

Research paper

## Effect of Hot Seat Technique on Pre-intermediate Learners' Oral Production

Maryam Elahifar\*

*Department of English, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran*

### Citation

Elahifar, M. (2022). Effect of hot Seat technique on pre-intermediate learners' oral production. *Journal of new advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 739-752.

 10.22034/jeltal.2022.4.1.3

### Received

2021-12-26

### Revised

2022-02-05

### Accepted

2022-02-07

### Keywords:

hot seat,  
oral production,  
pre-intermediate  
learners

### Abstract

The current research was to examine the impact of using hot seat technique on developing EFL learners' oral production. In doing so, 56 female language learners from English institute in Khorramshahr, Iran participated in a placement test to determine their English language homogeneity. Then 36 students at the pre-intermediate level were selected and assigned into three random groups, 12 learners each included one control and two experimental groups (i.e., teachers' questioning and students' questioning experimental groups). The groups took a pre-test of oral ability at the first session. In the treatment sessions, experimental groups practiced oral activities through hot seat strategy but the control one was taught conventional tasks such as question/answer, conversation, and participate on guided topics. Finally, at the end of the course, a post-test was administered to three groups. The teachers' questioning group outperformed the other groups in oral production through hot seat strategy. Descriptive and inferential statistics was used to compare the means of the groups in pre/post-tests. The implications of the study indicated hot seat technique may facilitate learners' oral production.

\*Corresponding Author: Maryam Elahifar

**Address:** *Department of English, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran*

**Tel:** (+98) 9163144974    **E-mail:** *elahifar@gmail.com*

## Introduction

English language as an international language is used as a significant medium of interaction in the world. These days, the world is in the edge of globalization. English language plays an important role in everything of life such as economy, international/cultural relationships, technology and education (Najem, 2001). In pedagogy, English language plays primary roles

in communication. It is used by millions of people around the world. Genc (2007) notes that, The English speakers learn a language and its four skills that they need for communication. "When we learn our native language, we usually learn to listen first, then to speak, then to read, and finally to write. These are called the four language skills in order to achieve a good command of the language"(p. 6).

Any language requires two kinds of skills. The first one is the receptive skills with two parts including listening and reading skills and the second one is productive skills which involve writing and speaking. Bygate (1987) notes speaking skill can gather attention as much as the literary skills in both native and non-native languages. When students speak in a competent and comfortable manner, they can interact better in real and interactive environments (Al-Mohanna, 2011).

Oral production as one of the basic skills of language learning requires communicative competence involving suprasegmental features, syntax, lexicon, speech fluency, accuracy, and comprehension (Richards, 2007). Brown (1994) believes speaking skill is producing oral language and " it is not only an utterance, but also a tool of communication. It occurs when two or more people interact with each other aiming at maintaining social relationship between them "(p.103).

EFL learners need more opportunity to practice English language orally and use it for communication inside and outside the classrooms (Lourdunathan & Menon, 2006). In other words, pair or peer work activities may provide learners with a chance to share information and build a sense of community (Van Ments, 1990). Techniques of teaching speaking skills need methods of active learning in classrooms. Teachers need to get students in understanding and sharing their ideas and opinions at the learning situations (Al-Twairish, 2009).

This study attempts to discover the role of hot seat as a role play in teaching oral proficiency (Afifah, 2020; Robinson, 1981; Sari, 2011; Taylor, 2000). Hot seat is a language teaching technique that helps students to learn how to dramatize their ideas in conversations to acquire oral skill (Trachtulcová, 2007). It is an effective strategy if it uses correctly. The purpose of hot seat is to help EFL learners to use the target language adequately (Abid, 2020; Bentley, Brewer, & Eaton, 2009). Hot seat is a technique which one student takes a particular role and others ask questions about a particular topic which the teacher choose it. It is a strategy that makes the class active to speak. Hot seat strategy helps the students to challenge by motivating them to be prepare for oral production in the classroom. When the students prepare themselves for class, they participate more in oral activity. It is a useful technique for increasing students 'preparation and participation in the class. The hot seat seems to be valued by students because it motivates them and improves their engagement in the classroom and they can learn the materials quickly. Hot seat strategy is effective for developing oral production (Tsou, 2005).

Hot seat technique may work for some reasons as a classroom activity. It takes no preparation or explanation and serve as a way to involve students in class activities of oral

interaction. Hot seat technique can encourage students to utter authentic ideas, questions, and opinions. The learners themselves may range in topics from their family background and everyday activities, to deeper through about life and culture (Primayadi & Zainil, 2018).

Oral skill is the most important skill for Iranian students, but most learners face problems to communicate in English language in classrooms. This lack of ability to interact in English may concern the learners to speak English as a foreign/second language (EFL/ESL). Most of the learners may be proficient in writing or in their grammar ability, but they are not successful in oral skill. Teachers should use the new and appropriate strategy for the learners to motivate them to speak English. There several researchers (e.g., Abid, 2020; Mattevi, 2005; Afifah, 2020; Wuryandani & Herwin, 2021) who believe in the use of hot seating as an effective strategy in teaching oral performance to EFL/ESL learners. They focus on the role of hot seating and an interaction between the teacher or students with each other in which a learner is asked by the teacher or other students in an interview. This can be in the form of a role play, drama, or even a game. The objective of this technique is to make fun and motivation in the class making learners talk in the class (Marina, Indrawati & Suarman, 2019).

Majority of learners may gain high scores in tests but they can hardly express themselves correctly or communicate effectively in the target language. These learners may use English language only in short and incomplete exchanges based on the dialogues they have learned. It becomes clear that what they learned of English language was not for communication, but for performing on a test of oral proficiency (Rohim & Umam, 2019). When they try to communicate, particularly in a serious situation, they switch back to their native, namely Persian, language. Thus, the researcher focused on this concern to examine the effect of hot seat technique on developing learners' oral proficiency.

## Background

### Oral production

Oral production is an important factor in language acquisition. It is one of the four skills that everyone can be gained it by conveying the intended meaning of concertation while telling the feelings and opinions. Oral production is an activity of speech production that becomes a part of classroom activities which involve interaction of the learners (Novita, 2008). Oral production is the most important skill in language learning and provides the learners with an opportunity for students to practice and use vocabulary, speak fluently and arrange phrases, sentences and correct form which lead to the strong confidence of learners in finding the best activities to improve their academic and vocational status. It also plays a major role in learning English language. Mastering the oral production is the final aim of acquiring a foreign or second language to the learners (McCarthy, 1998; Nunan, 2003).

Nowadays, the students know to express themselves in English. They should engage in social and cultural roles in any situation (Widdowson, 1994). They appeared to be concerned about speaking English in real life situations. Oral skill is characterized as the mutual function of language and its meaning is made and exchanged (Hughes, 2013). A few EFL teachers

expect their students can speak precisely after the teaching learning process. Oral skill is being competent of speech, showing or exchanging thoughts through using language.

Oral proficiency deals with intended meanings of speech rather than saying a word with more accuracy, fluency, feelings, ideas and communicative opinions (Purcell, 1993). There are many explanations that define speaking skills but the majority of them recognize oral production as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, processing, and receiving information. For instance, Andryani (2012) emphasizes that "oral production is the ability to speak target language to communicate with others that consists of accuracy, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and comprehensibility"(p.2).

Nunan (2003) notes the most realistic chance opportunity is that the teachers need to show students the applied uses of the second language to speak the language since the medium of communication throughout the daily conversations of managing the class. If they speak the language in class, it means that the class becomes an example of using language to function in a social situation. Therefore, one of the most important roles of oral skill is to investigate as a vehicle for taking part in class activities.

Widdowson (1994) states that learners with the high level of motivation do better language learning than those learners with low levels of motivation. He believes in the importance of motivation in classrooms since there are motivated learners that accomplish learning at any stage. They also use their motivation to catch other learners' attention toward learning and knowledge. Accordingly, if there is not enough motivation, the learners will hardly attain the pedagogical goals, because as said by Harmer (2001), motivated learners help class run to do things in order to attain their goals. In learning a language, learners may have various reasons for learning a second language. Many learners might be learning a language since it is a personal goal while other learners learn a language when they are in school and they have to pass the subject matter.

The literature has tried to elaborate on two parts that involved hot seat strategy and its effect on oral production. It recognized the different elements to motivate teachers in their class. It also discussed the importance of oral skill and the situation speaking English as a foreign language. In the first part, the theoretical background discussed about oral production, language learning strategies, drama techniques (Huang, 2008) and hot seat strategy (Mattevi, 2005). The second part, the empirical background discussed about the effect of hot seat and other strategies on developing oral production. But, the literature review of the current study clarifies that there were rare studies about speaking English or oral proficiency through hot seat strategy. Thus, the aim of the present research has been to review the related articles of the literature. All the previous articles have dealt with teaching and acquiring speaking skills rather than the use of hot seat technique to boost EFL learners' oral proficiency. Moreover, these studies investigated the effectiveness of techniques other than hot seat technique on oral production in English as a foreign language. This refers to the importance of various techniques of teaching speaking skills such as using of hot seat that involve EFL learners in the question and answer activities,

contextual interactions and dialogue techniques. The purpose of this study is to find out the answers of the following research questions:

RQ1. Does hot seat technique affect Iranian EFL learners 'oral production?

RQ2. Does teachers' and learners' questioning affect learners' oral production through hot seat technique?

## Method

### Participants

In this study, there were 56 female language learners who studied English as a foreign language in an English institute in Khorramshahr, Iran. Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was used for the selection of the homogeneous participants and 36 learners at the pre-intermediate level were selected as their scores of OQPT test have been regarded. The learners whose score were ranged from 17 to 26 band score were supposed as the pre-intermediate participants of the study. There were 12 participants in each group. Their age was ranging from 12-20. Then, the learners were assigned into three random groups, teacher questioning and student questioning were experimental groups and there was one control group.

### Instrumentation

The following instruments were employed to achieve the current study:

#### Oxford quick placement test (OQPT)

Oxford quick placement test (OQPT): this test included 60 items and the participants of this study took the it to determine their homogeneity in terms of their English language placement. This helped the researcher divide the sample population into three groups. the reliability of the test has been reported in several articles; therefore, it was used as a standardized test.

#### Pre-test

Pre-test: This test was a researcher-made speaking test and it was used based on the classroom materials to test the oral proficiency of the participants. The topics were selected from "Back-pack 3, developed by Diane Pinkley and Mario Herrera (2005) in order to measure the students' oral production before treatment. A few items were given every student. The items were answered orally in 3 or 4 minutes by the students. The learners' sounds were recorded during the pre-test. The scores were given based on the scores of a checklist developed by Hughes (2003). The scores in both pre-test and post-test were from 30 points. The scores of the control and experimental groups in the pre-test were given by two raters. Then, the mean of both raters was measured to attain the mean score of each participant. This determined as the score which allocated to learners' speaking skill. The inter-rater reliability of Pearson Correlation Analysis shows ( $r = 0.891$ ) that is an acceptable index.

#### Post- test

Post- test: The post-test was the same as the pre-test which included similar questions in content and format. Post-test was administered after the experiment. The design of the post-

test was similar to the pre-test in terms of time allocation and the number of items. The only difference of this test to the pre-test was the order of questions. In the post-test, the scores of the control and teacher questioning and student questioning experimental groups were given by two raters. Then, the mean of both raters was determined as the score allocated to learners' speaking skill. Content and face validity of the pretest and posttest was confirmed by two experts who worked on the same level in the language institute. Pearson Correlation Analysis was used to measure the inter-rater reliability as ( $r = 0.801$ ).

### **Checklist**

Checklist: The checklist (Hughes, 2003) assessed speaking skills that consist of six scales such as comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, communication, structure and accent. Every category involved five items. The scores were given based on the researcher-made test of pre and post-test of speaking skill.

### **Materials**

The researcher used the book "Backpack 3: pre-intermediate" written by (Diane Pinkely & Mario Herrera). The book contains 9 units and also a tape recorder to record the voice of learners while speaking. Totally, five units were selected from the book which was taught in twelve sessions.

### **Procedure**

This research was designed based on a quasi-experimental method including pre and post-test and a control group. It is conducted based on the research guidelines proposed by Mackey and Gass (2005). To accomplish the purpose of the study, first 56 females EFL learners were selected from English institute, Khorramshahr, Iran. This study carried out for 15 sessions. Before any treatment, an Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) was given to the participants to determine their homogeneity and to divide them into three groups. The learners who met the band score of the pre-intermediate level (17-26) participated in the study. They were divided into three groups. Each group included 12 participants. The groups were one control and two experimental groups (i.e., teachers questioning group and students questioning group). In the second session of the class, the pre-test was given to the participants to determine the level of oral production ability before any treatment. A pretest included some items that the teacher asked from participants to determine their oral ability.

After the pre-test, the sessions of the treatment began. The actual session of the treatment started from the third session. The treatment was allotted to the both experimental groups. There were 12 sessions of hot seat strategy for developing oral production in both experimental groups. The last 15 minutes of each session was allotted to oral production through hot seat strategy and the rest to teaching the course book. In hot seat strategy one of the learners sat on the chair in front of the class, the teacher or other learners should ask some questions about particular subject from the learner. In the teacher questioning experimental group, the teacher had the authority to ask the questions from the student that sat on the hot seat in front of the class and in the students' questioning experimental group the students asked the questions from



their classmate. All the questions were asked in experimental groups refer to the subject of learners' book. Every session was 60 minutes twice a week. In each session 2 or 3 learners sat on the hot seat. To motivate and encourage the participants to pay enough attention and to play more active role in the research program, they were told that the purpose of the extra instruction was to improve their oral production. Therefore, the research was held in the language classroom as a natural setting. In the control group, the learners did not receive any treatment based on hot seat strategy. They received some traditional instruction such as question and answer, conversation, and participate in topic discussion.

Finally, the last session was devoted to the post-test that is similar to the pre-test was given to the participants of control and experimental groups to determine their oral development during the treatment. The learners' voice in control and experimental groups through pretest and posttest recorded and the scores of groups were given by two raters based on the Hughes' (2003) checklist.

### Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to examine the impact of hot seat technique on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' oral production. One Way ANOVA and paired samples t-test were run to examine the differences of the mean among the groups. One Way ANOVA used because there are three groups of participants. Then Post-hoc Scheffe test used to obtain additional exploration among mean and to provide specific information on which mean are significantly different from each other.

### Findings

Data of the pre-intermediate learners' pre/post-tests were gathered and analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. The inferential statistics included One-way ANOVA to compare the means of the groups and a paired samples t-test to compare the pre and posttest of each individual group.

**Table 1.**  
*One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test*

	Control pretest	Control posttest	Ss Q pretest	Ss Q posttest	Ts Q pretest	Ts Q posttest
<i>N</i>	12	12	12	12	12	12
<i>Mean</i>	10.33	10.66	10.62	11.70	10.08	14.70
<i>SD</i>	1.28	1.82	2.87	3.40	2.32	3.31
<i>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</i>	.687	.617	.703	.426	.793	.953
<i>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.732	.841	.707	.993	.556	.324

\* *Test distribution is Normal.*

Table 1 reveals that the test distribution is normal and to calculate the data can be used normal parameters such as t-test and One-Way ANOVA.

**Table 2.**  
*Comparing One-Way ANOVA(Pre-test)*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Between Groups</i>	1.76	2	.88	.173	.842
<i>Within Groups</i>	168.64	33	5.11		
<i>Total</i>	170.41	35			

Table 2 indicates comparing One-way ANOVA in the pre-test among the three groups. The difference between the three groups is not significant ( $p < .842$ ). Since the level of probability was at ( $p < 0.05$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It can be inferred that the three groups in the pretest are homogenous.

**Table 3.**  
*Comparing One Way ANOVA (Post-test)*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Between Groups</i>	105.681	2	52.840	6.105	.006
<i>Within Groups</i>	285.625	33	8.655		
<i>Total</i>	391.306	35			

Table 3 indicates comparing One-way ANOVA among the three groups in the post-test. The difference between the three groups is significant ( $p < 0.006$ ). Since the value (0.006) is less than ( $p < 0.05$ ). Thus, the difference between the groups is significant.

**Table 4.**  
*Post-hoc Scheffe test (Multiple Comparisons of Post-test)*

(I) VAR00001	(J) VAR00001	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
<i>Teachers' questioning</i>	Students' questioning	-1.04	1.20	.689	-4.12	2.03
	control	-4.04*	1.20	.008	-7.12	-.96
<i>Students' questioning</i>	Teachers' questioning	1.04	1.20	.689	-2.03	4.12
	control	-3.00	1.20	.057	-6.07	.07
<i>control</i>	Teachers' questioning	4.04*	1.20	.008	.96	7.12
	Students' questioning	3.00	1.20	.057	-.07	6.07



Table 4 depicts the difference of the mean in the teacher questioning group is significantly different from student questioning group and control group is significant at the 0.05 level. There is not a significant difference between the student questioning group and the control group ( $p < 0.057$ ). The results show that the mean of the teacher questioning group is greater than the two groups ( $p < 0.008$ ) and it shows that the teacher questioning group was more effective than the other groups in promoting learners' oral proficiency.

**Table 5.**

*Descriptive Statistics (Pre & Post-tests of the Groups)*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Control pre-test	10.33	12	1.28	.37	-.68	11	.507
	Control post-test	10.66	12	1.82	.52			
Pair 2	Student questioning pre-test	10.62	12	2.87	.83	-1.15	11	.272
	Student questioning post-test	11.70	12	3.40	.98			
Pair 3	Teacher questioning pre-test	10.08	12	2.32	.67	-6.23	11	.000
	Teacher questioning post-test	14.70	12	3.31	.95			

Table 5 shows the pre/post-test of each group separately. Then, the mean of the pre-test and post-test in the three groups was compared. The difference between the means of both tests in teacher questioning group is significant. In other words, there was no significant difference between pre and posttest in the two other groups. It also shows the mean (4.62) with  $df=11$  in the teacher questioning group is higher than the two groups (4.62) with  $df=11$ . Moreover, the difference of the teacher questioning group in pre and post-tests is significant. Paired Samples  $t$ -test estimate the differences among the three groups in the pre and post-test.

### Discussion

Findings of the study revealed that the use of hot seat technique can be effective in teachers' questioning phase rather than the learners' questions one. However, the latter can be better than the conventional teaching methods of speaking skills that are common in most Iranian classes dealing with EFL. Research questions are answered and discussed as follows:

RQ1. Does hot seat technique affect Iranian EFL learners 'oral production'?

Learners' hot seat strategy has a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' oral production. The main aim of this study was to find out the effectiveness of learners' hot seat strategy on Iranian EFL learners' oral production. To answer this research question, two experimental groups of the teachers' questioning, students' questioning and one control group in the pre-

test were finally compared. The results showed that there was not an actual difference among students' performance in the pre-test, it can be inferred that the three groups were homogenous. Since the significant of value is greater than 0.05.

However, a significant difference was realized among the performances of the three groups in the post-test. Since the significant of value between three groups is less than 0.05. Therefore, three groups in post-test are significantly different. Secondly, the teachers' questioning experimental group, students' questioning experimental group and control groups in the pre-test performed the same level, that means, before using hot seat strategy, groups had the same proficiency level, so it is clear enough using hot seat strategy to improve oral production among EFL learners can be the basic reason for these different results in the post-test.

The performance of the participants in the teachers' questioning group and students' questioning group and the control group was different. Although, the control group was receiving some instruction such as conversation, question and answer and participate in discussion during 10 sessions, the teachers' questioning experimental group and the students' questioning experimental group used the hot seat strategy. In teachers' questioning experimental group, the teacher has the authority to ask the questions from the learner who sit on the hot seat and in the students' questioning experimental group, the students ask questions from their classmate. The teacher and learners' activities were recorded through the recorder. Findings of the results of Post-hoc Scheffe test revealed that there was not any significant difference between students' questioning experimental group and control group ( $p < 0.057$ ), it could be discussed that students' oral production did not improve significantly in students' questioning experimental group. Between teachers' questioning and control group, the difference was significant ( $p < 0.008$ ), it could be discussed that students improved significantly in oral production in teachers' questioning experimental group. Although the students' questioning group slightly improved but according to Post-hoc Scheffe test students' questioning group did not reveal a prominent difference concerned with the control group. The first null hypothesis "Learners' hot seat strategy does not have any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' oral production." was rejected. Therefore, it can be claimed that learners' hot seat strategy has a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' oral production.

Findings of the current research are in line with Wanous (2002) who believes English language learners may not communicate well in the classroom and were ashamed to speak English in the classroom. The teacher should encourage learners to speak English in hot seat technique. This is in line with Wile's (2013) study that the teacher should provide an atmosphere in the class in order to motivate students to participate in class communication actively through hot seat strategy. The teacher let them use hot seat strategy to speak English in the classroom and discussed particular topics based on their book. This procedure of teaching oral production through hot seat strategy during 15 sessions cause to improve the students' oral proficiency.

The hot seat technique was effective among Iranian pre-intermediate learners' oral production. The findings were supported by Al-Twairish (2009) who stated that hot seat strategy is effective for enhancing speaking skill for the students-teachers. Idris' (2014) findings are matched with the outcome of the present research that notes there is a significant effect of improvement of students' speaking ability between students who were taught by using hot seat strategy and who were taught by using conversational strategy. It indicated that the use of hot seat strategy is better than conversational strategy. Since the hot seat technique is encouraging the EFL learners to talk and play the passages in hot seat activities, the learners can be use language for real conversations. There are several reasons for the efficacy of this technique including the role of using language in a semi-structured context, speaking in a reciprocal manner between the students, having fun when they try to convince others, trying to gather information for better communication, etc. Teachers may also save the class time to focus on the main points like correcting learners' pronunciations, teaching vocabulary effectively, monitoring the class activities, and facilitating the learning processes in the class.

RQ2. Does teachers' and learners' questioning affect learners' oral production through hot seat technique?

Teachers' questioning affect EFL learners' oral production. Descriptive statistics compared the means between pretest and posttest in each group. There was not any significant difference between means' pre/posttest in control group. The mean in the students' questioning experimental group revealed there was difference between pretest and posttest to some degree, but there was not any significant difference. The teachers' questioning experimental group indicated a significant difference of means in the pre/ posttest. It showed the role of teachers' authority in the teachers' questioning experimental group. When the teacher had the authority of asking the questions from the students, the students' performance improved in hot seat strategy. Inferential statistics of *t*-test was compared the means of the pre-test and post-test between the three groups. The researcher measured the means of scores after the treatment to see if the hot seat strategy was effective. Teachers' questioning group were more influential than the students' questioning and control groups. Thus, the difference between the pre and post-test in the control group and students' questioning group was not significant but the difference between pre/post-test in the teachers' questioning group showed a significant level. It means that groups had the same proficiency level before treatment, but the EFL learners' oral production in teachers' questioning group was improved through hot seat strategy. Results of the study are matched with Wile (2013) since they refer to the techniques and methods used in teaching the oral production through hot seat technique as a drama or role play that are amusing and make an effective class when teachers are questioning the learners. The null-hypothesis "Teachers' questioning does not affect EFL learners' oral production " was not confirmed. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers' questioning as a hot seat technique influences learners' oral production.

In the teachers' questioning experimental group both teacher and learners worked in the group, but in students' questioning experimental group teacher just saw the students' participation in the class. The researcher observed that learners' oral production in the teachers' questioning experimental group that have the greatest improvement, so the teachers' authority

in that group has a positive effect on learners' oral production. This agrees with several scholars (e.g., Abid, 2020; Mattevi, 2005; Afifah, 2020; Wuryandani & Herwin, 2021) who emphasized the role of class conversation in developing learners' speaking proficiency. The reasons for this could be the effectiveness of learners' involvement in teaching and learning processes since the students participate in role-plays, dramas, or hot seating techniques. The learners can play their roles and this may make fun in the classroom.

### Conclusion

The research attempted to examine the effect of hot seat strategy on developing oral production among Iranian pre-intermediate learners. As it was said, oral production is one of the most important skill. Oral production helps the learners improve their communication in the classroom and their daily life. The teachers may be a significant part of the class in teaching oral skill. The two experimental groups were taught oral skill through hot seat technique. The control group received some instruction such as conversation and participation in discussion. The researcher investigated to see the effect of hot seat technique in teachers' questioning experimental group and students' questioning experimental group on developing oral production. The use of the posttest and analyze the data through One-way ANOVA and Post-hoc Scheffe test could revealed the fact that using hot seat strategy in teachers' questioning experimental group had a significant effect on learners' oral production. The result also showed that using hot seat strategy in students' questioning experimental group may improve the learners' oral production to some extent.

The outcome of this study suggests that EFL learners may improve oral production in the class through hot seat strategy. The learners need more responsibility, and self-confidence for their learning. The hot seat strategy helps EFL learners to become motivated to converse in English in the classrooms. In this case, all students gain the opportunity to answer the questions by short sentences without any fear. They can talk about their life and family in the classroom by participating in the hot seat technique. Students learn to communicate to each other in the class and even in their daily life. Learners become active participants in oral production through hot seat technique.

Limitations of the study could be the small size of the participants and the number of treatment sessions. Future research may compensate for these shortcomings. The researchers may work on hot seat technique in other areas of investigation like writing and reading skills to give the opportunity to the learners to express their ideas and opinions. Hot seat technique could be a great help that provide the learners with a chance to communicate the intended meaning not on the language forms. Here, one thing they need to do is to communicate with others.

### References

- Abid, O, S., (2020). The effect of hot seat strategy on the 1st intermediate students' Reading comprehension. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 15(5), 1089-1098, Doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i5.5153

- Afifah, N. (2020). The effectiveness of hot seating strategy to improve the students' speaking skill. *Journal of English education*, 3(1), 66-78.
- Al-Mohanna, M. (2011). Developing English learners' listening- speaking skills interactively: An analytic study in the Saudi Arabian context. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*.4(10),77-105.
- Al-Twairish, B. (2009). *The effect of the communicative approach on the listening and speaking skills of Saudi secondary school students: An Experimental Study*, MA thesis in Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature, King Saud University: Saudia.
- Andryani, L. (2012). Improving students speaking skill through socio drama. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 37(2), 1-22.
- Genc, B. (2007). *An Analysis of communication strategies employed by Turkish-speakers of English*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Institute of Social Sciences, Department of English Language teaching, Cukurova University, Adana:Turkey.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *How to teach English*. London: Longman Press.
- Herrera, M., & Pinkley, D. (2005). *Backpack: British English. 3, Backpack series*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Huang, Y. I. (2008). Role play for ESL/EFL children in the English classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 14(2). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Huang-RolePlay.html>
- Hughes, R. (2003). *Teaching and researching: Speaking (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY:
- Lourdunathan, J., & Menon, S. (2006). *Developing speaking skills through interaction strategy training*. University Technology, Malaysia.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S.M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Ince, Publishers.
- Marina M, Indrawati, H. & Suarman S. (2019). Application of moving class learning models and teacher pedagogical competence on learning motivation and student learning discipline. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 72–83. doi:10.31258/jes.3.1.p.72-83
- Mattevi, Y. (2005). *Using drama in the classroom: The educational values of theatre in second language acquisition*. From: <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdwebindex>
- McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Najem, Kh. (2001). *The effectiveness of using mathematical and educational games for the seventh primary graders on their achievement in mathematics and their attitudes towards them*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Jordanian University, Amman.
- Novita, L. (2008). *Improving student' speaking competency by using role-play technique at the eight year of SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Surakarta: A classroom action research*. Skripsi thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. from <http://viewer.eprints.ums.ac.id/archive/etd/168>.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

- Primayadi, P. P., & Zainil, Y. (2018). Using hot seating strategies to teach a descriptive text in senior high school. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(3), 490-496.
- Purcell, J. M. (1993). Livelier FLES lessons through role-play. *Hispania*, 76(4), 912-918.
- Richards, J. C. (2007). *Developing classroom speaking activities; from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P.G. (1981). Role play and classroom participation. *ELT Journal*, 35(4). 384-386.
- Rohim, S. & Umam, K. (2019). The effect of problem-posing and think-pair-share learning models on students' mathematical problem-solving skills and mathematical communication skills. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning*, 4(2), 287-291. doi:10.26737/jetl.v4i2.803
- Sari, D (2011). Drama as a tool in interpretation: Practitioner perceptions of its strengths & limitations. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 23(2), 31-44.
- Taylor, P. (2000). *The drama classroom: Action, reflection, transformation*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Trachtulcová, K. (2007). *Effective learning of English through drama*. Bachelor Thesis, Department of English Language and Literature, faculty of Education, MASARYK University BRNO.
- Tsou, W. (2005). Improving speaking skills through instruction in oral classroom participation. *Childhood Education*. 38(3), 46-55.
- Van Ments, M. (1990). *Active talk: the effective use of discussion in learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Wanous, Y. (2002). *The Effectiveness of teaching program via the video for learning listening comprehension in English*. An Empirical Study on the Second Secondary Class in the Schools of Martyrs in Syria. Unpublished M.A Dissertation, Damascus University.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1994). Teachers of English to speakers of other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2). 377-389.
- Wile, E (2013). *EFL vocabulary games*. Retrieved from: [www.ehow.com/list6624901-vocabularygameenglish-learners.html](http://www.ehow.com/list6624901-vocabularygameenglish-learners.html).
- Wuryandani, W & Herwin. (2021). The effect of the think pair share model on learning outcomes of Civics in elementary school students. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(2), 627-640. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5640>