University Students' Attitude towards Oral Interaction in English as a Foreign Language Classroom: Second Year Students in Focus

Mekonnen Tolera[1]; Tamiru Olana[2]; Ebissa Bekele [3]

[1]Departmen of English Language and Literature, Indstitute of Languages Study and Journalism, Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia

[2]Departmen of English Language and Literature, Indstitute of Languages Study and Journalism, Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia

[3]Departmen of English Language and Literature, Indstitute of Languages Study and Journalism, Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia

Abstract

The purpose of the current study was to investigate students' attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom. For the study, a post positivist paradigm was adopted because the post positivist assumptions have represented the traditional form of research, and these assumptions hold true more for quantitative research than qualitative research. Besides, a descriptive case study design and a quantitative research approach were employed to achieve the research objective. The participants of the study were 64 second year students in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH), Gambella University who were selected through simple random sampling technique in the year 2023. The data were collected through close ended questionnaire. A close ended questionnaire was used to collect the data about the students' attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom. In this study, a quantitative method of data analysis was employed by using SPSS 24. The data were analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages and mean scores. The data about the students' attitude were analyzed in terms of the three basic components of attitude. They were the cognitive, affective and behavioral components. Regarding the cognitive component of their attitude about the benefits of oral interaction, the students had little understanding about the merit of oral interaction. Pertaining to the affective component of their attitude concerning their own preferences to employ oral interaction in a classroom, the students did not prefer using oral interaction in EFL classroom. With regard to the behavioral component of their attitude towards oral interaction, the students were not enthusiastic to use oral interaction in classrooms in enhancing their oral interaction skill. Therefore, the findings the study revealed that the students had negative attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classrooms.

Keywords: *Attitude; Cognitive; Affective; Behavioral; Oral interaction; Interaction skill*

Introduction

Concerning its importance, English Language is one of the internationally used languages in which numerous scientific, academic, literary, innovative and research works have been written and publicized in. Scholars assert that success in learning in general and language learning in particular is attributed to the role of interaction. In addition, classroom interaction furnishes "input, practice opportunities, and receptivity" (Allwright & Bailey, 1991, p. 25). Moreover, a common theme underlying the different methods of language teaching is the idea that second language learning is a highly interactive process as well as a great deal of time in teaching is devoted both to interaction between the teacher and the learners, and to interaction among the learners themselves (Richards & Lockhart, 1996, p. 138). Therefore, it is possible to say that interaction is the crucial part of language teaching and learning.

Regarding interaction and using the target language, Jora (2019, p. 786 - 787) states that learners learn and practice the target language through the interaction with one another and with the instructor, and through the use of the language both in and outside of a classroom. Rivers (1987) portrays also that through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to 'authentic linguistic material', or the output of their fellow students in discussions. In interaction, students can get opportunity to use the target language in exchanging or expressing their ideas.

In the interactionists view, learners should be exposed to comprehensible, negotiated, or modified input in their attempts to acquire a language (Sarem & Shirzadi, 2014, p. 62). Here, learners receive input itself through interaction with others. The introduction of the interactive approach into classroom learning and the study of classroom interaction are largely attributed to social interactionism which emphasizes the role of other speakers around the language learner by means of interaction (Congmin, 2013).

Furthermore, on their part, Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991, p. 266) argue that "the interactionist views are more powerful than other theories because they invoke both innate and environmental factors to explain language learning and teaching". Therefore, the interactionist theory does not neglect the previous theories, but gives an additional social perspective of language acquisition (Sarem & Shirzadi, 2014). For this reason, one can infer that interactionist theory considers both innate and environmental factors as contributing to language teaching and development. Besides, interaction is the fundamental fact of classroom pedagogy and everything that happens in the classroom occurs through a process of live person-to-person interactions (Allwright, 1984, p. 156).

However, empirical studies reveal that the engagement of students in oral interaction in EFL classroom was reported low. For example, the study conducted by Dawit and Demis (2015) concluded that in Ethiopian public universities, it was found that students were quiet in EFL classrooms. Moreover, it was indicated that very few students were willing to speak individually rather than in groups in EFL classrooms. In an analogous manner, the study conducted by Li and Liu (2011) portrayed that there was low participation of students in EFL classrooms in oral interaction in Chinese context. Consequently, in the current study, the researcher was initiated to investigate students' attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom.

Statement of the Problem

English Language is one of the languages that are used across the world since it is a language in which academic communication works, researches works and scientific and innovative works have been written in. Consequently, in Ethiopia, the importance of the knowledge and skills in English language is inevitable, particularly where young learners are prepared for higher education, works that include teaching, business, medicine and communications.

Concerning the essence of interaction**,** Brown (1994) asserts that in the era of communicative language teaching, interaction is the heart of communication; interaction is what communication is all about. In addition, classroom interaction plays a significant role in fostering learner's development of communicative competence and classroom interaction makes input more comprehensible to learners and maximizes the input to be learners' intake (Lap & Thy, 2017, p. 695). Without interaction, input could not be taken in, resulting in no output produced. Therefore, there is strong connection between classroom interaction and learners' language development.

According to Chaudron (1988), a much greater role has been attributed to the interactive features of classroom behavior such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meaning and feedback. On their part, Richards and Lockhart (1994) state that second language learning is a highly interactive process. Therefore, it is possible to understand that interaction is an essential part of communication and cognitive development which includes language development.

Nevertheless, several practical studies revealed that the practice of oral interaction in EFL classroom have been low. Accordingly, despite the importance often assigned to participate in EFL classroom discussions, it has been repeatedly reported in different studies that most students did not participate (Caspi, Chajut, Saporta, and Beyth-Marom, 2006; Gorsky, Caspi, and Trumper, 2004). Furthermore, although second language educators are devoted to improving their students' communication skills, many of the students remain silent (Chang, 2018, p. 135).

On their part, Legesse (2017) and Dawit & Demis (2015) found out that majority of the students never, rarely or only occasionally asked or responded to a teacher's question in the classroom. Their findings also indicated that most of the students never or rarely participated in EFL classroom oral interactions. Another study conducted by Lap and Thy (2017) entitled, "EFL instructors' challenges in maximizing classroom interaction" found out that Vietnamese EFL lecturers encountered challenges related to physical factors, learners' factors, and teachers' factors. As a result, learners were not able to communicate effectively in speaking in the target language after years of learning it**.** Moreover, the findings of the study conducted by Esayas (2018) entitled, "an investigation of the practice of teaching and assessing speaking skills in spoken English language classes: Dilla University" in Ethiopia identified that the students' were found with poor language background.

There are factors which can hamper learners' participation and willingness to interact with others in a classroom. Students' attitudes play a pivotal role in the way the teaching and learning process can be directed to achieve its desired ends. According to Ahmed (1989, p. 105-106), it is clear that there is a fairly strong link between achievement or success in foreign language learning and the learner's attitude as well as learners start learning a foreign language with either positive or negative attitudes which, in turn, influence their participation in the learning task. Here, it can be inferred that students with a favorable attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom can be willing to participate in oral discussions which in turn can lead to more opportunities to interact in order to promote their own oral interaction skills.

Educators recommend that it was important to investigate learners' attitude towards a foreign language they learn. For example, the study of language attitude still needs more investigation since it can furnish the required data for curriculum designers, planners, teachers and instructors and an understanding of the students' attitude allows educators to gain a more realistic insight into what goes inside the learners' heads, and their preferences instead of relying only on how teachers view the teaching learning process (Abu-Snoubar, 2017, p. 19). In a similar way, there has not been a research in relation to students' attitude towards oral interaction in a classroom at university level in Ethiopia, even though students' oral interaction in EFL classroom has been reported low. Consequently**,** in the current study, the researcher was initiated to identify the students' attitude towards oral interaction in terms of its three components: cognitive, affective and behavioral components in EFL classroom.

The Research Questions

1. What is the students' cognitive component of attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom?
2. What is the students' affective component of attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom?
3. What is the students' behavioral component of attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom?

Review of Related Literature

The concept of attitude

An attitude refers to a feeling, an emotion and a behavior or an action tendency towards someone or something. According to Bailey (2006, p. 41) attitude is defined as a stance toward self, activity, and others that links intrapersonal dynamics with external performance and behaviors and an attitude is a relatively more enduring than belief because it is an organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner.

Role of attitude in practicing oral interaction in EFL classroom

According to Chang, (2011, p. 21), attitude is viewed to have influence on someone's behavior That is to say, a person's attitude toward an object affects the person's intentions to perform behaviors relating to that object. Therefore, it is possible to infer that learners' attitude is an important thing in their decision and willingness to participate in classroom oral interaction during EFL teaching and learning process. Accordingly, students with favorable attitude towards oral interaction are expected to be willing to engage themselves in interaction in EFL classroom as well as enthusiastic to spend much time interacting orally. In this way, the more they interact, the more they get chance to practice the target language which in turn provide them with the opportunity to improve their oral interaction skill. Regarding the above point, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991, p. 616) indicate that the greater the student's involvement or engagement in academic work or in the academic experience, the greater his or her level of knowledge acquisition and general cognitive development. Here, cognitive development includes language development.

As a result, it is evident that the more positive pupils' attitude towards learning the foreign language is, the more likely their success and better achievement in learning the language will be and there is a significant correlation between positive attitude towards learning a foreign language and achievement in the target language (Ahmed, 1989, p. 117).

The oral interaction

Oral interaction is an exchange of ideas and expressions of feelings through verbal talk. Regarding interaction, particularly instructional interaction, Wagner (1994, p. 8) provides its definition within the context of learner performance indicating it as an event that takes place between a learner and the learner's environment which includes classmates and a teacher. Here, the purpose of an oral interaction is to respond to the learner orally in a way intended to change his or her behavior toward an improvement of learners' oral interaction skill.

The oral interaction skill

An oral interaction skill is a performance someone demonstrates during oral interaction or verbal talk. Performance is a person's actual use of a language in a context and how a person uses his/her language knowledge in producing and understanding sentences in exchanging ideas (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, P. 392 and 489).

With regard to the essence of the oral interaction skill, Ur (1996, p. 120) states that "of all the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), speaking skill seems intuitively the most important. For Nunan (1998, p.39), speaking is the most frequently used mode of communication to express opinions, make arguments, offer explanations, transmit information, and make impressions. Therefore, the oral interaction skill through which these opinions, arguments, explanations, information exchanges are made, is essential.

Research Methodology

Research paradigm

For the current study, post positivist assumptions has been adopted because the post positivist assumptions have represented the traditional form of research, and these assumptions hold true more for quantitative research than qualitative research and it is also called positivist/ post positivist research, empirical science, and post positivism (Creswell, 2009, p.6). Post-positivism represents the thinking after positivism, challenging the traditional notion of the absolute truth of knowledge and recognizing that we cannot be positive about our claims of knowledge when studying the behavior and actions of humans (Phillips & Burbules, 2000 as cited in Creswell, 2014, p.36).

Research design

For this study, a descriptive case study design was employed. Case studies were the predominant research approach at the beginning of modern social science (Given, 2008, P. 68). According to Kumar (2011, p. 123), case study, though dominantly a qualitative study design, it is also prevalent in quantitative research.

Research approach

For the current study, a quantitative research approach was utilized. Here, a questionnaire was employed as a research instrument to assess students' attitude. Attitudes are assessed and the data are collected on an instrument that measures attitudes, and the information is analyzed using statistical procedures (Creswell, 2014, p.48).

The participants of the study

The participants of the current study were 64 second year students in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH), Gambella University who were selected through simple random sampling technique in the year 2023.

Data gathering instrument

In the current study, the data gathering instruments was a close ended questionnaire. The questionnaire with sixteen (16) items was used to collect data from the students about their own attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom. According to Dornyei (2003, p. 8), questionnaires can yield three types of data about the respondent: factual, behavioral, and attitudinal. Therefore, through the questionnaire, the students provided responses about their attitude towards oral interaction. Opinions are just as subjective as attitudes, but they are perceived as being more factually based and more changeable (Dornyei, 2003, p. 9). Here, an opinion is a part of the first component of attitude. The first component of attitude is cognitive component which subsume opinion. Accordingly, a close ended questionnaire with a five points Likert scale, were used to collect quantitative data. Closed-ended or simply closed questions provide 'ready-made' categories within which respondents reply to the questions asked by the researcher,

help to ensure that the information needed by the researcher is obtained and the responses are also easier to analyze (Kumar, 2011). The major advantage of closed-ended questions is that their coding and tabulation is straightforward and leaves no room for rater subjectivity (Dornyei (2003, p. 35). Accordingly, such questions are sometimes referred to as 'objective' items.

Moreover, in the current study, among the ranked scales, the original Likert scales which contain five (5) response options were employed (Dornyei, 2003, p. 37). There are three major types of attitudinal scale and one of them is the summated rating scale, also known as Likert scale (Kumar, 2011, p. 159). In Likert scales, respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with these multiple choice items by marking (e. g., circling) one of the responses ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. That is, the various alternatives can represent degrees of an attitude, interest, and belief. In quantitative research, one can ascertain the types of attitudes people have in a community, how many people have a particular attitude and what the intensity is of those attitudes (Kumar, 2011, p. 157). The scholar adds that a number of techniques have been developed to measure attitudes and their intensity in quantitative research.

Data collection procedures

For the current study, the data were collected in the following ways. Accordingly, a close ended questionnaire with a five points Likert scale as well as with some open ended questions was designed, developed in English and administered by the researcher through face-to- face contact with the students. The questionnaire data were collected from the second year students in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities (FSSH), in the selected university. Moreover, during the administration of the questionnaire, the participants who needed clarifications for understanding the questions were given opportunities to ask. Accordingly, the quantitative data were collected, coded, thematically categorized and ready for analysis.

Methods of data analysis

In the current study, in order to answer the research question, the data were gathered through close ended questionnaire. Besides, the quantitative data collected from the students about their attitude through questionnaire were analyzed by using descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages and mean scores.

For the purpose of data analysis, Alston and Miller (2002, p. 6) recommend that readers should use the following specifications when interpreting the scales. Accordingly, for the current study, the labels of the mean scores range has been depicted in the following table. Accordingly, Table 1 shows Likert scale, value allocation and interpretation of the ranges of mean scores.

Table 1: Likert Scale Value Range Allocation and Interpretation

Likert Scale	Value allocation	Interpretation
1	1 - 1.49	Strongly disagree Agree
2	1.50 - 2.49	Disagree
3	2.50 – 3.49	Moderately agree
4	3.50 – 4.49	Agree
5	4.50 – 5.00	Strongly agree

Source: Alston and Miller (2002, p.6)

Validity the questionnaire

In the study, in order to ensure the validity of the findings, the data gathering instrument was reviewed by experts in the field of TEFL. The experts' comments include the following. For example, when there appear unclear and obscure questions of the tool, they were amended and the ineffective as

well as nonfunctioning questions were discarded based on the suggestions of the reviewers and experts in the field of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL). According to Dornyei (2003, p.66-67), the comments include wording of the items, clarity of their meanings, relevance of items, or items that should be incorporated.

Reliability of questionnaire

In order for the questionnaire to be effective, the items in it should work together in a homogeneous manner. That is, the items should measure the same target area or construct. This means that each item should correlate with the other item which is referred to as internal consistency (Dornyei, 2003, p. 69). The coefficient of reliability falls between zero (0) and one (1). In social sciences, acceptable range of alpha value estimates from 0.7 to 0.8 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). In addition, the result of reliability analysis is valid when Cronbach's alpha reveals ≥ 0.70 (George & Mallery, 2009).

In the current study, the inter item reliability analysis of the questionnaire has been carried out. Accordingly, in the study, the result of the total item reliability of the questionnaire was 0.906 which indicated high reliability score.

Results

Students' attitudes towards oral interaction

In this section of the study, attitude of the students towards oral interaction has been presented. Accordingly, the students' cognitive component, affective component and behavioral component of their attitude towards oral interaction have been discussed.

Students' cognitive component of attitude towards oral interaction

Regarding the students' cognition about the benefits of oral interaction, the data collected from the students through questionnaire have been presented in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Students' Cognitive Component of Attitude towards Oral Interaction

No.	Items	Likert Scale										Mean
		1		2		3		4		5		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
1.	Oral interaction is essential to promote my oral interaction skill.	4	6.2	50	76.9	4	6.2	4	6.2	2	3.1	2.22
2.	Interacting with classmates improves my oral interaction skill.	14	21.5	42	64.6	4	6.2	4	6.2	-	-	1.97
3.	Interacting with instructor improves my oral interaction skill.	48	73.8	4	6.2	4	6.2	2	3.1	6	9.2	1.66
4.	My oral interaction skill can develop through oral interaction.	54	83.1	4	6.2	6	9.2	-	-	-	-	1.25
5.	It is important to practice oral interaction to enhance oral interaction skill.	48	73.8	4	6.2	4	6.2	6	9.2	2	3.1	1.59
	Average Mean											1.73

Key: 1.00- 1.49: Strongly disagree, 1.50 - 2.49: Disagree, 2.50 – 3.49: Moderately agree, 3.50– 4.49: Agree and 4.50 – 5.00: Strongly disagree

Table 2 presents students' responses regarding their cognition about oral interaction. From the Table 2, the average mean score of this part of the questionnaire regarding students' cognition about oral

interaction was 1.73 which indicates that the respondents disagreed to all of the items on average because the average mean score was indicates disagree.

More specifically, from Table 2, on item one, the mean score was 2.22 whose 50 (76.9 %) of the students disagreed and 4 (6.2 %) strongly disagreed that oral interaction is essential to promote their oral interaction skill. Besides, on item two, the mean score was 1.97 or 42 (64.6 %) of the students disagreed that interacting with classmates improves their oral interaction skill. On item three, the mean score was 1.66 or 48 (73.8 %) of the respondents strongly disagreed and 4 (6.2%) disagreed that interacting with the instructor improves their oral interaction skill.

Moreover, on item four, the mean score was 1.25 or 54 (83.1 %) of the students strongly disagreed and 4 (6.2%) disagreed that their oral interaction skill can develop through oral interaction. Furthermore, on item five, the mean score was 1.59 which indicates that the students disagreed. More specifically, 48 (73.8 %) of the students strongly disagreed and 4 (6.2%) disagreed that it is important to practice oral interaction to enhance oral interaction skill. Therefore, concerning the cognitive component of their attitude towards oral interaction, it was possible to deduce from the findings of the questionnaire that the students did not have adequate cognition about the advantages of oral interaction in order to develop their oral interaction skill.

Students' affective component of attitude towards oral interaction

Concerning the students' preferences to use oral interaction in the classroom, the data collected from them through questionnaire have been presented in the following Table 3.

Table 3. Students' Affective Component of Attitude towards Oral Interaction

No.	Items	Likert Scale										Mean
		1		2		3		4		5		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
6.	I like oral interaction in EFL classroom.	6	9.2	52	80	6	9.2	-	-	-	-	2.00
7.	I prefer to interact orally with classmates in EFL classroom.	8	12.3	44	67.7	4	6.2	8	12.3	-	-	2.19
8.	I prefer to interact orally with instructor in EFL classroom.	6	9.2	48	73.8	-	-	4	6.2	6	9.2	2.31
9.	In class, I like to improve my oral interaction skill through oral interaction.	10	15.4	50	76.9	4	6.2	-	-	-	-	1.91
10.	I like talking in pairs in EFL classroom to enhance my oral skill.	12	18.5	40	61.5	4	6.2	8	12.3	-	-	2.12
11.	I like interacting orally in small groups to enhance my oral skill.	20	30.8	44	67.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/69
12.	I like to spend much of class time in oral interaction in the EFL classroom.	8	12.3	48	73.8	8	12.3	-	-	-	-	2.00
	Average Mean											**2.03**

Key: 1.00- 1.49: Strongly disagree, 1.50 - 2.49: Disagree, 2.50 – 3.49: Moderately agree, 3.50– 4.49: Agree and 4.50 – 5.00: Strongly disagree

Table 3 presents students' responses regarding their preferences about using oral interaction in EFL classroom. From the Table 3, the average mean score of this part of the questionnaire regarding students' preferences to employ oral interaction was 2.03 which indicates that the respondents disagreed to all of the items on average because the average mean indicated that the students disagreed to prefer oral interaction in EFL classroom. In detail, from Table 3, on item six, the mean score was 2.00 that revealed that students disagreed. That is, 52 (80 %) of the students disagreed and 6 (9.2 %) strongly disagreed that

they like oral interaction in EFL classroom. Besides, on item seven, the mean score was 2.19 portraying that the students disagreed. Accordingly, 44 (67.7 %) of the students disagreed and 8 (12.3%) strongly disagreed that they prefer to interact orally with classmates in EFL classroom. on item eight, the mean score was 2.31 depicting that the students disagreed. Specifically, 48 (73.8%) of the students disagreed and 6 (9.2%) strongly disagreed that they prefer to interact orally with the instructor in EFL classroom. Besides, on item nine, the mean score was 1.91 showing that the students disagreed. On the item, 50 (76.9%) of them disagreed and 10 (15.4%) strongly disagreed that in the classroom, they like to improve their oral interaction skill through oral interaction. Moreover, on item ten, the mean score was 2.12 which indicated that the students disagreed. Here, 40 (61.5%) of them disagreed and 12 (18.5%) strongly disagreed that they like talking in pairs in EFL classroom to enhance their oral skill. On item eleven, the mean score was 1.69 revealing that the students disagreed. In detail, 44 (67.7%) disagreed and 20 (30.8%) strongly disagreed that they like interacting orally in small groups to enhance their oral skill. Furthermore, on item twelve, the mean score was 2.00 showing disagreement. More specifically, 48 (73.8%) of the students disagreed and 8 (12.3%) strongly disagreed that they prefer to spend much of the class time in oral interaction in the EFL classroom. Therefore, concerning the affective component of their attitude towards oral interaction, it was possible to infer from the findings of the questionnaire that the students did not prefer oral interaction in EFL classroom in order to develop their oral interaction skill.

Students' behavioral component of attitude towards oral interaction

With regard to the students' enthusiasm to use oral interaction in the classroom, the data collected from them through questionnaire have been presented in the following ways.

Table 4. Students' Behavioral Component of Attitude towards Oral Interaction

No.	Items	Likert Scale										Mean
		1		2		3		4		5		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
13.	I am enthusiastic to practice oral interaction in EFL classroom.	8	12.3	56	86.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.88
14.	I am eager to spend much of the class time interacting orally.	40	61.5	20	30.8	4	6.2	-	-	-	-	1.44
15.	I am interested in using interaction to improve my oral interaction skill.	10	15.4	48	73.8	2	3.1	4	6.2	-	-	2.00
16.	I have a tendency to interact orally in EFL classroom.	8	12.3	50	76.9	6	9.2	-	-	-	-	1.97
	Average Mean											**1.82**

Key: 1.00- 1.49: Strongly disagree, 1.50 - 2.49: Disagree, 2.50 – 3.49: Moderately agree, 3.50– 4.49: Agree and 4.50 – 5.00: Strongly disagree

Table 4 reveals students' responses regarding their enthusiasm about using oral interaction in EFL classroom. From the Table 4, the average mean score of this section of the questionnaire regarding students' enthusiasm to employ oral interaction was 1.82 which indicates that the respondents almost disagreed to all of the items on average because according to Alston and Miller (2002, p.6), the above average mean indicates that the students disagreed that they were enthusiastic to employ oral interaction in EFL classroom.

More specifically, from Table 4, on item thirteen, the mean score was 1.88 which indicates that the respondents disagreed. Hence, 56 (86.2%) of the respondents disagreed and 8 (12.3%) strongly disagreed that they were enthusiastic to practice oral interaction in EFL classroom. On item fourteen, the mean score was 1.44 indicating that the respondents disagreed. Therefore, 40 (61.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed and 20 (30.8%) of them disagreed that they were eager to spend much of the class time

interacting orally. On item fifteen, the mean score was 2.00 showing that the respondents disagreed. In detail, 48 (73.8%) of the respondents disagreed and 10 (15.4%) of them strongly disagreed that they were interested in using oral interaction in EFL classroom in order to improve their oral interaction skill. Moreover, on item sixteen, the mean score was 1.97 which revealed that the students disagreed. As a result, 50 (76.9%) of the respondents disagreed and 8 (12.3%) of them strongly disagreed that they had a tendency to interact orally in EFL classroom. Therefore, concerning the behavioral component of their attitude towards oral interaction, it was possible to deduce from the findings of the third section of the questionnaire that the students were not enthusiastic to use oral interaction in EFL classroom in order to develop their oral interaction skill. Regarding the students' attitude towards oral interaction in terms of cognitive, affective and behavioral components, the following Table 5 portrays the summary of the findings.

I.   Table 5. Summary of the Students' Attitude towards Oral Interaction

Respondents	N	Theme	No. of items	Average Mean
Students	64	Cognitive component	5	1.73
		Affective component	7	2.03
		Behavioral component	4	1.82
		Overall mean	**16**	**1.86**

Key: 1.00- 1.49: Strongly disagree, 1.50 - 2.49: Disagree, 2.50 – 3.49: Moderately agree, 3.50– 4.49: Agree and 4.50 – 5.00: Strongly disagree

From Table 5, the overall mean score of the items of the questionnaire which was about students' attitude towards oral interaction was 1.86. Therefore, the overall mean score indicates that the respondents disagreed to the items on average because according to Alston and Miller (2002, p.6), the overall mean score was found in the range which stands for disagree in the scale.

Discussion

The current study focused on an investigation of university students' attitude towards English oral interaction based on its three components: cognitive, affective and behavioral constituents. The findings of the study indicated that the students did not have adequate cognition about the advantages of oral interaction in developing their oral interaction skill. Besides, concerning the affective component of their attitude towards oral interaction, the findings revealed that the students did not prefer to interact orally in English language. Moreover, the findings showed that the students were not enthusiastic to interact orally in English language in order to develop their oral interaction skill.

As a result, the findings on the three components of attitude: cognitive, affective and behavioral constituents indicated that the students had negative attitude towards oral interaction in English language. On one hand, the findings of the current study were compatible with that of Munir and Rehman (2015) which indicated that Pakistani students held negative attitudes towards learning English as a foreign language. On the other hand, the findings of the current study were contrary to that of Gomleksiz (2010), in Turkey that found the students had positive attitudes towards learning English.

In fact, according to Lubis, 2015, p. 19), having a positive attitude toward the language and culture and toward learning a foreign language is an important contributor to the success of foreign language learning as well as positive attitude might encourage learners to interact with native speakers, which in turn increases the amount of input that learners receive.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the current study regarding the students' attitude towards oral interaction in EFL classroom in terms of the three components of attitude, the following conclusions have been made. Regarding the cognitive component of their attitude, the students have little understanding about the merit of oral interaction in promoting their oral interaction skill. Concerning the affective component of their attitude, the students did no prefer using oral interaction in EFL classroom. With regard to the behavioral component of their attitude towards oral interaction, the students were not enthusiastic to use oral interaction in classrooms in order to enhance their oral interaction skill. Consequently, it was possible to conclude that the students had negative attitude towards oral interaction when assessed in terms of cognitive, affective and behavioral components of attitude. The findings of the current study concluded that the students had negative attitude towards oral interaction in classrooms even though a number of studies revealed that the oral interaction in classrooms was little. For this reason, further studies need to be carried out in universities to recognize the hindering factors of oral interaction in English as a foreign language classroom other than learners' attitude.

References

Abu-Snoubar,T. K. (2017). An Evaluation of EFL Students' Attitudes toward English Language Learning In Terms of Several Variables. *International Journal of English Language Teaching,* 5 (6), 18-34. UK (www.eajournals.org)

Ahmed, H. A. (1989). The Role of Attitudes and Motivation in Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages. (Unpublished PhD thesis), University of Stirling, Iraq.

Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allwright, R. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *5*(2), 156-171.

Alston, A. J. and Miller, W.W. (2002). Analyzing the barriers and benefits toward instructional technology infusion in North Carolina and Virginia Secondary Agricultural Education Curricula. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 43* (1), 1-15.

Bailey, K. M. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles*. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.

Caspi, A., Chajut, E., Saporta, K., and Beyth-Marom, R. (2006). The Influence of Personality on social participation in learning environment. *Learning and Individual Differences,* 16(2), 129-144.

Chang, M. (2011). EFL teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles, 53,* 17-34.

Chang, Chi-Fang (2018). Exploring Factors Influencing the Willingness to Communicate among English-as-a-Second Language University Students. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation), The University of San Francisco, San Francisco, California.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Congmin, Z. (2013). Classroom interaction and second language acquisition: The more interactions the better? *Studies in Literature and Language*, *7* (1), 22-26. DOI:10.3968/j.sll.1923156320130701.3085

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4thed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rded.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dawit Tesfaye & Demis G/Tsadik (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. Website: www.soeagra.com/ijert.html

Dornyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Nottingham: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Esayas Teshome (2018). An investigation of the practice of teaching and assessing speaking skills in spoken English classes: Dilla University in focus. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, 49,* 32-40. www.iiste.org

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2009). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference1 6.0 update* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Given, L. M. (2008). *The sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gömleksiz, M. N. (2010). An evaluation of students' attitudes toward English language learning   in terms of several variables. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9,* 913–918. www.sciencedirect.com

Gorsky, P., Caspi, A., and Trumper, R. (2004). *Dialogue in Distance Education Physics Course*. Open learning, 19, 265-277.

Jora, M.B. (2019). ELT in Nepal: Exploring the paradigm shift. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, *9* (1), 784-788.

Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rded.).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage**.**

Lap, T. Q. & Thy, V. U. (2017). EFL teachers' challenges in maximizing classroom interaction. *Studies in English Language Teaching, 5* (4), 695- 709. dx.doi.org/10.22158/selt.v5n4p695

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research.* New York: Longman.

Legesse Wochato (2017). Investigating Factors Affecting Students' interaction in Grade 10 English Classroom: The Case of Three Selected Secondary Schools in Tembaro Woreda. (Unpublished MA thesis in TEFL), Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.

Li, H. and Liu, Y. (2011). A brief   Study of Reticence in ESL Class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1* (8), 961-965. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.8.961-965

Lubis, T. (2015).Students'language attitude toward English.*Jurnal Bisnis Administrasi*,*04*(01),17-21.

Munir, F. & Rehman, A. (2015). Attitudes of secondary schools towards English as a foreign language: a case study at Lahore. *Pakistan International Journal of Research*, *2*(4) 637- 650.

Nunan, D. (1998). *Language teaching methodology*. London: Prentice Hall.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw- Hill.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Rivers, W. (1987). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In a Wilga M. Rivers (Eds.), *Interactive language teaching*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sarem, S. N. & Shirzadi, Y. (2014). A critical review of the interactionist approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 1*(1), 62-74. Available online at www.jallr.ir

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: CUP.