term 'teaching strategy' in line with different scholars' point of view is very important. Generally, scholars agreed that Strategies are systematic, communication-enhancing devices used to handle communication difficulties and to avoid communication breakdowns. Supporting this idea, Jamshidnejad, (2011) stated that strategies are used to solve problems such as 'breakdowns' and 'gaps' in communication. According to (Brown, 2014; Nakatani, 2005), oral communication strategies (OCS) are a communication sustaining device or a communication repairing device. Similarly, Hughes (2002) defines the strategies ELF teachers use to make learners give out their oral output as the ability of the learners to manipulate a conversation and negotiate interaction in an effective way. Besides, teaching strategies are all about paraphrasing, literal translation, language switch, gestures, and appealing for assistance through which the interlocutors can reach their goal of communication (Chamot, 2005; Rastegar & Gohari, 2016). Hence, many scholars advocate the use of speaking strategies at the various levels of education to improve the learners' speaking ability (Alibakhshi & Padiz, 2011; Campillo, 2006; Nakatani, 2010; Nguyet & Mai, 2012; Tian, 2011;). On the basis of the above scholarly provided concepts, the researcher prepared questionnaires with 18 items for both teachers and students to measure EFL teachers' teaching strategies used in improving students' oral output production. The questionnaires were designed with five-point Likert scale that is extended from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to let the respondents express their feelings either by agreeing or disagreeing to the items. To measure the reliability of the items the researcher used Alpha measure (Cronbach's alpha), and checked the alpha measure of the items thematically and put in the table below. An acceptable level of reliability coefficients specifically for tests of cognitive ability should not be below 0.7 (Heale & Twycross, 2015; Muijs, 2004). Thus, the alpha results of the items are thematically presented in the table below.

Table 1. The alpha measures of the items as to their thematic group

N0	Items in theme	Alpha coefficient
	Teacher's questionnaire	
1	Strategies of varying inputs	.879
2	Strategy of using oral output for different purposes	.833
	Student's questionnaire	
1	Strategies of varying inputs	.868
2	Strategy of using oral output for different purposes	.917

The questionnaire was filled by 30 high school EFL teachers, and the data was analyzed using descriptive statistics namely, mean value, frequency and percent, for standard deviation is not recommended for ordinal data. Supporting this Denscombe (2007, p.265) states that "It is meaningless to use standard deviation with nominal or even, strictly speaking, with ordinal data." With ordinal data we do not know the cause of the order, or by how much they differ from each other. The analyses of the items were also indicated in the table as follows. Finally, the researcher analyzed the the items under the theme using SPSS and interpreted the results of the mean value in line with the views of different scholars. EFL teachers' conceptions of oral output as follows.

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 oral output differently.	8	26.7	18	60	4	13.3	-	-	-	-	1.87
I make learners use minimal response to attract their attentions 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 oral interaction practice to increase learners' oral output production.	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**
Strategy of using OO for d/f purposes	**1**		**2**		**3**		**4**		**5**		**Mean**
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
I give comprehension checking expressions to my students to increase their oral output production.	7	23.3	15	50	8	26.7	-	-	-	-	2.03
I make students produce OO in the form of request for clarification.	7	23.3	16	53.3	5	16.7	2	6.7	-	-	2.06
When my learners don't understand the question, I prefer to change the direction of the discussion rather than staying silent	8	26.7	14	46.7	7	23.3	1	3.3	-	-	2.03
I use 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 discussion 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 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	12	40	13	43.3	4	13.3	1	3.3	-	-	1.80

Item	SD	%	D	%	U	%	A	%	SA	%	Mean
voluntarily, I raise questions for the whole class.											
I raise questions for a few students when I think others will be benefited from.	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

Table 2. is concerned with items dealing with EFL teachers' teaching strategies used to improve students' oral output production. Totally it consists of 18 items which are grouped in to two themes as strategy of varying inputs and strategy of using oral outputs for different purposes. Accordingly, the first group contains 4 items, and the response was found to the disagreement continuum. Specifically, about 80% of the respondents disagreed to the idea that EFL teachers used a variety of inputs to improve students' oral output production. Similarly, the grand mean (**2.05**) of the group which is found to the disagreement side of the middle point scale (3.00) also confirmed the disagreement of the respondents to the idea. Further, the result from the classroom observation revealed that the teachers were not observed using a variety of inputs as strategy in increasing students' oral output production. The teachers didn't use different questions, topics and contents as strategy to maximize students' oral output production except in a few cases CO_1T_3, CO_1T6 and CO_2T_2 used minimal responses to engage students in oral output production.

As far as the second theme is concerned, 14 items were used to gather data on using oral response from the students for different purposes. The response showed that in almost all the items case the teachers disagreed to the idea oral output from the learners is used for different purposes in oral interaction practice. In all the items case, most (75%) of the respondents disagreed to the concept. Similarly, the grand mean of the theme (**1.95**) also confirmed that the oral output from the learners was not used for different purposes. In addition to this, the result from the classroom observation also revealed that oral output from the students was not used for a variety of purposes. In almost all the classroom observation conducted cases, students were almost not orally responding to what the teachers input. Oral output is used for different purposes as: to generate better input, for syntactic process, to maintain oral interaction breakdowns, to test learners' understanding, develop learners' automaticity, to develop learners' personal voice and others (Bygate, 2001; DeKeyser, 1997; Kid Sense, 2017; Swain, 2005; Tuan & Nhu, 2010). However, the result from the classroom observation denoted that the oral output from the students were used for neither of these purposes except
in cases of CO_1T_1, CO_2T_3 and CO_2T_4 used it for approval, refusal, corrective and evaluative purposes. Indeed, the expressions commonly used were yes/no, right/wrong, yes, but and others.

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**

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 for clarification on what is not clear.	20	40	16	32	14	28	-	-	-	-	1.88
When we fail to understand the message & OI is tend to be broken down, 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 repetition strategy to increase learners' participation in producing oral output.	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 justifying their answers.	17	34	17	34	9	18	3	6	4	8	2.20
The teacher engages himself in group discussion in order to maximize students' oral output production.	19	38	17	34	11	22	2	4	1	2	1.98
Our teacher gives individual learners chances to produce oral output so as to improve their oral interaction skills.	20	40	15	30	10	20	5	10	-	-	2.00
The teacher modifies his/her message on the basis of feedback (+ve, -ve or ambiguous) received from the learners.	19	38	15	30	14	28	2	4	-	-	1.98
The teacher directs most of the questions to shy learners to build their confidence so as to give their oral output.	18	36	19	38	10	20	2	4	1	2	1.98
The teacher puts learners at ease to freely produce oral output.	18	36	17	34	10	20	4	8	1	2	2.06
When I don't understand what the speaker said, 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/her expressions to help the learners produce oral output.	22	44	16	32	7	14	3	6	2	4	1.94
My teacher uses idea shifting strategies to overcome learners' confusion problems in producing oral output.	20	40	18	36	11	22	1	2	-	-	1.86
Grand mean											**2.00**

Table 3. is concerned with students' questionnaire items dealing with EFL teachers' teaching strategies used to improve students' oral output production. Totally it consists of 18 items which are grouped in to two themes as strategy of varying inputs and strategy of using oral outputs for different purposes. Accordingly, the first group contains 4 items, and the response was found to the disagreement continuum. Specifically, about 75% of the respondents disagreed to the idea that EFL teachers used a variety of inputs to improve students' oral output production. Similarly, the grand mean (**1.95**) of the group which is found to the disagreement continuum of the middle point scale (3.00) also confirmed the disagreement of the respondents to the idea. In similar manner, the result from the classroom observation also denoted that the teachers were not observed using a variety of inputs as strategy in increasing students' oral output production. The teachers didn't use different questions, topics and contents as strategy to maximize students' oral output production except in a few cases CO_1T_3, CO_1T6 and CO_2T_2 used minimal responses to engage students in oral output production.

In case of the second theme, the researcher administered 14 items to gather data on using oral response from the students for different purposes. The response indicated that in almost all the items case the students disagreed to the idea that oral output from the learners is used for different purposes in oral interaction practices. As indicated in table 3 above, most (**72%**) of the respondents disagreed to the concept. Similarly, the grand mean of the theme (**2.00**) also confirmed that the oral outputs from the learners were not used for different purposes. In addition to this, the result from the classroom observation also showed that oral output from the students were not used for a variety of purposes as indicated in literature. Oral output is used for different purposes as: to generate better input, for syntactic process, to maintain oral interaction breakdowns, to test learners' understanding, develop learners' automaticity, to develop learners' personal voice and others (Bygate, 2001; DeKeyser, 1997; Kid Sense, 2017; Swain, 2005; Tuan & Nhu, 2010). However, the classroom observation result denoted that the oral outputs from the students were used for neither of these purposes as students were almost not orally responding to what the teachers input except in cases of CO_1T_1, CO_2T_3 and CO_2T_4 used it for approval, refusal, corrective and evaluative purposes. Indeed, the expressions commonly used were yes/no, right/wrong, yes, but and others.

4. Discussion

The researcher used 18 items to deal with EFL teachers' teaching strategies used to improve students' oral output production. The items were grouped to two themes as indicated in **Table 2 and Table 3** above for both teachers and students cases. Accordingly, the first group is concerned with strategies of varying inputs to improve students' oral output production, and the result showed that the EFL teachers' didn't vary inputs as to the learners' background which is recommended by scholars to increase students' oral output production level. Likewise, the result from classroom observation proves that the EFL teachers didn't use varying inputs as a strategy to improve students' oral output production except they rarely use minimal responses.

However, Kennedy (2007) claimed that student engagement in different activities is linked with his/her individual critical thinking. Similarly, Villalobos (2015) noted that degree of personalization in speaking activities is always important because it is an effective attention getter, so language teachers need to be clever enough to relate the content to students' interests and circumstances. Sanchez et.al (2016) also pointed out that the activities teachers choose to use reflect their beliefs about teaching and their teaching styles; deciding if the

activity to be included in the lesson plan is useful, interesting, necessary or motivating depends on what the teacher thinks students should learn. In similar manner, Leaver and Stryker (1989) noted that the topics, contents, materials and activities should correspond to the cognitive and affective needs of the students and should be appropriate to the level of the students. Indeed, many scholars recommend a strategy of using different inputs to increase students' oral output production. Nevertheless, the result from teachers' and students' questionnaires along with the classroom observation indicated that the teachers didn't use a variety of contents, topics, tasks/activities and other inputs in EFL class so as to increase students' oral output production.The second category of the items in both the teachers' and students' questionnaire cases is concerned with the purposes that oral outputs from the students were used for. The result from the teachers' and the students' questionnaires denoted that the respondents claimed that the teachers didn't use oral outputs from the student for different purposes. Specifically, the result from Table 2 and Table 3 represented 75% of teachers and 72% of students respondents disagreed to the idea. In the same way, the result from the classroom observation ascertained that it is less likely to use the oral output from the students for different purposes where oral interaction is not meaningfully conducted and where only limited oral responses like 'Yes' or 'No' and 'Correct' or 'Wrong' were used. Basically, oral output in oral interaction class is used for many purposes as asking for clarification, confirmation, repetition, giving comments, checking comprehension, recast and others Sundari (2018). Further, authors like (Bygate, 2001; Kid Sense, 2017; McDonough, 2005; Swain, 1985, 1995, 2005; Tuan & Nhu, 2010) pointed out that oral output is used in generating inputs, hypothesis testing, developing automaticity, discourse skills and personal voice, in adjusting oral interaction and others. But the data from teachers and students questionnaire and classroom observation revealed that the oral responses from the students were used almost for none of the above purposes. The researcher believed this is due to two reasons. Firstly, the students were not in a position of producing oral output except in a rare cases responding using "Yes/No, Agree/disagree, right/wrong" responses. Secondly, the teachers' poor teaching strategies contributed much for their failure to use even such limited responses for a variety of purposes.

5. Conclusion

The main focus of this study was investigating EFL teachers' teaching strategies used in improving students' oral output production. Specifically, the focus of the study was assessing EFL teachers' strategies of varying inputs to improve students' oral out production and identifying the strategies of using oral output for different purposes. The finding showed that EFL teachers didn't use strategies of using varieties of inputs in improving students' oral output production. That is except they rarely used minimal response activities where they need to use the structural and communicative activities interchangeably. Plus to this, Topics, contents and tasks for oral interaction practices were limited to what is in the textbook though teachers were expected to adapt the inputs as to individual students' immediate environment. In similar manner, the teachers didn't use strategies of using oral output from the students for different purposes to maximize their participation of oral output production indirectly. Yet teachers' request for clarification, comprehension checking or other purposes is vital to force students to continue speaking.

References

1. *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.*

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

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

4. *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). Pearson Longman.*

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

6. *Chamot, A.U., 2005. Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 25, 112_130.*

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

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

9. *Dawit Tesfaye Abebe and Demis G/Tsadik Deneke. Causes of Students' Limited Participation in EFL Classroom: Ethiopian Public Universities in Focus. Inter. J. Edu. Res. Technol. 6[1] March 2015;74-89.*

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

11. *Denscombe, M. 2007. The good research guide for small-scale social research projects. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.3rd Edition.*

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

13. *Gass, S. M., and Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten and J. Williams (Eds.), Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction, 175-199. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.*

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

15. *Kennedy, R. (2007). Class Debates: Fertile Ground for Active Learning and the Cultivation of Critical Thinking and Oral Communication Skills, 19(2), 183-190, ISSN 1812-9129 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania*

16. *Khadidja K. (2010). The effect of classroom interaction on developing the learner's speaking Skill. MA thesis - Mentouri university-Constantine Faculty of letters and languages Department of foreign languages.*

17. *Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques, (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New age international P. Ltd.*

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

19. *Krosnick, J. A. et al . (2002). The impact of "no opinion" response options on data quality: non- attitude reduction or an invitation to satisfice? Public Opin.;66:371–403.*

20. *Kulas, J. T.et al. (2008). Middle response functioning in Likert-responses to personality items. Journal of Business and Psychology, 22(3), 251-259.*

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

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

23. Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

24. Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second-language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), Native language and foreign language acquisition: Vol. 379. Annals of the New York   Academy   of   Sciences pp.259-278. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

25. Mebratu Mulatu. (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: Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics,.41, ISSN 2422-8435

26. Meehan, et al. (2004). Special strategies observations system-revised: A useful tool for educational research & evaluation. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University

27. Melaku Tezera. (2005). Implications of classroom interaction with reference to oral communicative focused tasks.(Unpublished M.A thesis) Addis Ababa University.

28. Meseret Gizachew (2007). Classroom interactional implication in teaching oral communication   through the use of tasks. (Unpublished M.A thesis) Addis AbabaUniversity.

29. 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.

30. Mouhoub, A.A (2016) Investigating the Role of Oral Presentation Projects in Enhancing EFL Learners' Oral Proficiency. The Case study of Master 1 ALELT Students at Bejaia University. A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics and ELT.

31. 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.

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

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

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

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

36. Raaijmakers, et al. (2000). Adolescents' midpoint response on Likert-tyep scale items: Neutral or missing values? International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 12(2), 208-216.

37. 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.

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

39. Sánchez, S. N., Garduño, R. M. Sarracino, T. G. D. (2016). Students' preferences for   communicative activities and teachers' frequency of communicative activity use in   Tijuana. Plurilinkgua, 12 (1), pp. 15-33.

40. Sultana, R. (2015). The Survey on Using Oral Corrective Feedback in ESL Classroom in Bangladeshi Context: BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

41. Sundari, H. (2018). Analyzing Interaction Practices in a Typical EFL Classroom Setting: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal, 11(2).

42. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and   comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in   second language acquisition (235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House

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

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

45. Villalobos, B.O. (2015). Action Research: Fostering Students' Oral Production in the EFL Class. Revista De LenguasModernas, 23. 349-363.

46. Walliman, N. (2001).Your research project: a step-by-step guide for the first-time researcher. New Delhi: SAGE Publishers India Ltd.

47. Zhang, S, (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency: Foreign languages Department, Applied Linguistics, 2 (4), 523-805.

Corresponding Email: **endalewal@yahoo.com, tekle.ferede2014@gmail.com, tzeleke11@yahoo.com**