

# Chapter One

## Introduction

This chapter provides description of theoretical framework of the study. It focuses mainly on the statement of the study problem, the study questions and hypotheses as well as the research methodology.

### 1.1 Context of the Study:

Learning a foreign language is skill that needs more practice for mastering it. It's like Physical Education (PE) or woodwork or riding a bicycle because it's a set of skills. Learners have to practise these skills until they can master them well.

Teachers should do their best to enable the students to be more participant in the class activities during teaching English as a foreign language; which can be done successfully through pair work and group work. They can give the students a chance to practise their activities with each other for more interaction in their communication in the classroom.

According to Brumfit (1984), group work is often considered an essential feature of communicative language teaching. Moreover Long and Porter (1985) hold that pair work and group work can promote students' practice, the quality of their talk, their motivation, and positive classroom atmosphere. Salmon (1988) supports Long and Porter's ideas and argues that pair work and group work also help to increase students' confidence.

This study is an attempt to explore pair work and group work in Sudanese Secondary Schools ELT Classrooms. Pair work and group work are techniques for communicative teaching that provide a chance for social interaction. They are a class management strategy and the role that teacher has to play while teaching is as a facilitator. Teacher's role in group work is very difficult and at the same time it is very important. The groups are a temporary clustering of students within a single class session. They can be pairs of students or groups of three or four formed to solve a problem or pose a question. The teacher can organize these groups at any time in a class of any size to check on the students' understanding of the material, to give students an opportunity to apply what they are learning, or to provide a change of pace.

There are many suggested techniques to teach English as foreign and/or second language in the classroom. One of these techniques is pair work and group work. Pair work is a learning activity which involves learners working together in pairs while group work is a learning activity which includes a small group of learners working together. The group may work on a single task, or on different parts of a larger task. Pair work seems to be a good idea because it increases students' practice; it also allows the students to use language and encourages them to cooperate with each other. In other words it enhances student's motivation to fulfill the goal of practicing the language inside or outside the classroom. Pair work is considered as an opportunity for the students to practise their communicative skills and consolidate their knowledge of English language; besides, it enhances the social skill and interaction between classmates, while group work is a common practice in first language (L1) and second language (L2).

The use of pair work and group work in language teaching is seen as providing learners with more opportunities to practise language. In addition to that, students become more interested not only intellectually but emotionally as well, because when they work in groups they have to think, participate to the group, evaluate the other members of the group, share information, ask colleagues for clarification, and prepare a presentation together.

(Brown, 2001:177) states that “group work is generic term covering a multiplicity of techniques in which two or more students are assigned a task that involves collaboration and self-initiated language.” According to this quotation, students can be creative by using various techniques to practise language such as using games which are considered as important activities for groups. In addition to that role-play which contains roles for the members of the group to practise the language, also jigsaw techniques, interviews, drama, brainstorming and different ways to consolidate multiple techniques.

Nyala is the capital of South Darfur State. It's a crowded town as a result of population flush from the different rural areas. They escaped from insecure situations created by armed robbery, tribal wars and rebellion that led to schools' crowdedness especially in secondary schools classrooms. The classrooms' crowdedness decreases students' participation during teaching English in the classroom that consisted of seventy-students only few of them were participating in the classroom activities. The class was divided into seven groups ten students for each group . He noticed the rising of students' participation rate as a result of the spirit of competition among them. The researcher expects that pair work and group work give the students far more chances to participate

and speak English in the classroom. Moreover, the reasons for choosing this study can be stated as follows:

Pair work and group work are regarded as teaching activities at the classrooms to encourage students' participation.

- To develop students' skill in speaking English language, because majority of them effected by local dialects in the area that regard an effectual problem in their speech sounds and words pronunciation.
- To motivate students desire in communication among them for practicing English language through conversational competition in the classroom.
- This research is an opportunity for unsociable students to be participant and active through their participation with their classmates in pair work and group work in the classroom.

The researcher attempts to find out whether pair work and group are applicable in secondary level or not. This study is expected to be of great importance for secondary school teachers and students, authorities and materials writers.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Teaching English Language to large classes is regarded a problem that faces English teachers in teaching English as a foreign language in secondary schools. This phenomenon has become a problem for both teachers and students in realizing the target of learning English as a foreign language. Students begin to learn English from class five at Basic Level Schools up to secondary schools. It is expected that the students should have been able to use English well and speak it fluently.

ELT as a foreign language is a compulsory subject in Sudanese Secondary schools. Therefore, all students, regardless of their cultures, should be given the opportunity to learn English to be proficient in the English, more precisely and capable to communicate effectively in the English language four skills listening, speaking, reading and writing. Thus, the school plays an important role in providing students with learning opportunity.

Many teachers of ESL are aware of the implementation of pair work and group work, but they neglect them in teaching and learning process for the purpose of facilitating students' learning of ESL. However, there are many opinions of educators and researchers on pair work and group work, some of which are opposing and others that are supportive to pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.

Opposing views of pair work and group work (which they mean as group activities that contain between two and six students are assigned to work together). It is feared that students will abuse their freedom when they are assigned to work in pairs and groups, and cause the class to become difficult for the teacher to control, there is the high tendency for students to use their mother tongue in pairs and groups with teacher' absence to supervise all the time. While working in pairs and groups, students listen to each other use the English language, which is inclusive of pronunciation and grammatical errors. Besides that, students are also feared not having the ability of identify each other's errors. The greater fear is that one may provide others with incorrect feedback.

On the contrary, there are supportive views of pair work and group work. Firstly, it is the nature of working in pairs and groups to require some interaction to take place among students themselves. Therefore,

opportunity for realistic and meaningful use of the language is created. Secondly, some second language educators view that group activities lead to increase success for students and a better learning environment, thus increase student motivation for language learning.

In small groups, students should take on responsibility of managing talk and determining the direction of the discussion themselves. This results in students' experience of individual empowerment and also the high probability for individual students to raise differences opinion.

In order to enhance students' standards in learning English and to develop their skills in speaking English, the researcher expects that pair work and group work will contribute in encouraging students to be interested in learning English language in secondary classroom.

This research is going to investigate pair work and group work in Sudanese secondary schools ELT Classrooms.

### **1.3 Research Questions**

This research seeks answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent are pair work and group work activities applied in teaching English as foreign language in secondary schools?
2. What are the attitudes of teachers and students towards the application of pair work and group work in learning English at secondary level?
3. To what extent does SPINE series include sufficient practices on pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?
4. To what extent classes' size and students seating affect inpair work and group work teaching in secondary schools classrooms in Nyala.

## **1.4 Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses are set:

1. Pair work and group work activities are not sufficiently applied in teaching English as foreign language in secondary level;
2. Teachers and students may have different attitudes towards pair work and group work application in teaching English in secondary level;
3. SPINE series does not include sufficient practices on pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms;
4. Classes' size and students seating do not help in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms.

## **1.5 Research Objectives**

The research objectives are:

1. To investigate pair work and group work techniques for enlarging students' participation in the classrooms in secondary schools classrooms.
2. To show how to organize pair work and group work effectively and how to deal with problems that may arise in secondary schools classrooms.
3. To find out to what extent pair work and group work are included in the syllabus in secondary schools classrooms.
4. To encourage teachers to use pair work and group work in teaching English if they prove that they are useful techniques.

## **1.6 Research Significance**

- This study approves the possibility and suitability of pair work and group work application techniques in teaching English in secondary schools instead of depending on specific students or students in teacher's zone.
- Pair work and group work activities are regarded as an opportunity for students to talk with their friends, partners and exchange opinions, more than listening to their teacher talking alone.
- This study is expected to be of importance for secondary level English teachers as a teaching means for improving the students' interaction in classrooms.
- It is expected that pair and group work are appropriate and suitable teaching techniques in secondary schools classrooms in Sudan (physically and culturally).

## **1.7 Limits of the Study**

The study will be applied to ten secondary schools and will be chosen randomly according to their different locations in Nyala town the capital of South Darfur State in academic year 2014 – 2015.

The research moreover, focuses on the students of the lower classes first and second classes who will participate in the survey. In addition to that English teachers in secondary level schools will be included for more information about pair work and group work.



## **1.8 Research Methodology:**

TEFL has long theories of changes in pedagogical methods. The most important aspect is that the focus has shifted from teacher-centred classes to student-centred classes. This aspect has imposed new “rules” and attitudes, especially for the teacher. The modern pedagogy has understood that the class is a balanced two-ways relationship between the one who teaches and the one who learns. Thus, the two parts “negotiate” their importance in the class, in the sense that, for a better learning activity the one who teaches should become more or less dynamic or implicated. He is the one who knows, the one who eventually puts things into order and understands the best attitude towards his partner.

### **1.8.1 Population and Sample**

The questionnaires will be administered to the study sample of 120 EFL students and 60 ELT teachers who will be selected from the study population. The researcher will design the tools and check their reliability and validity.

### **1.8.2 Tools**

The researcher will use two questionnaires that will be designed separately for both teachers and students. Each one will contain open-ended questions in order to obtain participants’ opinions about suitability of pair work and group work in teaching English in secondary schools classrooms. The questionnaires will be reviewed by arbitrators to ensure their appropriateness to validity and reliability of the study.

### **1.8.3 Procedure**

Nyala locality will be divided into four areas, in addition to middle area. Ten schools are chosen which represent both boys and girls. Two schools for each area and the sample of population will be chosen randomly both students and teachers to cover the survey area completely.

### **1.8.4 Statistical Analysis**

Statistical analysis will be applied for analyzing the data that was collected. Different techniques will be used to answer the questions of the study.

- Means, standard deviations and percentage,
- Independent T-Test,
- One way ANOVA,
- Cronbach Alpha formula will be used to determine the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire.

### **1.8.5 Validity and reliability**

To confirm the validity of the research tools, the researcher submitted it; in its initial form to specialized jury members represent a group of expert teachers in the field of education for more arbitration to ensure the suitability of the research tools.

To confirm the reliability of the research the questionnaire will be redistributed to the same sample of the study and the results will be compared with the previous one. It should be expected that the relationship between the first and second subject scores of the two tests administration would be a high positive correlation.

Chapter one is an introductory chapter. It has provided the theoretical framework of the study. It has particularly focused on statement of the research, research questions, research hypotheses, research objectives, research significance and research methodology as the source of data collection.

## Chapter Two

### **Literature Review**

This chapter consists two parts. Part one will provide the conceptual framework of the study. It will review literature on some key concepts of the study. The second part will critically review some relevant previous studies.

### **2.1 Conceptual Framework**

#### **2.1.1 Grouping Students into classes in Secondary Schools**

According to part one extensive research exists regarding the effects of grouping students into classes on the basis of ability. Groupings may vary in size, structure and purpose and can be constrained by a number of factors including concerns with age and ability of students, and subject studied. Groupings within classrooms are a main structuring factor in everyday learning experiences, which may facilitate or inhibit learning (Creemers, 1994).

Research on grouping in secondary schools has been dominated by the role of student's ability. In contrast to issues of ability grouping, little empirical research has explored the organization of student groupings within classes in secondary schools (which is in stark contrast to primary schools - Alexander, Rose & Woodhead, 1992, Bennett & Dunne, 1992; Galton & Williamson, 1992). Within-class groupings in secondary schools may be informally arrived at, and uncritically accepted practices may characterize a textbook area or school.

Three related areas of research suggest that grouping practices, effective teaching and learning are related, but also reveal limitations in knowledge about grouping practices in secondary schools:

- Experimental research shows positive effects of co-operative, collaborative and mastery learning for small-sized groupings (4-6 children), though these only represent a small set of the various classroom groupings possible and certain learning tasks (Creemers, 1994).
- School effectiveness research (e.g. Sammons, Hillman & Mortimore, 1995) identifies factors associated with grouping as important for learning; but has not directly addressed the strategic development of groupings (Creemers, 1994; Ofsted, 1995; Muijs & Reynolds, 2001).
- Psychological theories of instruction and development (e.g. Vygotsky, 1978) identify social and group based factors in cognitive development (Light & Perret-Clermont, 1990; Damon & Phelps, 1989), but little attempt has been made to apply these to secondary classrooms.

### **2.1.2 Whole-Class teaching**

Whole class teaching gives teachers control over the subject matter under discussion. Such teaching made students aware of what the teacher thought was appropriate knowledge. It also enabled teachers to direct who took part in discussion and to choose who answered which questions.

Harmer (1995:205) uses the term “lockstep” for the whole-class teaching. Lockstep is the class grouping where all the students are working with the teacher, where all the students are ‘locked into ‘the same rhythm and pace, the same activity (the term is borrowed from the language laboratory). Lockstep is the traditional teaching situation, in

other words, where a teacher-controlled session is taking place. The accurate reproduction stage usually takes place in lockstep (although this is not necessarily the only way it can be done) with all the students working as one group and the teacher acting as controller and assessor.

Where pair and group work are to be set up clearly the whole class has to listen to instruction, etc.

The researcher summarizes the main points teachers have to keep in mind during whole-class work. When standing at the front of the class, they should look at students and look interested in what they are saying. They should watch the students while they are talking and control the class clearly.

Finally, they should make sure that the students get enough practice.

Lewis and Hill (1992) also point out those teachers who recognize language as communication will see the necessity for genuinely interesting texts, individualized teaching, pair work and group work, free practices, listening practices and many other classroom activities.

### **2.1.3 Linguistic Space and Teacher Talk**

In a language learning classroom, one of the greatest dangers as teachers is that of lockstep teaching. Teachers spend most of the lesson talking and explaining things, allowing very little time for students to actually practice the language themselves.

It is agreed that most language teachers talk too much. It is not, however, sufficient for the teacher to avoid unnecessary talk. If the main classroom activity consists of the teacher asking questions which are then

answered by individual students, it still means that half of all classroom language is coming from the teacher.

Scrivener (1998) also underlines that the more a teacher talks – the less opportunity there is for learners. They need time to think, to prepare what they are going to say and how they are going to say it. He suggests the teachers to allow the time, and the quiet students need. Teachers must not feel the need to fill every gap in a lesson. Explore the possibilities of silence.

The researcher emphasizes that students should be involved in the lesson. But that is very different from saying that all students should be encouraged to speak, or that the student who is not talking is not participating.

It is the teacher's job to involve everybody, but not necessarily to involve everybody in the same way. Some students can participate fully while saying very little. This can be frustrating for the teacher, but it is important to realise that you are there to adapt to and help the students and not to impose your demands on them creating stress and reducing learning and certainly not in an effort to change their personalities.

#### **2.1.4 Interaction in the ESL/EFL Classroom**

Nearly every conversational textbook for ESL/EFL students has directions for students to work with a partner or in small groups. One of the primary reasons is that learners have greater comprehension when allowed to interact (Gass & Varonis, 1994). To increase interaction, it is important for the teacher to take the role of a facilitator rather than an authoritarian (Brown, 2007). The teacher as a facilitator focuses on the principle of intrinsic motivation by allowing students to discover

language through using it in context rather than telling them about language (Rivers, 1987).

Through pair work and group work exercises, students are engaged in the ‘communication approach’, a way to learn languages that focuses on practicing the language by communicating with each other in that language.

Long and Porter (1983) advocated group work for five reasons. First, group work increases language practice opportunities. Secondly, group work improves the quality of teacher talk. Thirdly, group work helps individualize instruction. Fourth, group work promotes a positive affective climate. As students work together, they get to know each other, creating a stronger social fabric weaved into learning. Lastly, group work motivates learners. Learners feel less inhibited and free to make mistakes in small groups, than in a teacher-led class. This combined with communicating with classmates, can lead to higher motivation.

### **2.1.5 Conversation as a Skill**

Communication requires participation. ‘Free conversation’ as a class activity often fails due to the fact that only a minority of students are actively speaking or listening. Even when one partner is speaking, the other may not be listening, which may cause the conversational activity to fail. Because of this, it may make conversation so demoralizing that the teacher learns to avoid it and substitute drill for conversation.

The researcher notes that many students hesitate to participate in class and therefore, students are insecure about their ability to use English. Fluency building tasks can help students feel more confident about their speaking. The ability to use language smoothly and easily is a skill, and this skill can only be developed through practice. In order to



make communication an intrinsic part of an ESL/EFL program, it is one thing for students to be able to make a 'well-formed sentence', but it is meaningless if they cannot convey their message when communicating. More important is the ability of a student to communicate his message to others in the target language, even if the sentence structure is not absolutely correct.

A method must be developed which induces the student to employ his or her newly learned language structures with others. The ability to use language can only be acquired by the act of using the language.

A learner's willingness to communicate is related to a variety of factors such as motivation, attitude, English proficiency, foreign language anxiety, situational context, language learning strategy and so forth.

### **2.1.6 Willingness to Communicate**

MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément and Noels (1997) emphasize that the two immediate contributing factors to willingness to communicate (an actual language-use) are a desire to communicate and communicative self-confidence. For the first, interpersonal motivation and positive experience in communication are essential. For the second, general self-confidence and communicative competence are needed. It is easy to see from this list that students who have poor relationships with their peers can be in a disadvantageous position in language learning; for example, they have less motivation and less self-confidence. In addition, there are students who find it more difficult to establish adequate interpersonal relationships and to learn a foreign language. These two processes can reinforce each other: the lower a student's WTC, the less chance the group has to get to know him; the fewer reciprocal relationships he has, the lower motivation and self-confidence, the lower willingness to

communicate. In fact, the chain can also start at “lower self-confidence”, a personality trait, and the result may be the same: isolation and fewer chances to practise English.

According to Richards (1998), language textbooks are resources for the presentation of spoken and written material, source of activities for learners’ practice and communicative interaction, reference source for grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation, a source of simulation and ideas for classroom language, and a support for the less experienced teacher.

Language textbooks are expected to have both linguistic and situational realism and be consistent with basic linguistic, psychological and pedagogical principles.

The researcher suggests that the language used in textbooks should make it easy to divide the class into groups or pairs, to have role-play or dialogue activities, and to allow students to interact with one another. Language teaching materials should emphasize the clarity of what students are expected to do at the end of each lesson.

The amount of practice provided in standard textbooks and exercises ought to be sufficient, balanced in their format, containing both controlled and free practice.

### **2.1.7 Starting of Pair work and Group work**

Pair work and group work started getting attention of educationist in the 70s. In 70s educationists were concerned about increasing teacher talking time in language classes. During the 1980s and 1990s the development of communicative language teaching brought an important change in the role of students (Nunan& Lamb 1996) Working together is worthwhile as “pair and group work immediately increase the amount of

students talking time” (Harmer, 1991). Researchers are convinced that the students who take the initiative in learning learn more things and learn better than those who sit at the feet of teachers passively waiting to be taught (Knowles as cited in Hedge, 2000). Researchers reported that it is a source of intrinsic motivation for students as working in groups is fun for them. It provides the students with the opportunity to communicate with each other to share “suggestions, insights, feedback about successes, and failures” Researchers also claim that a teacher’s dominance in class makes it dull and it kills the students’ interests (Kundu&Tutto, 1989).

Educators are still of the opinion that language students should acquire the use of the language learnt in the context of structured and interpersonal exchanges because languages are interactional and transactional.

There is now a general shift towards using techniques where students are more actively involved, such as pair work and group work.

To begin with, pair work and group work considerably increase the amount of students’ practice. Next, this mode of learning allows the students to use the target language, to which two aspects contribute. Firstly, students can help one another to use and learn the language; secondly, a psychological factor, that is, encouraging weak or not confident students to use the language in a less stressful environment than the whole class forum plays a vital role, because ‘students feel less anxiety when they are working ‘privately’ than when they are ‘on the show’ in front of the whole class’ (Doff 1990: 111).

Pair work is a situation which enables two learners to work independently and interactively without teacher involvement (Doff, 1988; Phipps, 1999; Rimmer, 1999).

Group work can be defined in the same way, except that more than two individuals will be involved in the activity. Having said that, as McDonough and Shaw (1993: 227) note, “pair work and group work are not synonymous”. They create different social patterns and have different characteristics. Phipps (1999: 1) says that "pair work is a convenient short term for any form of pupil-pupil interaction without the intervention of the teacher"

### **2.1.8 Use of Pair work and Group work**

Education administrators have to explore and introduce the most recent and best methods of teaching English.

In South Darfur State, for example, teachers of English recognize that traditional pedagogy, emphasizing merely the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary rather than communicative competence, does not meet the requirements of English learning in an era of integration and globalization.

Pair work and group work are arguably today's most popular teaching method in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). The researcher agrees that it is necessary, therefore, for teachers to adopt another teaching approach that better suits the needs of language learners in teaching English language as a foreign in our schools classrooms.

The use of language in pair work or group work retains the features of language use outside the classroom, i.e. students communicate directly, face one another, and may use nonverbal signals, which increases the efficiency of communication. According to Brumfit (1994), group work provides a 'natural linguistic environment'.

Moreover, the students get an opportunity to work independently, which enhances their motivation and makes them concentrate on the task. These patterns of grouping students also increase their responsibility, with regard both to solving a particular task and to their entire learning process.

Additionally, students' cooperation is likely to be encouraged, which is important from the point of view of the atmosphere. Students help one another and discover things together, which makes a task more likely to be completed successfully.

On top of that, pair work and group work provide variety during the lesson, at the same time being relatively quick and easy to organize.

The term 'pair work' comprises interaction patterns differing in terms of aims and modes of grouping students (Doff 1990). Open or public pairs can be defined as pairs of students speaking in turns in front of the class under teacher's control. The extent to which this pattern of interaction varies from traditional lockstep situation does not seem remarkable; the only actual difference is the decrease in teacher talking time. Nevertheless, the students not involved in a public pair do not benefit from such an activity as far as their talking opportunities are concerned. With regard to simultaneous pairs, where all the pairs work synchronically, they can be either fixed or flexible. The former pattern of interaction engages each pair in cooperation throughout the entire activity; the latter case involves tasks completion, which demands changing partners.

Generally, pair work aims at accuracy practice. The role of the teacher shifts from resource to organiser and monitor. Typical pair work activities are: controlled conversation, games and role-plays.

A problematic issue concerning pair work stems from the relationships between individual students who may prove to dislike working with a particular partner (Harmer 2001). The process of pairing students may be conducted in various ways, including pairing neighbours, forming pairs by chance, etc. In order to prevent the problem of students' dissatisfaction with their partners the criterion of friendship may be employed as the basis of the pair forming process.

Group work is a more dynamic interaction pattern than pair work. As a consequence of larger number of people involved, there is a greater likelihood of varied opinions, which prompts discussion. For the same reason, there is also a greater chance of solving the task successfully, as at least one of the members will be able to complete it. The size of a group also means that personal relationships are less likely to interfere with the learning process (Harmer 2001).

Ellis (1994) noted that generally students successfully learn in natural settings. Moreover, group activities develop higher levels of thinking than the traditional lecture approach and help to retain knowledge. Discussion may even help to inspire active learning. Ellis (1994) was of the view that students are more motivated to engage in further communication when they have more opportunities to speak. Researchers observed often that Asian students are not trained to speak up; they prefer other people to take the limelight (Richards and Renandya, 2002). "In some cultures, students are very anxious about making mistakes in front of others" (Weaver and Hybles, 2004).

Harmer (1991) claimed that pair work and group work allows students to work in a conducting and facilitating environment. Group work claims a number of advantages as Gower (1987) has noted that it

stimulates the learners' experience of various types of interaction and helps to generate a more relaxed and cooperative classroom atmosphere.

Most fluency activities need the environment of a group and usually last 10-15 minutes, which may enable students to forget that they are in the classroom. Group most fluency activities need the environment of a group and usually last 10-15 minutes, which may enable students to forget that they are in the classroom. Group work allows students to perform a range of tasks for which pair work is not appropriate or sufficient, such as discussion, writing a group story, project work, etc. What is more, this interaction pattern involves broader negotiation and cooperation skills than working in pairs. The teacher's role is that of a manager and consultant.

In mixed ability groups fluency practice can be enhanced by students' help resulting from the need for co-operation and collaboration necessary to complete a task.

As far as noise is concerned, the teacher should ignore it unless it is likely to disturb other members or another class. Should this be the case, the activity ought to be interrupted and begun in a quieter way. The occurrence of mistakes in the case of tasks focused on accuracy should be rather prevented by providing students with a clear model and controlled practice before a pair activity. According to Harmer (ibid), activities aimed at fluency practice should not be intervened with by the teacher even if mistakes occur. Bartram and Walton (1991) generalise on this idea, interpreting mistakes as an evidence of learning progress with the student subconsciously forming ideas or hypotheses concerning the rules of language and putting those ideas into practice. Being exposed to more

language, the student receives new information and, in turn, changes the original ideas to fit the new information.

In summary, pair work and group work prove potentially beneficial from the point of view of the English Language learning process. Unlike lockstep, they provide the students with many opportunities to use the target language, especially with regard to oral practice. What is more, pair and group activities are by definition student-centred. Those patterns of interaction may engage relating to students' experience, emotions and imagination, which considerably prompts the language learning process. Working in groups is likely to increase the students' responsibility with regard both to the completion of the task and to the entire learning process. Language tasks are generally easier to perform in a pair or, especially in a group without diminishing the sense of achievement.

On the contrary, pair and group work increase satisfaction and self-confidence of the students, which, in turn, results in higher motivation.

### **2.1.9 Concept of Pair Work and Group Work**

Pair work and group work have been incorporated into language teaching and learning in most parts of the world since the emergence of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the early 1970s, and have taken firm root in many present-day ESL or EFL classrooms. This approach came into being because of the ever-growing need for the use of language for communicative purposes, and because of the fact that a lot of educators and linguists became more and more dissatisfied with the Audio-Lingual and Grammar-Translation methods of language teaching. In this context, there began a movement away from traditional lesson formats where emphasis was put on the mastery of different items of grammar, hence shifting practice from controlled activities such as



mechanical memorization of dialogs and drills towards communicative activities, which can be successfully done through pair work and group work.

According to Brumfit (1984), group work is often considered an essential feature of communicative language teaching. In favor of it, Long & Porter (1985) hold that pair work and group work can promote students' practice, the quality of their talk, their motivation, and positive classroom atmosphere. Salmon (1988) supports Long & Porter's ideas that pair work and group work also help increase students' confidence.

Similar to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) also promotes learning through communication in pairs or small groups. CLL is an approach to teaching that makes maximum use of cooperative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom. This means each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others (Olsen & Kagan, 1992, p.8). The concept "cooperative" in CLL emphasizes an important aspect: developing classrooms that foster cooperation rather than competition in learning. That is to say, students in pairs or groups work together towards a common goal instead of competing with one another for individual ambitions.

Other benefits which pair work and group work may offer. First of all, they may maximize each learner's opportunity to speak and that practicing in pairs and groups will reduce to some extent the psychological burden of public performance. In pair work and group work, students will also have more language practice opportunities and the time they will have for interacting with one another in pairs and groups are absolutely abundant. Second, pair work and small group

activities enable students to take a more active role in their learning as well as to act as an important resource person for one another (McGroarty, 1989). Last, students learn best when they are actively involved in the learning process via pairs or groups.

According to Davis (1993), students working in small groups tend to learn more of what is taught and retain it longer than when the same content is presented in other instructional formats.

#### **2.1.10 Pair work and Group work in Second Language Classroom**

The use of pair work and Group work in the second language (L2) classroom is widely recognized as beneficial, and begins to address concerns which have been raised with respect to the cognitive focus which has tended to dominate SLA research (see for example, Firth and Wagner, 1997, 2007). Research has shown that learners working in small group or pairs use the L2 more so than in teacher-fronted class activities (Long and Porter, 1985).

This greater use of the L2 is particularly important in foreign language contexts where, unlike second language contexts, the classroom is often the only site where students are exposed to and engage with L2 input. The researcher believes, students need to be encouraged to work in pairs or small groups because this is likely to provide them with the necessary practice to improve their fluency. In terms of accuracy, Storch (2001) found that students when working in pairs performed better on a joint written task than did students working on the same task individually, suggesting that the joint activity allowed the student to pool their resources. In this case, there was the added advantage that students discussed language points with each other in some detail.

Research from different theoretical perspectives has also promoted the use of small group and pair work in L2 classrooms. Research (e.g. Gass and Varonis, 1986; Mackey, 1999; Pica, and et al 1991), based on the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1983, 1996), has shown that when learners work in small groups or pairs with a competent speaker of the L2, or a fellow student, they engage in a number of negotiation moves (e.g. requests for clarifications, confirmation checks, recasts), which are said to make input more comprehensible, and direct their attention to gaps in their linguistic knowledge. While this focused attention or noticing, has been hypothesized as important for second language acquisition (Schmidt, 1993, 2001), it has only a limited amount to contribute to our understanding of the role of social context and social interaction in language learning, now widely recognized as playing a major role in second language learning.

Thus, researchers informed by sociocultural theoretical perspectives also promote small group and pair work. Based on the work of Vygotsky (1978), sociocultural theory views cognitive development as an inherently social activity involving interaction between people. Researchers informed by this perspective argue that engaging in collaborative talk (Swain, 2000) is language learning, where both the process (what is said) and the ability to reflect on what is said (product) engender language development. A number of studies (e.g. Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001; Storch, 2002) have shown that when learners work in pairs or small groups, they use language to deliberate about the L2 and in the process of doing so pool their linguistic resources and co-construct linguistic knowledge or knowledge about language. Donato (1994) refers to this pooling of resources as ‘collective scaffolding’. Ohta’s (2001) longitudinal study of peer interaction in a Japanese classroom found that

even less proficient peers are able to provide assistance to more proficient peers.

However, as Storch (2002) has shown, language students assigned to work in pairs do not always work in patterns that are conducive to language learning. Storch found that when students work in collaborative (working together to solve the problem) or expert/novice (where one assists the other) patterns, they are more likely to offer each other assistance and be receptive to the assistance given.

This assistance can take the form of positive feedback or providing corrections, as well as explanations of grammatical conventions and word meanings. However, in patterns where one participant dominates the interaction, while the other remains fairly inactive (a dominant /passive pattern), or in cases where both members of the pair attempt to dominate the interaction and are not receptive to the advice offered by their partner (a dominant/dominant pattern), there are fewer opportunities for language learning. The small number of studies that have investigated the nature of pair work and group work interaction intact L2 classrooms show similar results (Watanabe, 2004).

### **2.1.11 Pair work and Group Work as an Effective Means in the ESL Classroom**

The use of pair work and group work in the ESL classroom have been shown to be an effective means for improving language competence (Long, 1996, 1985; Pica, et al., 1996; Pica & Doughty, 1985). Pair work and group promote a variety of opportunities for learners that fully teacher-led classrooms do not always afford. It's an opportunity for learners to build confidence in a smaller setting that is limited to language learning peers, as well as the increased individual talk time available in

pair work and group work environment are examples of the benefits. When learners interact with one another, they sense a level of control in their language learning which lends itself to building confidence in acquiring a second language. Johnson (1995) found this to be true:

Student-student interaction in second language classrooms can create opportunities for students to participate in less structured and more spontaneous language use, negotiate meaning, self-select when to participate, control the topic of discussion, and most important, draw on their own prior knowledge and interactional competencies to actively communicate with others.

Language learners are constantly looking for ways to use their skills in order to improve their fluency and instructors are also seeking new avenues to motivate and provide optimal environments for learners to accomplish this.

### **2.1.12 Arguments for Using Pair work and Group work**

Long and Porter (1985) have summarized the results of several research papers in the field to arrive at pedagogical and psycholinguistic arguments for using small group activities. It was revealed that working in small groups or pairs increases practice opportunities significantly (e.g. if 50% of the time spent on oral practice is dedicated to pair-work instead of lockstep practice in a class of 30 students, the individual practice time increases by over 500%). The quality of the language used by the students was also found to improve.

Pair work and group work provide a natural, face-to-face setting during which students have to rely on themselves, take on roles, produce coherent segments of language, and use language functions otherwise

used exclusively by the teacher (e.g. changing the topic, interrupting, and asking for clarification).

In addition, Long and Porter's research shows that students perform at the same level of grammatical accuracy as in lockstep work, engage in more peer correction and in more negotiation, and have the opportunity to participate in lifelike two-way tasks.

It is essential that pair work and group work should contribute to establishing a positive affective climate in the group, which will have a significant effect on co-operation later on. In Dörnyei's opinion (1990), the basis of any coherent group structure is the existence of mutual acceptance and respect between the members. For this to happen, they need opportunities to get to know one another.

This process can be facilitated by physical proximity, interaction and co-operation, which are naturally involved in most group-work activities. Also, when a positive group atmosphere and a co-operative climate is created, students are more committed to each other, work harder, co-operate and interact more efficiently, which increases productivity (Dörnyei, 1997). Thus, group cohesion and productivity are closely connected, and affect each other mutually. Consequently, it is very important to start the chain of events in a positive direction.

Besides a co-operative study environment and a friendly atmosphere, it is also essential to lower anxiety for effective learning to take place. Brown (1994) emphasizes the importance of satisfying the most basic human need -the need for security- otherwise students cannot be made to set higher objectives for themselves. Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1994) state that many learners feel threatened when they have to speak in their new groups in front of several unknown people, and that

this has a negative effect on self-confidence, self-perception of competence and consequently on effort and achievement. This vicious circle can be avoided by including some activities that lower anxiety, such as group work or pair work, which can also prepare students for being self-reliant, taking risks, and challenging their limits.

Establishing a positive attitude towards the language itself is very important. Dörnyei (1997) argued that motivation has about 50% influences on determining the achievement of a learner. He also found that small group activities, especially co-operative learning techniques, have a positive effect on most components of motivation, including language-use anxiety, perceived competence, interest in the course, expectancy, satisfaction, goal-orientation, as well as on the norm and reward systems of the group and group cohesion.

### **2.1.13 Student's Perceptions about working in Pairs and Groups**

There is limited research that delves into the learner's perceptions of their participation in pair work and group work and how this may create optimal conditions for second language acquisition (SLA). Prior research has focused on what utterances the learners construct and not how they perceive their environment or how that may shape their production.

Mackey (2002) elaborated that interaction is believed to facilitate the necessary connections between input, output, feedback, noticing, scaffolding, processing, and control that can benefit the comprehension and acquisition process for various aspects of the target language. To date, researchers have pointed to evidence of these processes in interaction data mainly through examining the production of learners and their interlocutors.

While production is an important aspect in language acquisition and theory, language learners' perceptions are a vital strand that needs to be knit within the fabric of SLA theory and practical application. When theory is integrated with the actual thought processes of the learners, their acquisition opportunities could be greatly enriched.

#### **2.1.14 Students' Interaction in Pair work and Group work**

Vygotsky, cited in Arends (2000:354) argues that when students interact with each other they build on their understanding, learn new ideas and concepts, and develop their cognitive skills. Thus, pair and group activities are essential in the classroom as they provide students with an opportunity to work collaboratively; and when working on pair and group activities, more capable students can work with those who find it difficult to complete the tasks on their own.

Furthermore, pair work and group work interaction activities encourage communication among students. According to Lightbown and Spada (1999:124), "Learner language in group work activity is filled with questions and responses and many more occasions where learners using pair and group interaction to foster students' interpersonal skills take the initiative to speak spontaneously" Most importantly, Lightbown and Spada also note that student-centered activities motivate the students to use language for different purposes such as disagreeing, requesting, and clarifying.

#### **2.1.15 Pair work and Group work Activities**

Pair work and group work activities influence the learning of a language as they provide learners with an opportunity to communicate using the target language. Pair work and group work activities are implicit in the communicative approach to language teaching, as it



focuses not only on the understanding of the structural elements of a language, but also on the role of the social interaction and language use in learning the language.

Many researchers also place an emphasis on the importance of peer involvement and pair works in enhancing students' confidence and the self-esteem of shy students. Pair work and group work help in drawing out withdrawn children and enhances their confidence and participation levels in the classroom.

#### **2.1.16 Student Motivation in Pair work and Group work Activities**

To motivate learners in the classroom takes a creative approach due to the many differences that can arise in that environment comprised of many peoples, languages, and nations. "Individual differences in motivation are influenced and supported by factors originating in environmental characteristics (i.e. cultural, personal, social, educational, etc.). Gardner (2006) discusses the socio-educational model as a "dynamic ongoing process" that looks at many factors contributing to SLA.

Thus, it would be hypothesized that motivation and perhaps ability would mediate relationships between second language achievement and other variables such as gender, personality, etc." Motivation is one of the key factors in determining the direction and degree of a language learners' progress.

Participation by learners' in the pair work and group work setting is a necessity or interaction would be non-existent.

The complexities of motivation are so vast that various scholars have broken it down into smaller pieces in order to see the relevance of

its role in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Three components arose from a study by Clement, (1994:417), consisting of “integrative motivation, linguistic self-confidence and the appraisal of the classroom environment” that forged a new way of seeing motivation as integral in the ESL classroom. Many aspects of the interrelationship of motivation and participation have been shown to be beneficial in the second language classroom.

The students enjoyed the activities that were set in a communicative style and, further, were motivated to work through communication and finish the assignment.

#### **2.1.17 Comprehensibility of Pair work and Group work Activities**

Studies have focused on NS/NNS interactions and used the NS as a sort of “control” to see what the NNS would comprehend in the second language. There has been a move toward more in-depth review of NNS/NNS interaction and these studies are revealing, at least as much, if not more, viable information about interaction in the language classroom. While not every study reveals a clear relationship between NNS/NNS interaction and comprehension there are a growing number that do point in that direction. Long (1985) has reviewed other scholars in parallel with his research and found similarities and differences among the research relating to NNS/NNS interaction.

A recent study by Hawkins (1985) has shown that it is dangerous to assume that the adjustments always lead to comprehension by NNSs, even when they appear to have understood, as judged by the appropriateness of their responses.

On the other hand, at least two studies (Chaudron 1993 and Long 1985) have demonstrated clear improvements in comprehension among

groups of NNSs as a result of specific and global speech modifications, respectively.

The past notion that only native speakers can offer assistance in the language learning process is now less relevant as studies continue to confirm that NNSs can offer valuable language skills to one another. There has been some debate on whether only input is necessary or whether output is also a vital aspect in second language development. While Krashen (1985) thought comprehensible input was the major condition necessitating SLA, Swain (1995) hypothesized that in the production of language a learner must consider syntax. If input and output are both necessary pieces in the puzzle then it seems only right that NNS-NNS pairs or small groups could also provide an environment conducive to language learning within the confines of their own interaction.

Varonis and Gass (1985) believe that communication originating from NNS/NNS can be important to these learners for the following reasons:

First, it allows them a non-threatening forum within which to practise developing language skills. Second, it provides them with an opportunity to receive input which they have made comprehensible through negotiation.

## **2.1.18 Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair work and Group work**

### **2.1.18.1 Advantages**

Pair work and group work give the students far more chances to speak English in the classroom. The language produced by students working in groups is more varied and greater in quantity. Learners take

the initiative to express themselves, they are more spontaneous in asking questions and responding, they use more language functions.

By dividing the class into groups students get more opportunities to talk than in full class organization and each student can say something. Penny Ur (1996) recommends that teachers working with large classes should divide them into five groups which is the most effective organization for practicing speaking.

It is advisable for teachers to spend at least one lesson a month devoted only to speaking. If the topics are adequate to the learners' interests and level such a lesson can be really effective and give a lot of satisfaction both to the learner and the teacher. That is why oral practice in small groups and pairs is essential.

In the long run, group work develops learners' independence. At first preparing a group or a pair presentation may be time consuming and requires more effort from the student. However, using this technique regularly students become more efficient and skilled at practicing the language. They become more confident, their motivation also increases and they can manage without regular teacher's supervision. Students learn how to learn and gradually take responsibility for their own learning.

Besides practicing and consolidating the language group work help to integrate the class. Learners learn how to cooperate with one another, make compromise, negotiate, and respect individuals with different abilities and views which is important for the class atmosphere and relationship with the teacher. If a person in a pair or a group is not able to solve a problem s/he can always rely on his/ her friends who will help him/her because "there is a greater chance that at least one member of the

group will be able to solve a problem when it arises."(Harmer, 1991:245)  
In such a class the teacher is no longer a supervisor but becomes a resource Centre and advisor for the students. "Most people learn a foreign language better with others than on their own.

Working in pairs and groups is less stressful and more effective for students, especially introverts who needn't perform in the front of the whole class. They feel more confident working with the friend they like and are more likely to accept his/her correction or criticism.

Brumfit, (1984) says that pair work and group work are the most effective techniques of classroom organization which combine aspects of communication learning and natural interaction in a stress free environment.

#### **2.1.18.2. Disadvantages**

Some teachers are reluctant to introduce pair work and group work being afraid of noise or discipline problems which might occur particularly with children. Such noise may become disruptive for the whole activity and class behavior because misbehavior is contagious. To avoid a danger of this happening the teacher should plan his/her activity very carefully.

Another disadvantage of pair work and group work is the use of the mother tongue. When students get excited working in pairs or groups they sometimes use their mother tongue to express something they are not able to express in a foreign language. Such a situation is normal because they want to communicate. It is teacher's responsibility to plan activities at the level of the students and to encourage them to use the little of the language they know as best as they can because speaking their own language during an oral activity is a waste of time.

However, we should not be bothered too much if students use their mother tongue while doing a reading comprehension task or vocabulary exercises because the outcome of their discussion will be presented in English. It may also be necessary to ask students to translate instructions into mother tongue to check if they understand what we want them to do because giving instructions of a complicated activity may be a waste of time.

To avoid the use of mother tongue during the lesson the teacher can discuss this problem with the students who should understand that during oral activities the use of the mother tongue is a real problem. During the activity the teacher should encourage the students to use English by going round the classroom helping and prompting students who do not know how to express some ideas.

Some teachers neglect group work and pair work saying that students make mistakes trying to express their own ideas. Indeed incorrectness is a problem yet in real life it is communicative fluency that matters not accuracy so we should not be concerned too much with accuracy if we want to practise oral skills. But if teachers aim at accuracy they are obliged to try to prevent mistakes as much as possible giving students a clear model and enough practice before setting students into groups. Teachers should realize that the students' utterances consist of correct language too. Another positive aspect of this problem is the fact that learners correct one another.

(Doff, 1988) says When learners work in pairs or groups it is impossible for the teacher to listen and correct all the mistakes they make and this is not the purpose of the activity. However, s/he can reduce the number of mistakes before the students start working by demonstrating

the activity to the class first and by asking pairs or groups to perform in front of the class afterwards and discussing what they said and pointing out the most common mistakes.

Another way of reducing mistakes is to appoint a very good student to correct the mistakes of his friends. Such a student is responsible for checking the correctness of others' utterances when the teacher helps another group.

It may be a problem to put students into groups. There is the danger that if the teacher divides the class into mixed ability groups the best students in the group will have to do the task while the weakest ones switch off and become disruptive. To overcome this problem the teacher may put students into groups according to their abilities and each group is given a task right for their level of difficulty.

Then the teacher may monitor the whole class; devote more time to the students who need his/her assistance or even work with individual students.

The researcher has done his best to provide a theoretical frame of his study. He discussed the starting of pair work and group work and their concept and characteristics. He also attempted a critical analysis of advantages and disadvantages of pair work and group work. Some obstacles of learning and teaching pair work and group work were also shown. The second part of this chapter will review some literature related to the subject of the present study.

## **2.2 Review of Previous Studies**

This part two reviews previous studies that were written before in the same field and investigated relevant literature that directly related to

this study to discover to what extent they closely relate or differ from this study.

Awad (2000) explained it is observable in classroom practice a normal English lesson consists on focus text and a list of language items drawn from it, and much of our time as language teachers goes in taking up teaching particular features of phonology, lexis or language form and structure; but is it a 'good' foreign language teaching or 'bad'?

In the present study, two major means of data were used. These are a picture-description test and an experimental work. The picture description test is meant to find out about the students language standards to help dividing them into groups and subgroups for the work of experimental part which aims mainly to investigate the benefits of pair work and group work technique of other methods of teaching particular in oral skills courses.

Ibnauf (2008) explained some of English teachers in secondary schools are not trained nor have sufficient knowledge of teaching methods. They do not carry out language teaching by following certain techniques on the bases of learners' needs of abilities. They measure their students learning in how many rules they have acquired.

On other hand, even trained teachers ignore the methodological procedures of teaching English due to many factors such as time, classroom size, lack of books and the most important reason is that, those teachers do not trained to act communicatively with their students, therefore, students could produce sentences accurately in a lesson, but could not use them appropriately when genuinely communicate outside the classroom.



The students do not have a very strong reason for learning a foreign language. They probably learning it only to pass an examination, The foreign language does not help to satisfy their urgent needs so their motivation is low, because most of teachers do much of talking in the classroom, there is a very little for each student to practise speaking English.

There are many students in the classroom, so, the activities of pair work and group work are not controlled, and sometimes are not practiced at all. A detailed checklist for both teachers and students is developed for 37 English teachers and students in Gebra district. The collected will be analyzed and result will be drawn up. The study results are:

- Highly motivated students learn faster and better than ones, who are not motivated.
- The effective techniques of teaching speaking skills in large classes are an issue that can be tackled.
- Teacher's role is the backbone in improving teaching and learning process.
- Teachers should have various methods and create whatever possible aid, which help the teaching and learning process.
- Group work is a useful technique that leads to successful language acquisition specially, in teaching foreign languages.
- Visual aids should be clearly stated and illustrated the in the class. Teachers can't control large classes, and correct errors.

Ali M.M (2009:157) reviewed the syllabus of English and teaching

In the light of the findings of the study, the researcher recommended converting some of the supposed oral communicative activities provided by SPINE 4, which turned out to be uncommunicative activities in SPINE series, testing the students' oral communicative competence by the class English examinations as well as enriching the SPINE series with authentic audio materials among other recommendations.

Ibrahim (2011) displayed speaking is an important language skill. Students find it difficult, but interesting. They may contact people, express their needs, ideas, wishes and impressions.

He investigated the problem of teaching speaking skills to Libyan secondary schools in Wadi Alhayat. It had been largely perceived that students who learn English as a foreign language face a lot of difficulties, especially those which are related to the four skills (speaking, reading, writing and listening) however, the most difficult one is speaking, because there is a big difference between the native learners of the language and learners of the second language.

The data were collected by using two questionnaires both for teachers and students in addition to teachers' observation sheet. The findings showed teachers did not use many activities in teaching speaking skills; teachers speak Arabic most of the time in classrooms which delays guessing and speaking negatively.

Najma (2012) displayed the Collaborative Language Teaching (CLT), group work and pair work. The introduction of a new English textbook at the undergraduate level has created some difficulties for teachers. These difficulties include the use of group and pair work. This innovation demands a move in the direction of a more learner - centered

approach to teaching. Questionnaire and interview were designed to collect data.

Population was diverse therefore stratified random sampling technique was adopted. 300 students studying at undergraduate level in colleges of Karachi and 75 teachers from the same colleges were selected for the study. The sample was selected from all the teachers and students at public and private sector degree colleges in Karachi. The study's results ensured that the period from 13 to 20 years of human growth is period of adolescence, is the most crucial period in the life of human beings. This period is full of turmoil and conflict. At the same time the adolescent is eager to interact and builds new relationships. They try to have more liberty to develop their own skills. This clarifies the picture why most of the students at undergraduate level prefer group work. Group work provides them activities to interact in a fresh environment. It also provides them opportunities to express them and as a result they have an outlet for emotions and can socialize while studying in class.

Albadawi (2004) had observed that most of the English language classes are teacher centered. They rarely use pair and group activities in the classrooms, which mean that the students work individually most of the time. On the few occasions where teachers introduce pair or group activities, as he observed, the students show a lack of understanding of the necessary interpersonal skills, such as turn taking. The researcher used three instruments (questionnaire, interview and observation) for data collection to realize her research's aims. Her study concentrated on a class of twenty two, Grade Two students in a large primary girls' government school. She maintained that the influence of pair and group interaction activities in fostering students' interpersonal skills is affected by the way they are introduced to the students. The unfamiliarity with

pair and group interaction activities might create some discipline problems, especially if the teacher is working in a school context where pair and group activities are hardly used in the classroom. However, teachers can manage that by using different strategies such as the use of a pair and group work rules chart where the teacher outlines the rules that the students have to follow when they work in pairs or groups.

Ibnian (2012) stated in the negative attitudes of non-English major students at W.I.S.E. University towards leaning English as a foreign language. The study's tools included a questionnaire to measure attitudes of non-English major students at W.I.S.E. University towards leaning English as a foreign language.

The study's results emphasized the effectiveness of using the group work technique in developing students' attitudes towards learning EFL. - Giving students enough opportunities to express their opinions, ideas and reactions in EFL class could lead to developing their attitudes towards learning the subject.

Al.Farsi (2010) reviewed children have a natural instinct for interaction, and this instinct can be seen as the most powerful motivator for using the language. She adds that children need opportunities to talk and that without pair work and group work they cannot learn to use the language. Teachers can create such opportunities in the classroom through pair work and group work, and these techniques, learners' views about them and the behaviours they encourage are the focus of this study. The study was conducted in a Grade 2 Basic Education class that she taught. Six learners from this class took part in the study. They were 7-8 years old and consisted of three boys and three girls of mixed abilities.

They were in their second year of learning English. Data were collected using observation and interviews.

The findings of this study provide general support for the use of pair and group work in teaching. There are, however, some limitations to note in interpreting the findings presented here. The use of observation rating scales also raises issues; observers cannot capture what learners are doing at every moment (and therefore some behaviours may have been missed); observers' judgments, too, may also be subjective and having two observers who could then compare their analyses would have improved the reliability of the results. The interviews with the learners, too, generated limited amounts of data and longer and more open-ended interviews would have produced more detailed insights into how learners feel about pair and group work. Finally, the impact on the behaviours observed of the particular materials used must also be noted. Certain activities may have promoted certain behaviours more than others.

Vuong (2009) determined the students' English speaking ability in terms of grammar, pronunciation and intonation before and after the application of pair work and group work activities, and the significant difference between the effects of pair work and group work activities in the speaking skills of the students in terms of grammar, pronunciation and intonation.

A quasi-experimental two-group design attempted to establish relationship between the students with activities of speaking in the speaking skills of the students. The respondents in this study are the 120 students of the two classes selected 12 classes in the first semester the school year 2008-2009 of the college of Mechanics and Metallurgy. The

data gathered were described statistical using frequency, percentage, mean and t-test for independent samples.

The findings revealed that most of students feel safe in group work activities, it takes 43.3 percent; 11.7 percent chose this role in pair work activities. 21 students as 35.0 percent found the most important role of pair work was that they have more chance to speak. While, only 5 students taking 8.3 percent chose this role in group work activities.

The English speaking ability of the students of the 2 classes in terms of grammar, pronunciation and intonation were different as shown by pre-test and post-test given before and after speaking classes with pair and group work activities. The average of the scores of the students who were engaged in pair and group work activities became higher than before. Therefore, it is concluded that Pair work and Group work activities have a lot of advantages. Teachers should use these activities to increase students' speaking ability. Besides, they should know what students afraid of when taking part in pairs and groups to find out the solution in order to help the students develop their speaking.

To conclude the studies mentioned above that represent previous studies that were written before by researchers from Sudan and out of Sudan. They reviewed pair work and group work and their effective role in promoting and developing students' abilities in learning communicative language in the classrooms.

The researchers displayed the statements of the studies problems and different tools for data collection in order to get ideal methods that help to motivate students' participation and interaction in pair work and group work instead of listening and recording during English period, they have to participate in the classroom.

The researchers had obtained access to positive results despite variation of environments, places and social cultures. They insured through their studies the importance and necessary of pair work and group work in schools classrooms.

The researcher observes that all the studies' concentration among students' ages from 13 to 19 years that is the average level of secondary students' ages, it's the period of human growth and development, called the adolescence, is the most crucial period in the life of human beings. This period is full of turmoil and conflict. At the same time the adolescent is eager to interact and builds new relationships. They try to have more liberty to develop their own skills. This clarifies the picture why most of the students at undergraduate level prefer group work. Group work provides them activities to interact in a fresh environment. It also provides them opportunities to express them and as a result they have an outlet for emotions and can socialize while studying in class- room. These concepts ensure and support the researcher to investigate theory and practice of pair work and group work in secondary schools. This investigation will be a great addition to English teachers in secondary level. The researcher expects that the study will realize unequaled success.

### **Summary of the chapter**

Chapter two is literature review. It encompasses two parts:

In part one the researcher reviews conceptual framework which contains class grouping and whole-class teaching in secondary schools classrooms as well as the danger of linguistic space and teacher talk in pair work and group work, moreover explains the starting of pair work and group work and their role in willingness to communicate also as a

concept in teaching English language and their importance for students' practice to use the target language, and the effectiveness of pair work and group work in second language teaching classroom in addition to arguments of using pair work and group work in teaching English language.

Pair work and group work activities enhance students' motivation, interaction and participation in the classroom.

Moreover, the chapter reviewed previous studies that were written before about pair work and group work and their role in promoting students' standards in learning English language. This part contains different opinions to different researchers from Sudan and out of Sudan; there is point of resemblance in their concepts about pair work and group work in developing students' standards in English skills especially speaking.

The researchers explained their dictions in reviewing pair work and group work statements of problems and the methods that they had followed to collect the data in order to realize their researches' aims in addition to final results that they obtained access to.

To conclude, part two that reviewed researchers' previous studies about pair work and group work statements of the problems, methods for collecting data and finally studies' results. The researcher observes there is correspondence and agreement between the researchers and I according to different previous studies concepts, importance and aims. The researcher noticed that the main instruments that the researchers concentrated on designing questionnaire, observation sheet and interview.

Similar to previous studies' methods the researcher will rely on the questionnaires for both teachers and students to collect the data. The



researcher regards that the questionnaire is comprehensive and easy method for respondents and data collection, moreover observation depends on researcher's eye for setting down responses and information.

The researcher expects that the research will implement the study's aims and will regard turning point to English's teachers in secondary schools classrooms in teaching pair work and group work. They will emphasize the importance of pair work and group work and their functional role in enhancing students' abilities in learning communicative language in the classrooms.

Teachers' appreciation and an ideal application of pair work and group will lead to students' motivation and interaction in the secondary schools classrooms in Nyala locality (Darfur) that what the researcher aims to add in teaching English as a foreign language in Sudanese secondary schools classrooms. The current study intends to contribute to this research area.

The following chapter will present research design and methodology.

## Chapter Three

### **Research Methodology**

#### **3.0. Introduction**

The objective of this chapter is to explain the general research methodology that adopted the Descriptive Analytical Method of the study and the ways that were followed in administering the research tools (two questionnaires were designed for both teachers and students). The study focused on some Sudanese secondary schools in Nyala to investigate pair work and group work in teaching English as foreign language and their possible suitability for Sudanese secondary level. The participants in this investigation were from first and second grades.

For the analysis of data in this study SPSS program (Statistical Package for the Social Science) was used.

The analysis of data gathered during this study does not depend on a description of the data collected, but it follows a process that will help the researcher to interpret the data (Defeng 1998:685). An analytic deductive strategy was adopted to analyze the data, that is, it entailed reading and looking closely, and critically through the questionnaire responses. This was done to identify and compare the responses and behaviors of participating teachers for further statistical analysis, as suggested by Leedy (1993:150)

The data analysis was carried out by means of descriptive statistics. In descriptive statistics, the Likert technique provides a testing approach to infer the differences in order to be analyzed statistically in relation to the attitude expressed by the respondents, and recorded on the attitude

continuum as suggested by Torgerson (1958:47). This, in turn, helps correlation of the frequencies and percentages between the different categories. In this regard, descriptive statistics of the data collected are tabulated and presented in graphs.

### **3.1 Study design Tools**

The study aims at investigating pair work and group work in teaching English as foreign language and their possible suitability for Sudanese Secondary level concentrated on appointing teachers and students' attitudes towards application of pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms. In order to realize the general objectives of the study, two questionnaires were designed as tools of data collection. The study depended on the analysis's results of the questionnaires from a population of (120) subjects, representing the secondary schools students (table 3-1 & table 3-2) academic year 2014 – 2015.

Another questionnaire was distributed to a population of (60) subjects who represented EFL teachers were selected randomly from the area during the same academic year 2014 – 2015.

The respondents' responses of both (120) and (60) subjects were tabulated and computed by using the arithmetic mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) and the standard deviation (SD) for different statements to test the hypothesis round the mean, by using the (T) test at (0.05) level of significance as illustrated in the tables.

### **3.2. Population of the Study**

The population of the study consisted of two groups for accomplishing this study:

### 3.2.1. The Sample of the Students

The sample of the students represents the participants' students from some secondary schools both for boys and girls who are learning English language as a foreign language in Nyala locality. They represented ten secondary schools. The selection of these secondary schools was according to their geographical locations that enabled the researcher to cover the investigation's area completely.

One hundred and twenty students participated in the investigation both males and females, they represented ten secondary schools in Nyala locality. The chosen of the participants was randomly.

The tables below explain the distribution of sample.

**Table (3.1) Boys secondary schools and students' number.**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of students</b>
Nyala Secondary School	15 students
Al.Mustaffa Model Secondary School	15 students
South Darfur Model Secondary school	10 students
Khalid Secondary School	10 students
Al.Jabal secondary school	10 students
Total	60 students

The table (3.1) shows the boys chosen schools and the students' number that is according to the schools capacity.

**Table (3.2) Girls secondary schools and students' number.**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number of students</b>
Um Al.Mo'omineen Model Secondary School	15 students
Moheira secondary school	15 students
Al.Ingaz Secondary School	10 students
Al.Wihda Secondary School	10 students
Al.Sadaga secondary school	10 students
Total	60 students

The table above (3.2) shows the girls chosen schools and the students' number that is according to the schools capacity.

### **3.2.2 The Sample of teachers**

The sample of teachers includes the English language teachers who are teaching English language in Nyala secondary schools. Sixty teachers were chosen for investigation. Half of them were males and half females. They represented five locations according to teachers and schools' centralization in Nyala locality. The table below explains teachers' locations and number.

**Table (3.3) Distribution of English language teachers sample.**

Location of schools	Number of teachers
Middle of Nyala	20
Northern-side of Nyala	10
Southern-side of Nyala	10
Eastern-side of Nyala	10
Western-side of Nyala	10
Total	60

The table (3.3) shows teachers' locations and their numbers. The middle of Nyala represents the majority in teachers' chosen.

### **3.3 Instrumentation**

This study used two questionnaires each one contained open-ended questions in order to obtain participants' opinions about the suitability of pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms in Nyala locality.

The use of questionnaires as data collection tools mainly come from the fact that with the help of questionnaires large amount of data can be collected quickly and economically from a large sample (Krathwohl, 1998). Also, questionnaires, as one of the most common forms of data collection tools, can easily be assessed in terms of reliability. In this respect, reliability refers to the ability of questionnaire to produce the same results in different implementations, leading to a consistency and dependability of the results (Leftwich, 2007). Moreover, the strength of questionnaires generally includes accuracy, generalizability, and convenience (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). However, besides the strength, the questionnaires usually fall short in examining complex

social relationships or intricate patterns of interaction (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). The questionnaire enables the researcher to collect data in field settings where the data can be quantified to produce the responses required for analysis (Nunan 1991). The questionnaire is also a cheap tool and can be administered easily. Finally, the data is more accurate as it is given to all the research subjects at the same time, avoiding bias that may affect the reliability and validity of the study (Seliger and Shohamy 1989:172).

The survey questionnaires used in this study were designed for both Sudanese EFL teachers who are teaching English in secondary schools and students of secondary schools in Nyala locality. Questionnaires were given to the sixty teachers and to one hundred and twenty students to explore the possibility and suitability that EFL teachers in Nyala have and might encounter in their attempts to implement pair work and group work, as well as to investigate their understanding of the possibilities of overcoming these difficulties.

The survey was composed of two main parts. The first part is the teachers' questionnaire consisted of questions that dealt with participants' personal information. The questions in first section asked about participants' gender, academic background, educational sessions and years of experience in teaching English.

The questions in this section asked about whether the participants tried pair work and group work in their classes and the reasons for using or not using pair work and group work, whether they devote time for applying this technique of pair work and group work in the classrooms if so how they benefited from it.

Part two students' questionnaire includes of questions that dealt with students' responses and their attitudes towards application of pair work and group work in the classroom, whether they benefit from this technique in learning English and to what extent does SPINE series include sufficient practices on pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?

Finally, what are the difficulties and challenges that face the teachers and the students in adopting the techniques of pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?

### **3.3.1 Students' questionnaire**

The students' questionnaires were distributed to 120 participants half of them males and half females both of them represented ten secondary schools in Nyala locality that have already chosen according to the tables (3.1/3.2).

Students' questionnaire was designed consisting of 6 questions were measured by 20 statements on pair work and group work in secondary schools. The questionnaire's questions have been selected to evaluate the students' attitude in pair work and group work. The questions attempted to follow-up the students' views towards the application of pair work and group work in learning English in secondary level classrooms.

Participants were from first and second grades that are learning English as foreign language.

The questionnaire' questions were explained to participants and they informed about the purposes and procedures of the study.



### **3.3.2. Teachers' Questionnaire**

Teachers' questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part included the personal information. The second part contained 8 questions were measured by 30 statements to evaluate teachers' views about the suitability of pair work and group work teaching in secondary level schools classrooms in Nyala locality.

Sixty teachers were investigated thirty of them males and thirty females. The Likert scale is used in this study as part of a summated ratings method and a means of self-report measurement. The Likert technique presents a set of attitude statements, according to which subjects are asked to express agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale. Each degree of agreement is given a number value from one to five. For example:

Pair and group-work activities help to provide opportunities for developing genuine interaction among learners.

**Strongly agree / Agree / Not sure/ Disagree/ strongly disagree**

The questionnaires have designed to measure the following variables:

**Table (3.4) Variables measured by the ELT teachers and students' questionnaires**

<b>Statements</b>	<b>Variable measured</b>
Statements 1,2,3, 4,5 & 6	Application of pair work and group work activities in teaching English as foreign language in secondary schools classroom.
Statements 7,8,9, 10,11,12,13,14, 16,17,19,20,21, 22&23	Attitudes of teachers and students towards the application of pair work and group work in learning English in secondary level.
Statements 24,25 26&27	Whether SPINE series include sufficient practices on pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms.
statements 28,29 &30	Class size and students seating effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms.

#### **4.3 Validity of the Research Tools**

To ensure the validity of the research tools, the researcher submitted it, in its initial form to specialized jury members in the fields of education. The jury members were asked to comment on:

- Suitability of the research tools to measure teachers and students' attitudes towards pair work and group work application in secondary schools classrooms in learning EFL.

- Clarity of the pair work and group work items for both teachers and students' questionnaire.
- Clarity of the teachers and students' questionnaire instructions. The questionnaires were modified according to the jury members' comments and suggestions.

### **3.4 Reliability of the Research Tools**

There were many styles for measuring the reliability of the researcher tools. Test – retest method was chosen that means the test should give similar results if it gives to the same group of subjects on at least two separate circumstances. It should be expected that the relationship between the first and second subject scores of the two tests administration would be a high positive correlation.

To establish the reliability of the scale, it was administered to a sample of 120 students other than the sample of the study. Then, the same scale was administered to the same group after 2 weeks under relatively the same conditions in terms of the time and place. The reliability coefficient was estimated using Cronbach Alpha Formula.

The range of the correlation coefficient is between  $-1.00$  and  $1.00$ .  $-1.00$  indicates a perfect negative correlation while  $1.00$  indicates a perfect positive correlation.

**Table (1) Paired Samples Correlations**

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Before & After	108	.250	.009

Table (1) reviews the correlation between the two tests:

\* 2-tailed: it is the two-sided test determining the connection and correlation value between the two sides of the test before and after.

\*\* (108): refers to the 108 subjects of the study.

The correlation between the two tests was very significant at .009, which is close to +1.00. Mulder (1989:73) states that the correlation significance ranging from 0.80 to 0.99 is very high.

The table shows that the correlation between the two tests interpretation assuming a positive relation between the two tests was correct.

**Table (2) Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Before	42.13	108	7.683	.739
	After	40.68	108	12.084	1.163

Table (2) the statistical analysis of paired data is performed on differences between the pairs and for this data the mean difference (before & after) is (2) degrees. The standard deviation (SD) of the difference is (5) degrees. The before-questionnaire mean scores are higher.

**Table (3) Paired Sample Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2 –tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Before – After	1.454	12.597	1.212	-.949	3.857	1.199	107	.233a

- Result: No Significant difference at 0.05 level of Significance

The estimated value was (0.95), which is considered reliable for the purpose of the current study.

### 3.6 Procedure

This study investigated students' interaction during pair work and group work activities in secondary school classroom in Nyala. The researcher has been teaching those students for two years so he knows the participants very well. All of them are Arabic native speakers and they started to learn English in the fifth class in Basic schools level. They do not have any experience in studying other languages. The students have four lessons of English a week. It was observed the participants' engagement in pair work and group work activities and made notes. The observation lasted for about eight weeks.

Thirty students participated in pair work and group work activities for this research. The researcher did not tell them that he would observe them during the task since he did not want the students to change their typical behavior. The students were accustomed to pair work and group

work in English lessons so they were not surprised to work in same way. SPINE series books were used, but for the action research some activities were chosen that are not included in SPINE series. The main reason is that he tries to introduce the variety into lessons and to make students speak more through the different types of tasks.

During the first three activities he observed the students going round the class and making notes. They did not ask him for help with the task, but he stopped them during the activity. He also corrected their mistakes and asked them to perform the task when they remained silent. He tried to notice students' reactions to the teacher's interventions.

In the course of the next three activities he changed his role. He stayed in front or at the back of the students. During his observation he was making notes and answering their questions only if they asked him for help. He wanted to find out if the students were completing the task without the teacher's control. For ensuring the possibility and the suitability of the study, there were field trips to the chosen schools of study's area (table 3.1 and 3.2) in addition the teachers' locations (table 3.3). 120 questionnaires were distributed to the ten secondary schools for boys and girls mentioned above for responding and were all returned to the researcher, making up 100% responses rate in addition 60 questionnaires were distributed to the teachers who are teaching English as foreign language in secondary schools level in Nyala locality and were all returned to the researcher, making up 100% responses rate. This survey was carried out within four weeks, from February 4, 2015 to March 2, 2015.

## **Summary of the Chapter**

In this chapter the research methodology and procedures have been described. The next chapter will focus on data analysis, results and discussion.

## Chapter Four

### **Data Analysis, Results and Discussion**

This chapter provides a detailed description of the statistical adopted in data analysis. It includes two parts the teachers' questionnaire and students' questionnaire.

According to Burns (2000), data analysis means to “find meanings from the data and a process by which the investigator can interpret the data” (p.430). Similarly, as noted by Marshall and Rossman (1999), the purpose of the data analysis is to bring meaning, structure, and order to the data. Interpretation requires acute awareness of the data, concentration, as well as openness to subtle undercurrents of social life.

Questionnaires data analysis included the analysis of open-ended questions that were analyzed with the help of the statistical analysis software program SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Frequency calculations (i.e. how many teachers or students selected each answer) were used to produce descriptive statistics that were used to present an overall picture of the teachers and students' perceptions of pair work and group work, and the difficulties and problems that teachers faced in their attempts to implement pair work and group work in English classrooms.



## **Part one:**

### **4.1 Teachers' Questionnaire Analysis**

The first part shows and analyzes the data that was obtained from the teachers' questionnaire which has included general information as follows:

#### **4.1.1 Study Sample**

**Table (4.1) Gender Participants' Frequencies and Percentages**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	30	50.0
Female	30	50.0
Total	60	100.0

**4.1.1.1 Gender**, thirty males and thirty females' teachers had participated in responding of the questionnaires questions.

**Table (4.2) Teachers Experience**

<b>Experience</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1-5 years	4	6.7
6-10 years	32	53.3
11 years +	24	40.0
Total	60	100.0

#### **4.1.1.2 Sample Teachers' experience**

According to teaching experience of the participants, it varies from one year to more than eleven years. Among the participants, 4 teachers have 1-5 years of teaching experience, 32 of them have 6-10 years of experience, and 24 have 11 or more years of teaching experience. It is noticed that teachers' experience from 6-11 years frequency 56(93%) represents the majority that refers to their long experience in the educational field as explained in table (4.2) and figure (4.2).

**Table (4.3) Workshop or Training on CLT**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	20	33.3
No	40	66.7
Total	60	100.0

#### **4.1.1.3 Workshop or training on Communicative Language Teaching.**

Some teachers have taken part in different workshops and training sessions on Communicative Language Teaching that according to their responses by saying "yes" they represent 20(33.3%) and 40(66.7) of teachers' responses saying "No" because they have not taken any workshops or training sessions. It is noticed that training represents the missing link on the light of table (4.3) and figure (4.3).

**Table (4.4) Teachers Qualification**

Degree	Frequency	Percent
M.A	3	5%
M.Ed	2	3.4%
Post G Diploma	4	6.6%
B.A	10	16.7%
B.Ed	41	68.3%
Total	60	100.%

#### **4.1.1.4 Teachers qualification**

Regarding the academic degrees earned by the participants, 41(68.3%) of the respondents Bachelor of Education holder, they represent the majority and they are regarded the fruit of educational faculties of Nyala and El.Fashir universities and most of them prefer to work in their towns. 10 of them of them Bachelor of Arts holders, 4 of respondents Post general diploma holders, 3 of them Master of Arts holders and 2 of the respondents Master of Education holders. They are all majoring in English language teaching.

## **4.2 Classroom Activities**

**4.2.1** To what extent are pair work and group work activities applied in teaching English as foreign language in Nyala secondary schools classrooms?

The first question of teachers' questionnaire consists of four open-ended statements (1), (2), (3) and (4).

**Table (4.5)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement (1)

**1. Teachers' interest in applying pair work and group work activities in the classrooms.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	6	3	9	41	1	60
Percent	10.0%	5.0%	15.0%	68.3%	1.7%	100%

**4.2.1.1 Statement (1)** determines whether teachers interesting in applying pair work and group work activities in the classrooms. In response to statement (1), 41 (68.3%) of teachers disagreed, 9 (15.0%) not sure, 6 (10.0%) strongly agreed, 3 (5.0%) agreed and there was only 1 (1.7%) strongly disagreed (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to teachers' responses in applying pair work and group work in the classrooms it was ensured that the majority of teachers 42(70%) neglect this technique in their teaching in the classrooms. It is evidence that they haven't got training in such styles in teaching English in the secondary schools classrooms.

**Table (4.6)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement (2)

**2. Teachers provide time for pair work and group work practice in classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	6	3	14	34	3	60
Percent	10.0%	5.0%	23.3%	56.7%	5.0%	100.0%

**4.2.1.2 Statement (2)** is introduced to determine whether teachers provide time for pair work and group work practice in the classrooms. While replying statement 2, 34 (56.7%) of respondents disagreed, 14 (23.3%) not sure, 6 (10.0%) of participants strongly agreed, 3 (5.0%) of them agreed in addition to 3 (5.0%) of teachers strongly disagreed, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of respondents' responses 37(61.7%) of them admitted that teachers did not provide time for practicing pair work and group work in classroom for developing speaking skills, because majority of teachers think that pair work and group work activities wasted learners' and teachers' time.

**Table (4.7)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 3

**3. Pair work and group activities provide opportunity for developing speaking skill.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	15	42	0	2	1	60
Percent	25.0%	70.0%	0%	3.3%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.2.1.3 Statement (3)** examines whether Pair work and group activities provide opportunity for developing speaking skill. In answering to statement 3, 42 (70.0%) respondents agreed, 15 (25.0%) strongly agreed, 2 (3.3%) disagreed and only 1 (1.7%) strongly disagreed (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to the teachers' responses 42 agreed and 15 of them strongly agreed that ensure the majority of respondents 57(85%) believe that pair work and group work have great role in improving students communication skill that confirms the research questions about the attitudes towards the application of pair work and group work in learning English in secondary level that agreed to the research significance that pair work and group work activities are regarded as an opportunity for students to talk with their friends, partners and exchanging opinions, more than listening to their teacher talking alone.

**Table (4.8)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 4

**4. Classroom activities focus more on accuracy than fluency.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	11	40	1	7	1	60
Percent	18.3%	66.7%	1.7%	11.7%	1.7	100.0%

**4.2.1.4 Statement 4** determines whether classroom activities focus more on accuracy than fluency. While answering statement 4 there were 40 (66.7%) respondents agreed, 11 (18.3%) strongly agreed, 7 (11.7%) disagreed, 1 (1.7%) not sure and one (1.7%) disagreed (i.e. a total of 100%).

Teachers' responses 40 of them agreed and 11 of teachers strongly agreed they represent 51(85%) have discovered that classroom activities concentrate more on accuracy that according to large majority of respondents' responses.

**4.2.2. Factors that lead to success of pair work and group work application in the classroom.**

Question two includes two statements (5) and (6)

**Table (4.9)** Frequencies and Percentage for respondents and statement 5

**5. Interesting tasks lead to success of pair work and group work application in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	30	27	0	1	0	58
Percent	51.7%	46.6%	0%	1.7%	0%	100.0%

**4.2.2. 5. Statement 5** determines whether interesting tasks lead to success of pair work and group work application in the classroom. In response to statement 5, 30 (51.7%) of teachers strongly agreed, 27(46.6%) of them agreed, and only 1 (1.7%) of teachers disagreed in addition to two missing cases, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The number of respondents' responses that includes 30 of respondents strongly agreed and 27 of them agreed that represent 57(98.3) is quite high ensured that interesting tasks lead to success of pair work and group work application in the classroom following to the majority of the respondents.



**Table (4.10)** Frequencies and Percentage for respondents and statement 6

**6. Suitable seating arrangement leads to success of pair work and work application in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	22	32	1	2	1	58
Percent	37.9%	55.2%	1.7%	3.4%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.2.2.6** Statement 6 proves whether suitable seating arrangement lead to success of pair work and group work application in the classroom. In reply to statement 6, 32(55.2%) of the respondents agreed, 22 (37.9%) strongly agreed, 2 (3.4%) disagreed, 1 (1.7%) disagreed and 1 (1.7%) not sure and there were two missing cases(i.e. a total of 100%).

The study confirmed that suitable seating arrangement is one of factors of success of pair work and group work application in the classroom that is according to respondents' responses 55(93.1) the large majority.

### **4.3 Class Tasks**

**4.3.3** What are the attitudes of teachers towards the application of pair work and group work in teaching English in Nyala secondary schools classrooms?

Question three consists of four statements (7), (8), (9) and (10).

**Table (4.11)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 7

**7. Application of pair work and group work is regarded a positive mean in learning English language in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	11	47	1	1	0	60
Percent	18.8%	78.3%	1.7%	1.7%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.3.7 Statement 7** discusses whether application of pair work and group work is regarded a positive mean in learning English language in the classroom. In response to statement 7 there were 47 (78.3%) of respondents agreed, 11 (18.3%) strongly agreed that represents 54(97.1) it is obvious the study realized that pair work and group work are positive mean in learning English language in the classroom according to the participants responses.

**Table (4.12)** Frequencies / Percentages for respondents and statement 8

**8. Application of pair work and group work in teaching English gives students more chances to exchange ideas with each other.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	17	42	1	0	0	60
Percent	28.3%	70.0%	1.7%	0%	0%	100.5%

**4.4.3.8 Statement 8** ensures whether application of pair work and group work gives students more chances to exchange ideas with each other. While answering to statement 8 there were 42 (70.0%) of teachers agreed, 17 (28.3%) strongly agreed and only 1 (1.7%) not sure (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of respondents' responses 42 of teachers agreed and 17 of them strongly agreed that means 59(98%) the large majority of the respondents it is evidence that pair work and group work help the students to communicate each other in classroom.

**Table (4.13)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 9

**9. Application of pair work and group work in teaching English encourages students to talk in English.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	15	43	1	1	0	60
Percent	25.0%	71.7%	1.7%	1.7%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.3.9 Statement 9** examines whether application of pair work and group work encourages students to talk in English. In reply to statement 9, 43 (71.7%) of participants agreed, 15 (25. %) strongly agreed, 1 (1.7%) disagreed and one (1.7%) not sure (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of participants' responses 43 of them agreed and 15 of participants strongly agreed they represent 58(96.7) the large majority. It is evidence that application of pair work and group work encourages

students to talk in English, because of the number of participants' responses.

**Table (4.14)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 10

**10. Application of pair work and group work in teaching English creates a relaxing learning environment.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	11	45	2	2	0	60
Percent	18.3%	75.0%	3.3%	3.3%	0%	100.%

**4.3.3.10 Statement 10** determines to what extent application of pair work and group work creates a relaxing learning environment. In reply to statement 10, 45 (75.0%) of respondents agreed, 11(18.3%) strongly agreed, 2 (3.3%) disagreed and 2 (3.3%) of respondents not sure (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to respondents' answers 45 agreed and 11 strongly agreed the total of them 56(93.3) admitted that pair work and group work create a relaxing learning environment in classroom.

4.3.4 There are obstacles facing the teachers in implementing pair work and group work in the classroom.

Question four consists of five statements (11), (12), (13), (14) and (15).

**Table (4.15)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 11

**11. Obstacles facing the teachers in implementing pair work and group work in the classroom that refers to students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	43	15	0	2	0	60
Percent	71.7%	25.0%	0%	3.2%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.4.11 Statement 11** determines whether students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups. While answering statement 11, 43(71.7%) of teachers strongly agree, 15(25.0%) of them agreed and 2(3.3%) of respondents disagreed, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It is clear from respondents' responses 43 of teachers strongly agreed and 15 of them agreed large majority of them according to general responses 58(96.7%) admitted that students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups in classroom.

**Table (4.16)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 12

**12. Obstacles that facing the teachers in implementing pair work and group work in the classroom refersto students' lack of fluency and accuracy when using English.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	18	41	1	0	0	60
Percent	30.0%	68.3%	1.7%	0%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.4.12 Statement 12**examines whether students' lack of fluency and accuracy when using English. In response to statement 12, 41(68.3%) of teachers agreed, 18(30.0%) of them strongly agreed and 1(1.7%) not sure, (i.e. a total of 100%).

No doubt that students' lack of fluency and accuracy when using English in classrooms that refers to respondents' responses 41 of them

agreed and 18 of respondents strongly agreed, they represent 59(98.3%) the large majority.

**Table (4.17)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement13

**13. Obstacles that facing the teachers in implementing pair work and group work in the classroom refer toStudents' shyness when talking in English.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	17	41	1	1	0	60
Percent	28.3%	68.3%	1.7%	1.7%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.4.13 Statement 13** tests whether students feel shyness when talking in English in classroom. In reply to statement 13, 41(68.3%) of teachers agreed, 17(28.3%) of them strongly agreed, 1(1.7%) of respondents disagreed and 1(1.7%) of them not sure, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to respondents' responses 41 of them agreed and 17 of respondents strongly agreed that represent 58(96.6) they believe that students feel shyness when talking in English in classroom that is following to the majority of respondents.

**Table (4.18)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement14

**14. Implementation of prescribed textbook requires training and knowledge in application pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	25	32	1	2	0	60
Percent	41.7%	53.3%	1.7%	3.3%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.4.14 Statement** 14 proves whether implementation of prescribed textbook requires training and knowledge in application pair work and group work in the classroom. While replying statement 14, 32(53.3%) of respondents agreed, 25(41.7%) of them strongly agreed, 2(3.3%) of respondents disagreed and 1(1.7%) of them not sure, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It is noticed that participants' responses 32 of them agreed and 25 of them strongly agreed, the total of their responses 57(95%) lead to importance of training and knowledge of prescribed textbook in application pair work and group work in the classroom, according to great number of respondents.



**Table (4.19)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement14

**14. Implementation of prescribed textbook requires training and knowledge in application pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	25	35	0	0	0	60
Percent	41.7%	58.3%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.4.15 Statement 15** checks out whether some teachers have not been trained to apply pair work and group work in the classroom. In response to statement 15, 35 (58.3%) of respondents strongly agreed, 25 (41.7%) of teachers agreed, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The large majority of respondents' responses 35 of them agreed and 25 of respondents strongly agreed the total of the respondents 60(100%) that ensured the significance of training in promoting teachers' performance classroom. Teachers have to be trained to apply pair work and group work in the classroom to promote their students' speaking skill.

**4.3.5 There are benefits of having students work in pairs or groups in the classroom.**

Question five includes five statements (16), (17), (18), (19) and (20).

**Table(4.20)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement16

**16. Having students work in pairs or groups in the classroom helps them to solve tasks better and faster.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	28	31	0	0	0	59
Percent	47.5%	52.5%	0%	0%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.5.16 Statement 16**determines whether is benefit of having students work in pairs or groups in classroom helps students solve tasks better and faster. In response to statement 16, 31(52.5%) of teachers agreed, 28(47.5%) of them strongly agreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It is authentic that working in pairs or groups in classroom helps students solve tasks better and faster are according to respondents' responses 31 of them agreed and 28 of respondents that represented the large majority of respondents represent 49(100%) in addition to one missing case.

**Table(4.21)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement17

**17. Having students work in pairs or groups in the classroom helps them to solve tasks better and faster.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	26	32	1	0	0	59
Percent	44.1%	54.2%	1.7%	0%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.5.17 Statement 17** examines whether work in pairs or groups in the classroom helps to improve students' fluency. While answering statement 17, 32(54.2%) of respondents agreed and 26(44.1%) of them strongly agreed, 1(1.7%) not sure and there was one missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of respondents' responses 32 of them agreed and 26 of respondents strongly agreed that 58(98.3%) of the respondents believe that work in pairs or groups helps to improve students' fluency in classroom.

**Table (4.22)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement18

**18. Having students work in pairs or groups in the classroom it enhances students' effective use of English when talking to each other.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	24	34	1	0	0	59
Percent	40.7%	57.6%	1.7%	0%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.5.18 Statement 18** examines whether work in pairs or groups in the classroom enhances students' effective use of English when talking to each other. In response to statement 18, 34(57.6%) of teachers agreed, 24(40.7%) of them strongly, 1(1.7) of them not sure, (i.e. a total of 100%).

No doubt that work in pairs or groups in the classroom enhances students' effective use of English when talking to each other. The respondents' responses 34 of them agreed and 24 of respondents strongly agreed the total of their responses 58(100%) ensured the benefits that students will get from exchanging ideas and opinions among them.

**Table (4.23)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement19

**19. Work in pairs or groups in the classroom Students learn more about how to share the responsibilities when working in pairs/groups.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	25	33	1	0	0	59
Percent	42.4%	55.9%	1.7%	0%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.5.19 Statement 19** checks on whether students learn more about how to share the responsibilities when working in pairs/groups in the classroom. In reply to statement 19, 33(55.9%) of respondents agreed, 25(42. 4%) of them strongly agreed, 1(1.7%) not sure and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to respondents' responses 33 of them agreed and 25 of respondents strongly agreed that represent the total of 58(98.3%) they discovered that students learn more about how to share the responsibilities when working in pairs/groups in the classroom it was assured by the large majority of responses.

**Table (4.24)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement20

**20. Work in pairs or groups in the classroom helps students feel more confident when speaking English.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	28	30	1	0	0	59
Percent	47.5%	50.8%	1.7%	0%	0%	100.0%

**3.5.20 Statement 20** checks up on whether work in pairs or groups helps students feel more confident when speaking English in the classroom. In response to statement 20, 30 (50.1%) of respondents agreed, 28 (47.5%) of teachers strongly agreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The study discovered that work in pairs/groups helps students feel more confident in classroom that is according to respondents' responses 30 of them agreed and 28 of respondents strongly agreed, the total their responses 58(100%) that ensured the significance of pair work and group work in classrooms.

#### **4.3.6 There are problems that face the teachers in applying pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Question six determines problems that face the teachers in applying pair work and group work in the classroom and it includes three statements (21), (22), and (23).

**Table (4.25)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 21

**21. Noise is a problem that faces the teachers in applying pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	22	31	0	5	1	59
Percent	37.3%	52.5%	0%	8.5%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.3.6.21 Statement 21** determines whether noise is a problem that faces the teachers in applying pair work and group work in the classroom. In response to statement 21, 31(52.5%) of teachers agreed, 22(37.3%) of them strongly agreed, 5(8.5%) of respondents disagreed, 1(1.7%) strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

Noise is a real problem that faces English teachers in classroom that is following to difficulty of class' control. Respondents' responses 31 of them agreed and 22 strongly agreed, the total of respondents' responses 53(89.8%) their responses explained that noise is a problem in applying pair work and group work in classroom.

**Table (4.26)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement 22

**22. Teacher's little control of the whole class is a problem in applying pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	9	44	1	5	0	59
Percent	15.3%	74.6%	1.7%	8.5%	0%	100.0%

**4.3.6.22 Statement 22** investigates whether teacher's little control of the whole class is a problem in applying pair work and group work in the classroom. While answering statement 22, 44 (74.6%) of respondents agreed, 9(15.3%) of them strongly agreed, 5(8.5%) of respondents disagreed, 1(1.7%) not sure and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of respondents' responses 44 agreed and 9 strongly agreed, the total of their responses 53(89.95) they admitted that teacher's little control of whole class is a problem in applying pair work and group work in classroom.

**Table (4.27)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement23

**23. Classes over crowdedness is regarded a problem that faces teachers in applying pair work and group work in the classrooms.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	37	21	0	0	1	59
Percent	62.7%	35.6%	0%	0%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.3.6.23 Statement 23**materializes if classes over crowdedness are a problem in applying pair work and group work in the classroom. In response to statement 23, 37(62.7%) of respondents strongly agreed, 21(35.6%) of them agreed, 1(1.7%) of respondents strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The main problems that face teachers are classes over crowdedness. Respondents' responses 37 strongly agreed and 21 of them



agreed, the total of their responses 58(98.3%) they ensured that classes over crowdedness are non-attractive school environment.

#### 4.4. Textbook (SPINE Series)

##### 4.3.7 To what extent does SPINE series include sufficient practices of pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?

Question seven explains to what extent does SPINE series include sufficient practices of pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms? It holds four statements (24), (25), (26) and (27).

**Table (4.28)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement24

**24. SPINE series texts help in practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	3	11	6	35	4	59
Percent	5.1%	18.6%	10.2%	59.3%	6.8%	100.0%

**4.3.7.24 Statement 24** discusses whether SPINE series texts help in practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms. While replying statement 24, 35(59.3%) of respondent disagreed, 11(18.6%) of them agreed, 6(10.2%) of respondents not sure, 4(6.8%) of them strongly disagreed, 3(5.1%) of respondents strongly agreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to respondents' responses 35 agreed in addition 4 strongly disagreed, they represent the majority of respondents 39(61%) admitted

that SPINE unsuitable for practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms. The SPINE series should be redesigned to convey communicative language teaching rise in learning English language.

**Table (4.29)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement25

**25. SPINE series includes sufficient exercises for practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	3	4	3	44	5	59
Percent	5.1%	6.8%	5.1%	74.6%	8.5%	100.0%

**4.4.7. 25 Statement 25**clarifies if SPINES series includes sufficient exercises for practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms. In response to statement 25, 44(74.6%) of respondents disagreed, 5(8.5%) of them disagreed, 4(6.8%) of respondents agreed, 3(5.1%) of them strongly agreed and 3(5.1%) not sure in addition to one missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of respondents' responses 44 of them disagreed in addition to 5 of them strongly disagreed, their total responses 49(83%) they admitted that SPINES series does include sufficient exercises for practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms. It is crucial to include more interesting topics for motivating students to bring out better performance from learners.

**Table (4.30) Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement26**

**26. Texts materials motivate students to learn English through pair work and group work application in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	3	13	11	26	6	59
Percent	5.1%	22.0 %	18.6%	44.1%	10.2%	100.0%

**4.4.7. 26 Statement 26** discovers whether texts materials motivate students to learn English through pair work and group work application in the classroom. In reply to statement 27, 26(44.1%) of respondents disagreed, 13(22.0%) of them agreed, 11(18.6%) of respondents not sure, 6(10.2%) of them strongly disagreed, 3 (5.1%) of respondents strongly agreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to respondents' responses 26 of them disagreed and 6 of respondents strongly disagreed, the total of their responses 32(54.3%) explained that texts materials do not motivate students to learn English through pair work and group work application in the classroom. More materials should be developed and introduced to motivate students to learn English through pair work and group work application in the classroom.

**Table (4.31)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement27

**27. SPINE series has enough tasks to promote students' standards in applying pair work and group work.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	3	2	1	43	10	59
Percent	5.1%	3.4 %	1.7%	72.9%	16.9%	100.0%

**4.4.7. 27 Statement 27** determines whether SPINE series has enough tasks to promote students' standards in applying pair work and group work in the classroom. In response to statement 27, 43 (72.9%) of respondents disagreed, 10 (16.9%) of respondents strongly disagreed, 3 (5.1%) of respondents strongly agreed, 2 (3.4%) of respondents agreed, 1(1.7%) of respondents not sure and there was a missing case (i.e. a total of 100%).

The large majority of respondents' responses 43 of them disagreed and 10 of respondents strongly disagreed, the total of their responses 53(89.8%) explained that SPINE series hasn't enough tasks to promote students' standards in applying pair work and group work in the classroom. More materials should be developed to motivate students to learn English through pair work and group work application in the classroom. Topics that require pair work and group work activities should be more interesting to attract learners to become extrinsically motivated to practice them extensively.

## 4.5. Class Size and Students Seating

4.4.8 To what extent do classes' size and students seating effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?

Question eight determines to what extent do classes' size and students seating effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms. It includes three statements (28), (29) and (30).

**Table (4.32)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement28

**28. Schools classes' capacity effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	46	11	0	2	0	59
Percent	78.0%	18.6 %	0%	3.4%	0%	100.0%

**4.5.8.28 Statement 28**discusses whether schools classes' capacity effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms. In response to statement 28, 46(78.0%) of respondents strongly agreed, 11(18.6%) of them agreed, 2(3.4%) of respondents disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

No doubt that schools classes' capacity effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms that was ensured by the large majority of respondents' responses 46 of them strongly agreed and

11 of respondents agreed, the total responses 57(96.6%). The responsible authorities have to do their best in expansion schools' classes.

**Table (4.33)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement<sup>29</sup>

**29. Classes' size is suitable for applying pair work and group work.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	6	4	0	40	9	59
Percent	10.2%	6.8 %	0%	76.8%	15.3%	100.0%

**4.5.8.29 Statement 29** explains whether classes' size is suitable for applying pair work and group work. While answering statement 29, 40(67.8%) of respondents disagree, 9(15.3%) of them strongly disagreed, 6(10.2%) strongly agreed, 4(6.8%) agreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The large majority of respondents admitted that classes' size is not suitable for applying pair work and group work that is according to respondents' responses 40 of them disagreed, 9 of respondents strongly agreed the total responses 49(92.1%). The classes are crowded and lack of educational specifications, classes need to be compounded to students' number.

**Table (4.34)** Frequencies and Percentages for respondents and statement30

**30. Students number in the classroom hinders pair work and group work application.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	24	29	0	5	1	59
Percent	40.7%	49.2 %	0%	8.5%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.5.8.30 Statement 30**determines whether students' number in the classroom hinders pair work and group work application. In response to statement 30, 29(49.2%) of respondents agreed, 24(40.7%) of them strongly agreed, 5(8.5%) of respondents disagreed, (1.7%) of them strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to previous statements 28 / 29 that discussed classes' capacity and classes' size it natural that students' number in the classroom is regarded a hinder that face English teacher to apply pair work and group work in classrooms. Respondents' responses 29 of them agreed and 24 of respondents strongly agreed, their responses 53(89.9%) admitted students' large number is obstacle in applying pair work and group work in classrooms.

To conclude, part one that reviewed teacher's questionnaire analysis there was correspondence and agreement between the teacher's questionnaire analysis, study questions and the hypotheses of the study that was according to high frequency of teachers' responses for realizing the study's aims.

## **Part two:**

### **4.6 Students' questionnaire analysis**

A questionnaire was prepared to find out what attitudes the students have towards application of pair work and group work in teaching English in secondary schools classrooms.

Here is analysis and interpretation of the individual questions from the questionnaire. There were one – hundred and twenty students participated in survey 60 males and 60 female according to table (4.34) below:

**Table (4.35) Gender of the Students**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	60	50.0
Female	60	50.0
Total	120	100.0

### **4.7 Classroom Activities**

#### **4.6.1 What are the attitudes of students towards the application of pair work and group work in learning English in secondary level in Nyala?**

The question consists of three statements (1), (2) and (3).



**Table (4.36)**Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (1)

**1. There is some of time during teaching English periods for pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	18	37	38	14	13	120
Percent	15.0%	30.8%	31.7%	11.7%	10.8%	100.0%

**4.6.1.1 Statement 1**determines whether there is some of time during teaching English periods for pair work and group work in the classroom. In response to statement 1, 38(31.7%) of students are not sure whether there is some of time during teaching English periods for pair work and group work in the classroom, 37(30.8%) of them agreed,18(15.8%) of students strongly agreed, 14(11.7%) of students disagreed and 13(10.8%)of them strongly disagreed, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The number of students who responded that not sure if there is some of time during teaching English periods of pair work and group work in the classroom 38 is quite high. The researcher thinks that the reason for this fact is that still many teachers teach in a traditional way standing in front of the class and teaching all students together. Students are accustomed to this kind of work. 37 of students agreed and 18 of them strongly agreed that may refer to their teachers' knowledge about the technique of applying pair work and group work in the classrooms that ensures some of teachers were trained and have ability in execution of pair work and group work in the classrooms. However, pair work is not more popular than group work. The researcher' opinion, these two forms of work are very similar and both are suitable for learning languages in a

communicative way. Students' responses are clear evidence that teachers neglect the application pair work and group work in the classroom and students know nothing about them.

**Table (4.37)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (2)

**2. English teachers apply pair work and group work in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	9	21	15	51	24	120
Percent	7.5%	17.5%	12.6%	42.6%	20.0%	100.0%

**4.6.1.2 Statement 2** examines whether English teachers apply pair work and group work in the classroom. In response to statement 2, 51(42.5%) of students disagreed that English teachers apply pair work and group work in the classroom. 24(20.0%) of them strongly disagreed, 21(17.5%) of students agreed, 15(12.5%) of them not sure and 9(7.5%) strongly agreed, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to students responses whether English teachers apply pair work and group work in the classroom 51 of students disagreed and 24 strongly disagreed the responses of respondents 75(62.6%) the result assures that the majority of English overleap application of pair work and group work in the classrooms.24% of them strongly disagreed their responses are regarded as proof to teachers negligence for applying pair work and group work in the classrooms.21% of students agreed that reflects teachers' abilities and student' interaction in implementing pair work and group work in the classroom.15% of students not sure that may

express students' weakness in communication or teachers no interesting in applying pair and group work in the classrooms and 9% of students strongly agreed they present the minority of the students, so, they don't realize the aims of the study.

**Table (4.38)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (3)

**3. Pair work and group work have improved my speaking ability in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	49	58	3	4	5	119
Percent	41.2%	48.7%	2.5%	3.4%	4.2%	100.0%

**4.6.1.3 Statement 3** tests whether Pair work and group work have improved my speaking ability in the classroom. While replying statement 3, 58(48.7%) of students agreed, 49(41.2%) of them strongly agreed, 5(4.2%) of students, 4(3.4%) of them disagreed, 3% of students not sure and there was only missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It obvious the large majority of students believe that Pair work and group work have improved their speaking ability in the classroom that is in the light of students' responses 58 agreed and 49 of them strongly agreed, the total results of their responses 107(89.9%) appear that pair work and group work have played great role in improving students' standards in speaking.

- In your opinion, reasons that lead the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom?

Question two contains three statements (4), (5) and (6).

**Table (4.39)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (4)

**4. Lack of vocabulary a reason that leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	49	63	2	2	4	120
Percent	40.8%	52.5%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	100.0%

**4.6.2.4 Statement 4** discovers whether lack of vocabulary is a reason that leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom. While answering statement 4, 63(52.5%) of students agreed, 49(41.2%) of them strongly agreed, 4(3.3%) of students strongly disagreed, 2(1.7%) of them disagreed, 2(1.7 %) of students not sure if lack of vocabulary lead them to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom and there was only one missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The researcher common belief that pair work and group work will motivate students to communicate, large majority of students 63 agreed

and 49 of them strongly agreed their total responses 112(93.3%) they admitted that using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary that leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested in English communication, but they represent the small minority of the students.

**Table (4.40)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (5)

**5. Habit of using Arabic is a reason that leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	21	69	5	15	9	119
Percent	17.6%	88.0%	4.2%	12.6%	7.6%	100.0%

**4.6.2.5 Statement5** explains whether habit of using Arabic leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom. In reply to statement 5, 69(88.0%) of students agreed. 21(17.6%) of them strongly agreed, 15(12.6%) of the students disagreed, 9(7.6%) of them strongly disagreed, 5(4.2%) of students not sure and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of students' responses 69 agreed and 21 of them strongly agreed in using Arabic instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom, the total responses 90(93.3%) they admitted to use Arabic when working in pairs or groups, because the students' lack of vocabulary as well as lack of confidence and their habit of using Arabic for every day communication.

**Table (4.41)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (6)

**6. Lack of confidence is a reason that leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	29	63	15	10	2	119
Percent	24.4%	52.9%	12.6%	8.4%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.6.2.6 Statement 6** determines whether lack of confidence leads the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom. While replying statement 6, 63(52.9%) of students agreed, 29(24.4%) of them strongly agreed, 15(12.6%) of students not sure, 10(8.4%) of them disagreed, 2(1.7%) of students strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to students responses 63 of students agreed and 29 of them strongly agreed the large majority of students 92(77.3%) confess that lack of confidence is regarded as main hindrance during communication in the classroom, because many them shy to commit mistakes in front of their classmates, teachers must encourage them to break this barrier.

#### **4.8. Class tasks**

4.7.3. The following tasks are often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom.

Question three involves four statements (7), (8), (9) and (10).

**Table (4.42)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (7)

**7. Role play task is often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	39	63	9	3	4	118
Percent	33.1%	53.4%	7.6%	2.5%	3.4%	100.0%

**4.7.3.7 Statement 7** identifies whether role play often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom. In response to statement 7, 63(53.4%) of students agreed, 39(33.1%) of them strongly agreed, 9(7.6%) of students not sure, 4(3.4%) of them strongly disagreed, 3(2.5%) of student disagreed and there were two missing cases, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It is clear from the students' responses that 63 of students agreed in addition to 39 of them strongly agreed that means the large majority of students 102(86.5%) say role play is always or usually operated in their classroom, 9% of students not sure if role play assigned to pairs and groups in classroom, there is remarkable difference between the respondents' responses to the option "role play".

**Table (4.43)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents for statement (8)

**8. Discussion task is often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	33	70	5	3	7	118
Percent	28.0%	59.3%	4.2%	2.5%	5.9%	100.0%

**4.7.3.8 Statement 8** individualizes whether discussion is assigned as a task to pairs and groups in classroom. While answering statement 8, 70(59.3%) of students agreed, 33(28.0%) of them strongly agreed, 7(5.9%) of students strongly disagreed, 5(4.2%) of them not sure, 3(2.5%) of students disagreed in addition to two missing cases, (i.e. a total of 100%).

Obviously, discussion is most used as it receives the highest percentage of frequency 70 of students agreed and 33 of them strongly agreed they represent 103(87.3%) the large majority of the students.

**Table (4.44)** Frequencies and percentages of respondents and statement (9)

**9. Dialogue task is often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	41	63	7	3	3	117
Percent	35.0%	53.8%	6.0%	2.6%	2.6%	100.0%

**4.7.3.9 Statement 9** explores whether dialogue is assigned as a task to pairs and groups in classroom. In reply to statement 9, 63(53.8%) of students agreed, 41(35.0%) of them strongly agreed, 7(6.0%) of students not sure, 3(2.6%) of them disagreed and 3(2.6%) of students strongly disagreed in addition to three missing cases, (i.e. a total of 100%).

No doubt that students' responses 63 of them agreed and 41 of students strongly agreed the total responses 104(88.8%) admit that dialogue is regarded an essential task assigned pairs and groups in classroom.



**Table (4.45)** Frequencies / percentages for respondents and statement (10)

**10. Interview task is often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	26	59	17	10	7	119
Percent	21.8%	49.6%	14.3%	8.4%	5.9%	100.0%

**4.7.3.10 Statement 10** itemizes whether interview assigned as task to pairs and groups in classroom. In response to statement 10, 59(49.6%) of students agreed, 26(21.8%) of them strongly agreed, 17(14.3%) of student not sure, 10(8.4%) of them disagreed, 7(5.9%) of students strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of students' responses the majority of them 59 agreed and 26 strongly agreed the total responses 85(71.4%) they ensured the importance of interview in enhancing students' communication in classroom.

**4.8.4 In your opinion, the benefits of having students work in pairs or groups.**

Question four consists of three statements (11), (12) and (13)

**Table (4.46)** Frequencies / percentages for respondents and statement (11)

**11. Students have more time for practicing speaking.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	23	53	18	13	9	116
Percent	19.8	45.7%	15.5%	11.2%	7.8	100.0%

**4.8.4.11 Statement 11** explores whether students have more time for practicing speaking. In reply to statement 11, 53(45.7%) of students agreed, 23(19.8%) of them strongly agreed, 18(15.5%) of students not sure, 13(11.2%) of them disagreed, 9(7.8%) of students strongly disagreed and there were four missing cases, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to students' responses 53 of them agreed and 23 of students strongly agreed they represent 76(65.5%) the majority of students that having more time for practicing speaking in the classroom.

**Table (4.47)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (12)

**12. Classroom atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	41	38	20	12	7	118
Percent	34.7%	32.2%	16.9%	10.2%	5.9%	100.0%

**4.8.4.12 Statement 12** identifies whether classroom atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing. While answering statement 12, 41(34.7%) strongly agreed, 38(32.2%) of them agreed, 20(16.9%) of students not sure, 12(10.2%) of them disagreed, 7% of students strongly disagreed in addition to two missing cases, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to students' responses about whether classroom atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing 41 of them strongly agreed, 38 of students agreed their total responses 79(66.9%) reflect that class atmosphere is productive environment in creating communicative language teaching among the students in classroom.

**Table (4.48)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (13)

**13. Students can learn how to cooperate and to share tasks equally.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	37	68	7	5	2	119
Percent	31.1%	57.1%	5.9%	4.2%	1.7%	100.0%

**4.8.4.13 Statement 13** determines whether students can learn how to cooperate and to share tasks equally. In response to statement 13, 68(57.1%) of students agreed, 37(31.1%) of them strongly agreed, 7% of students not sure, 5% of them disagreed and 2% of students strongly disagreed in addition to only one missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

In the light of students' responses that represent the large majority according to students' frequencies and percentage 68 of them agreed, 37 of students strongly agreed, the total responses 105(88.2%) they explained that students can learn how to cooperate and share task together in classroom.

**4.9.5 Problems that pair work and group work can cause in the classroom.**

Question five consists of three statements (14), (15) and (16).

**Table (4.49)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (14)

**14. Noise is a Problem that pair work and group work can cause in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	45	52	4	9	9	119
Percent	37.8%	43.7%	3.4%	7.6%	7.6%	100.0%

**4.9.5.14 Statement 14** explores whether pair work and group work can cause noise in the classroom. While answering statement 14, 52(43.7%) of students agreed, 45(37.8%) of them strongly agreed, 9(7.6%) of students disagreed, 9(7.6%) of them strongly disagreed, 4(3.4%) of student not sure and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The large majority of students' responses that represent 52 of them agreed and 45 of students strongly agreed their general responses 97(81.5%) they believe that pair work and group work cause noise in classroom.

**Table (4.50)**Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (15).

**15. Teacher's little control of the whole class is a Problem that pair work and group work can cause in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	37	57	8	14	3	119
Percent	31.1%	47.9%	6.7%	11.8%	2.5%	100.0%

**4.9.5.15 Statement 15**determines whether pair work and group work can cause in a little control by teachers in classroom. In response to statement 15, 57(47.9%) of students agreed, 37(31.1%) of them strongly agreed, 14(11.8%) of students disagreed, 8(6.7%) of them not sure, 3(2.5%) of students strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It is noticed that students' responses according to their frequencies and percentage 57 of them agreed and 37 of students strongly agreed, their total responses 94(79%) they admit that teachers' little control of the whole class is a real problem.

**Table (4.51)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (16)

**16. Students' inequality of sharing the responsibilities is a Problem that pair work and group work can cause in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	35	61	9	8	7	120
Percent	29.2%	50.8%	7.5%	6.7%	5.8%	100.0%

**4.9.5.16 Statement 16** examines whether students' inequality of sharing the responsibilities. In reply to statement 16, 61(50.8%) of students agreed, 35(29.2%) of them strongly agreed, 9(7.5%) of students not sure, 8(6.7%) of them disagreed and 7(5.8%) strongly disagreed, (i.e. a total of 100%).

Seeing to students' responses troop of them that act out 61% of students agreed and 35% of them strongly agreed, their responses assured students' inequality of sharing the responsibilities during applying pair work and group work in classroom.

**4.10.6 There are some obstacles that prevent Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.**

Question six contains four statements (17), (18), (19) and (20).

**Table (4.52)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (17)

**17. The unsuitable seating arrangement is obstacle that prevents Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	41	69	2	4	3	119
Percent	34.5%	58.0%	1.7%	4.3%	2.5%	100.0%

**4.10.6.17 Statement 17** determines whether the unsuitable seating arrangement is an obstacle that prevents Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom. While answering statement 17, 69(58.0%) of students agreed, 41(34.5%) of them strongly agreed, 4(3.4%) of students disagreed, 3(2.5%) of them strongly disagreed, 2(1.7%) of students not sure if unsuitable seating is an obstacle that prevents pair work and group implementation in classroom and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to students' responses 69 of them agreed, 41 of students strongly agreed they represent 110(92.5%) the large majority in assuring the unsuitable schools environment that refers to classes' narrow size and great numbers of students in classrooms.

**Table (4.53)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (18)

**18. Students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups is obstacle that prevents Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	58	33	10	12	6	119
Percent	48.7%	27.7%	8.4%	10.1%	5.0%	100.0%

**4.10.6.18 Statement 18**determines whether students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups. In response to statement 18, 58(48.7%) of students strongly agreed, 33(27.7%) of them agreed, 12(10.1%) of students disagreed, 10(8.4%) not sure, 6(5.0%) strongly disagreed and there was a missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

According to students' responses about their unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups in classroom, 58 of students strongly agreed, 33 of them agreed, their total responses 91(76.4%) ensured that teachers' negligence the application of pair work and group work in classroom.



**Table (4.54)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (19)

**19. Students' weakness in English is obstacle that prevents Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	55	50	4	4	7	120
Percent	45.8%	41.7%	3.3%	3.3%	5.8%	100.0%

**4.10.6.19 Statement** 19 determines whether students' weakness in English is an obstacle to apply pair work and group work in classroom. While replying statement 19, 55(45.8%) of students strongly agreed, 50(41.7%) of them agreed, 7(5.8%) of students strongly disagreed, 4(3.3%) of them disagreed and 4(3.3%) of students not sure, (i.e. a total of 100%).

The majority of students confess that students' weakness in English is an obstacle to apply pair work and group work in classroom that is according to their responses 55 of students strongly agreed and 50 of them agreed their total responses 105(87.5%) ensure their real opinions.

**Table (4.55)** Frequencies / percentages of respondents and statement (20)

**20. Students' shyness when talking in English is obstacle that prevents Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.**

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Frequency	46	58	3	4	8	119
Percent	38.7%	48.7%	2.5%	3.4%	6.7%	100.0%

**4.10.6.20 Statement 20** determines whether students' shyness is an obstacle when talking in English. In response to statement 20, 58(48.7%) of students agreed, 46(38.7%) of them strongly agreed, 8(6.7%) of students strongly disagreed, 4(3.4%) of them disagreed, 3(2.5%) not sure in addition to one missing case, (i.e. a total of 100%).

It is clear through students' responses 58 of students agreed and 46 of them strongly agreed, their total responses 104(87.4) they admitted that students' shyness is main obstacle, because large majority of them can't participate or talk with his class-mates face to face.

To conclude, part two that reviewed student's questionnaire analysis there was correspondence and agreement between the student's questionnaire analysis, study questions and the hypotheses of the study that was according to high frequency of students' responses for realizing the study's aims.

## **4.9 Discussion**

The research discussed an Investigation into Pair work and Group work in Teaching English as Foreign and their Possible Suitability for Sudanese Secondary Level. As it is evident from the data analysis, pair work and group work techniques are neglected and tends to get increased attention since the majority of the students' responses according to students' questionnaires admit that their teachers do not spend a certain amount of time for teaching pair work and group work in classrooms, and the teachers themselves also show agreement to this. It is understandable because language teaching and learning in Sudan has been based on the Communicative Language Teaching, which puts great emphasis on enhancing learners' communicative competence and which can be successfully carried out when learners work in pairs or groups.

The findings reveal the negative responses of more than half of the students to the effect of pair work and group work on their speaking ability as well as the discrepancies between teachers' and students' answers on two matters: the frequency of the operation of (a) pair work and group work in their classrooms, and (b) role play. This means that the feasibility and effectiveness of the implementation of pair work and group work in teaching speaking skill may have to be questioned.

However, a large number of students show their positive attitudes towards pair work and group work. This view is shared by over 90% of the teachers. The reasons for students' liking for these patterns of classroom organization are various. First, according to students, when they work in pairs or groups, they can share their ideas with each other. Second, pair work and group work enable students to have more chances to interact with their partners in pairs or other members in groups. Third,

every single student's talking time will be increased. Last, pair and group work make students feel comfortable and relaxed because of the supportive climate formed by the intimacy among their peers.

Moreover, from the findings, it is rather surprising to note that about a quarter of the students do not find much interest in working in pairs or groups. What causes this attitude towards pair work and group can be put down to the problems mentioned earlier as well as a number of obstacles which are going to be elaborated on as follows. To begin with, it is inarguably that the seating arrangements in most Sudanese classrooms are inappropriate for the implementation of pair work and group work since a large number of desks and benches are unmovable, except for the case of multimedia classrooms which are often equipped with unfixed desks and benches. Nevertheless, those modern classrooms in reality seem to be limited in number compared with the number of classes in each secondary school. Needless to say, this obstacle causes difficulties for the teachers when setting up pairs and groups, especially with large classes. More specifically, if the teachers want each group to form a circle when doing tasks, with the existing classroom arrangement like this, it is quite hard to operate group work. Or when the teachers ask them to change partners, all the students will have to leave their seats and move to another place in order to pair with a new one.

Besides, it is worth mentioning that from the students' and the teachers' perspectives, pair and group work are quite beneficial. According to students, when working in pairs or groups, they gain more chances of exchanging ideas and experience with their friends and contributing to each other's learning. Also, the time allotted for their practicing speaking English will be raised since simultaneously they are able to talk with several people. However, in case students who are shy or

quiet or not confident enough by nature do not come of their own shells and do not dare to speak up their minds, it is hard for them to stand a chance of getting a word in edgeways during pair and group work. The students add that these two kinds of classroom management give more flavors to their class in a way that the classroom ambience becomes more relaxing and dynamic as well as conducive to learning. In addition, partners in pairs and members in groups, when working together, certainly will provide assistance to each other; hence the tasks assigned by the teachers will probably be accomplished faster and more easily. During the ongoing process of carrying out pair work and group work, students will get more experience about cooperating in a fluid way towards shared goals and dividing labor equally among members in order to be sure that there is no “hitchhiking” or “freeloading” for anyone in pairs or groups. The students’ aforesaid opinions about the benefits of pair and group work are in agreement with those of the teachers. According to the teacher, pair work and group work also offer such merits as helping students to improve fluency and to feel more confident when talking in English. These opinions of the students and teachers about the merits of pair work and group work match with the literature review.

Furthermore, the analysis of the data reveals that pair and group work may bring about some undesirable problems which can be categorized into four:

- The first problem that most teachers find annoying is the occurrence of noise in their speaking classes when the students do pair and group work.
- The second problem some teachers feel extremely stressful about this, so they expect the classrooms to be quiet and orderly and

insist on a well-organized and well-disciplined class. The problem of noise naturally gives rise to another one that is the teachers' little control over the whole class. Most of them feel the tension of having their students carry out communicative activities and maintaining the control over pairs or groups.

- The third problem teacher's less help and attention to each individual student is the next problem worth mentioning. When the whole class is divided in pairs or groups, the teachers cannot monitor and give help and advice to all of these pairs or groups.
- The fourth problem arises when students are not capable of splitting the responsibilities among partners in pairs and members in groups.

Moreover, from the findings, it is rather disappointing to note that still about a quarter of the students do not find much interest in working in pairs or groups. What cause this attitude towards pair work and group can be put down to the problems mentioned earlier as well as a number of obstacles which are going to be elaborated on as follows. To begin with, it is inarguably that the seating arrangements in most Sudanese classrooms are inappropriate for the implementation of pair work and group work since a large number of desks and benches are unmovable, except for the case of multimedia classrooms which are often equipped with unfixed desks and benches. Nevertheless, those modern classrooms in reality seem to be limited in number compared with the number of classes in each secondary school. Needless to say, this obstacle causes difficulties for the teachers when setting up pairs and groups, especially with large classes. More specifically, if the teachers want each group to form a circle when doing tasks, with the existing classroom arrangement

like this, it is quite hard to operate group work. Or when the teachers ask them to change partners, all the students will have to leave their seats and move to another place in order to pair with a new one. Sadly enough, it not only is time-consuming but also creates lots of noise and chaos in the class. In addition, teaching speaking is allotted just one period in the syllabus and pair and group work only cover a part of that period. Another impediment is the students' widespread use of Arabic during pair work and group work. Since they share the same mother tongue, they do not feel the need to communicate in English, which fails to help them convey fully their thoughts and opinions. It is obvious that pair work and group work are meant to maximize the amount of student talking time in talking language, but if the students keep on interacting with each other in mother tongue, the above rationale of pair and group work appears to be useless.

In short, it is satisfying and encouraging to conclude that pair and group work have to be implemented in most secondary schools in Sudan, are possible and suitable for Sudanese secondary level. It is undeniable that although there are a number of benefits to be gained from pair work and group work, there are some pitfalls too as have been discussed above.

### Summary of the chapter

This chapter has summarized the results of the whole process of doing research: the explicit answers to the four research questions in which the merits, the obstacles and the problems of the implementation of pair work and group work in teaching English in secondary schools classrooms are addressed. It is noticed that the hypotheses have confirmed full description that the chapter concentrates on for realizing

the study's aims. The hypotheses will be detailed widely in next chapter five.

The next chapter will provide a summary of the study and conclusions in addition to recommendations and suggestions for further studies.



## Chapter Five

### **Summary Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Studies**

This chapter provides the summary of the whole study, conclusions, results and findings of the study. According to the research' findings there will be some recommendations. Finally some suggestion will be given for further studies.

#### **5.1 Summary**

The purpose of this study is to investigate pair work and group work in teaching English as foreign language and their possible suitability for Sudanese secondary level. It is a case study of some Sudanese schools in Nyala locality (Sudan). It aims to explore the impact of pair work and group work technique in developing students' standard in speaking skills. It is regarded as one of the possible solutions of the problem of how to get all students to speak in the classroom. The technique of pair work and group work motivates students' interaction when they communicate with each other in classroom that is realized when there is high frequency of students' responses.

The study has discussed the general characteristics of pair work and group work in teaching English in addition to teacher's role, student's role, problems and obstacles that face them in applying pair work and group work during teaching and learning in classroom. All the characteristics of pair work and group work advantages and disadvantages have been reviewed.

One hundred and twenty questionnaires were distributed to students of secondary schools in Nyala locality in order to know their

attitudes and perceptions about pair work and group work in secondary classrooms in addition to sixty ELT teachers' questionnaires which were sent out to assess to what extent English teachers apply pair work and group work when they teach English language in classroom.

Questionnaires data analysis included the analysis of open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were analyzed with the help of the statistical analysis software program SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Frequency calculations were used to produce descriptive central tendency statistics that were used to present an overall picture of the teachers and students' perceptions of pair work and group work, and the difficulties and problems that teachers faced in their attempts to implement pair work and group work in English classrooms.

The validity of the research tools (questionnaires for both of teachers and students). The questionnaires were reviewed by a group of expert ELT teachers in Nyala locality.

Students' questionnaire was administered in some of secondary schools in Nyala locality and the ELT teachers' questionnaire was conducted to ELT teachers in same area.

Four questions and four corresponding hypotheses have been raised in the study.

***The first hypothesis*** explored that pair work and group work activities are not sufficiently applied in teaching English as foreign language in secondary level was favored by a large majority of respondents as shown by results of teachers' questionnaire.

***The second hypothesis*** examined teachers and students different attitudes towards pair work and group work application in teaching

English in secondary level, it was strongly supported by ELT teachers and students as seen from their responses to the questionnaire' questions.

*The third hypothesis* claimed that SPINE series does not include sufficient practices on pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms; it was supported by a large majority of respondents according to their responses to ELT teachers' questionnaire in a clear point that SPINE series is poor in practicing pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms.

*The fourth hypothesis* asked about class size and students seating do not help in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms; was strongly supported in the light of respondents' responses to ELT teachers' questionnaire questions results.

The study adopted the Descriptive Method and the data obtained were analyzed by using SSPS program and critically discussed.

## **5.2 Conclusions**

In order to examine the possible suitability of the implementation of pair work and group work in teaching English in secondary schools, the researcher has addressed four main questions as have been indicated in the study. Therefore, after in-depth analysis and discussion of the findings, the following conclusion can be drawn:

- Pair work and group work have been implemented in teaching English in secondary schools classrooms in Nyala locality and have gained a great deal of favor among both teachers and students.
- The use of pair work and group work has proved to have a great deal of advantages. It is clearly seen that pair work and group work can create a relaxing learning environment in which students feel

more confident to speak English and have more chances for practicing and exchanging ideas with each other. As a result, students' speaking ability and fluency are much improved. They also help students learn more about how to share their responsibilities while working in pairs or groups in order to solve tasks better and faster. However, the researcher finds it very necessary to take quite a lot of problems into thorough consideration. The most common problem is the students' use of mother tongue. Additionally, as student talking time increases, noise and teacher's less help and attention given to individuals are inevitable problems. Besides, conflicts and inequality of splitting the responsibilities among members in groups or between partners in pairs also need to be dealt with.

- Since SPINE series textbook has been used for many years, teachers and students have to be quite familiar with the implementation of pair work and group work in teaching speaking. However, it cannot be concluded that the implementation of pair work and group work are feasible and effective since language educators still have to face a number of obstacles. Firstly, the secondary students are still shy when talking with each other in English and are also inexperienced in cooperating and sharing responsibilities with other people. Furthermore, the amount of time suggested in the syllabus as well as the seating arrangements of Sudanese secondary schools classrooms are not suitable for encouraging the full potential of pair work and group work.
- The study has implied a number of suggestions about how to make the implementation of pair and group work into teaching speaking a success. Firstly, it is true that pair work and group work put

heavier demand on teachers than usual. It is pointed out by most of the participants that teachers need to spend a great deal of time not only preparing materials, tasks, exercises and games for pairs or groups at home but also going around the class more often when students are working to check their work, give help if they need it and prevent their using Arabic. Secondly, on mentioning how to prevent students' use of their mother tongue, it is also advisable for teachers to provide their students with vocabulary or grammatical structures that may help them to solve the tasks. When students have enough background knowledge, they do not have the need to use mother tongue. Thirdly, the tasks assigned to pairs or groups need to be interesting enough and not too difficult nor unfamiliar with students so that they can be occupied in working with their friends to finish them. Fourthly, teachers should not give pairs or groups more time than they need to do their tasks as they may gossip in mother tongue if they finish their work early. Fifthly, another consideration is to form pairs or groups of students that have different standards in English so that they can help and learn from each other. In such an organization, the better students can give assistance to their less capable peers. During this process, not only the weaker students will benefit from the help they get but it is also a chance for the stronger ones to understand more about the language they are mastering.

After conducting this study, the researcher highly recommend that English language teachers should use pair work and group work to develop students' oral skills. It helps students to use the language in meaningful contexts in addition to soul of completion among them. Teachers also have to remember the

importance of giving clear input for their students before asking them to work in pairs or in groups. The researcher enjoyed conducting this research and it helped him to discover the advantages, as well as the disadvantages, of using pair work and group work in teaching English as a foreign language and their possible suitability in Sudanese secondary schools.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations have been formulated:

- Teachers should make the classroom environment suitable so that different activities like pair work and group work, role play, information transfer etc. can be properly executed.
- If the classes' sizes are unusually large, they should be divided into small groups for the convenience of successful monitoring and corrective feedback of communicative activities.
- It is necessary for the teachers to be tolerant and encouraging tone while dealing with learners that their English phobia can be removed and confidence can be enhanced.
- Teachers should motivate learners both intrinsically and extrinsically for practicing pair work and group work activities inside the class and out of class.
- Teachers should do their best to provide time for pair work and group work activities in the classrooms to facilitate listening and speaking skills.

- Teachers should be properly trained so that they can be aware of their proper role in class and acquainted with the real process of teaching pair work and group work techniques.
- There should be sufficient arrangement of different kinds of seminars and training sessions to promote teachers' presentation in teaching communicative language teaching in the classrooms.
- More materials should be developed and introduced in such a way that they will focus on meaningful and real life communication.
- While redesigning teaching materials in future, it is preferable to include more interesting topics for motivating students to bring out better performance from learners.
- Topics that require pair work and group work activities should be more interesting that to attract learners to become extrinsically motivated to practice them extensively.
- SPINE series should be redesigned to come around the revolution of communicative language teaching to promote secondary schools students' standards in learning English language.

#### 5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies

As the present study was carried out, it became evident that there were many relevant questions that remained unanswered, which could potentially serve as research questions for related studies. Some of these questions are listed below as recommendations for further research:

- What are students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classrooms? The answer to this

question can offer important information for teachers and pedagogues, and help them better understand the needs and interests of learners so that they can make informed decisions in implementing a communicative approach in their classrooms.

- How can EFL teachers balance grammar instruction and communicative competence in their language classrooms? The answer to this question is crucial to provide more direct assistance to classroom English teachers since Sudanese EFL teachers feel and believe that grammar instruction is necessary for Sudanese teachers. Yet, they are not well informed as to how to balance grammar teaching with that of communicative abilities.
- What are teachers' and students' perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) at the tertiary level? This can bring further information into the field of CLT in EFL settings. In addition, it can suggest interesting sources of comparison between EFL teaching at the tertiary level and EFL teaching at the secondary and basic levels.
- The impact of pair work and group work on Sudanese Basic Level Schools for developing students' standards in speaking skills? This can lead to promote the learners' standards in speaking skills and enhance the communication skills among the students in the classrooms.
- It is recommended that Sudanese English Foreign Language (EFL) teachers should engage their students in more communicative activities to improve students' speaking skills. They should know which methods or activities are more suitable for the students in each situation.



- Education authorities should improve the quality of teaching facilities and materials. They should build more rooms with modern equipment in teaching communication skills.
- The students should be motivated well to study and overcome shyness and fear in learning English in classrooms.

The future studies should find and study deeper activities both inside and outside the classroom in order to improve the students' English.

## References

**Al-Farsi S. Ali (2010)**A Comparison of Pair Work and Group Work in a Grade 2 Classroom. Dhahira Region,Pakistan.

**Albadawi A. Khalifa (2004)**Using Pair and Group Interaction to Foster Students' Interpersonal Skills. Arab Gulf Press, Sharjah, Emirates.

**Alexander, R., Rose, J. &Woodhead, C. (1992)**Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools: A Discussion Paper. London: DES.

**Ali M. Mutasim (2009)**Evaluation of Oral Communicative Activities in SPINE series in Secondary Schools. Unpublished M.A Sudan University of Science and Technology-College of Graduate, Department of English. Khartoum, Sudan.

**Arends, R. (2000).** Learning to teach 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill, press.

**Awad Imam-elddin (2000)**Pair/Group Interaction in Oral Skills Courses for ESL University Students. Unpublished M.Ed Khartoum University-Khartoum, Sudan.

**Bartram, M. and Walton, R. (1991).** Correction. Mistake Management. London. Language Teaching Publications.

**Bennett, N. & Dunne, E. (1992)**Managing Classroom Groups.Hemel Hempstead: Simon & Schuster Education.

**Brains, Willnat, Manheim, Rich (2011).** Empirical Political Analysis 8th Edition. University of Boston, MA: Longman.

**Brown, H. (2007).** Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Pearson ESL.

**Brown.D. (1994)**Principle of Language Learning and Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

**Brown.D.(2001)**.Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, INC.

**Brumfit, Christopher (1984)**Communicative Methodology in Language teaching, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Burns, A. (1999)**. Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Burns, R. B. (2000)**. Introduction to Research Methods. London: Sage Publications.

**Chaudron, C. (1993)**.Second Language Classrooms.Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994)**.Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Creemers, B.P.M. (1994)**. The Effective Classroom. London: Cassell press.

**Damon, W. & Phelps, E. (1989)** 'Critical Distinctions Among Three Approaches to Peer Education'. International Journal of Educational Research.London.

**Davis, B. (1993)**. Tools for Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Defeng, L. (1998)**. "It is always more difficult than you plan and imagine": Teacher's perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea.TESOL Quarterly.

**Doff, A. (1988).**Teach English. A training course for teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Doff, A. (1990).**Teach English.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**Donato, Richard. (1994).**Collective Scaffolding in Second Language Learning. In J. P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), Vygotskian approaches to second language research. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

**Dörnyei, Z. (1990).**Csoportdinamikaésnyelvoktatás.PedagógiaiSzemle,

**Dörnyei, Z. (1997).**Psychological Processes in Co-operative Language Learning: Group Dynamics and Motivation. Unpublished Manuscript.

**Ellis, R. (1994).**The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Firth, Alan; Wagner, Johannes. (1997).** On Discourse, Communication, and (some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. Modern Language Journal, UKP.

**Firth, Alan; Wagner, Johannes. (2007).**On Discourse, Communication, and (some) Fundamental Concepts in Second Language Acquisition Research. Modern Language Journal.UKP.

**Foxcroft, C., Paterson, H., le Roux, N., & Herbst, D (2004).**Human Sciences Research Council. 'Psychological Assessment in South Africa: A Needs Analysis: The test use patterns and needs of psychological assessment practitioners: Final Report: July. Retrieved from website: [http://www.hsrc.ac.za/research/output/outputDocuments/1716\\_Foxcroft\\_Psychologicalassessmentin%20SA.pdf](http://www.hsrc.ac.za/research/output/outputDocuments/1716_Foxcroft_Psychologicalassessmentin%20SA.pdf)

**Galton, M. & Williamson, J. (1992).**Groupwork in the Primary School. London: Routledge

**Gardner, R. C. (2006).**The Socio-educational Model of Second Language Acquisition.Eurosla Yearbook, London.

**Gass, S. M., and Varonis, E. M. (1994).**Input, Interaction, and Second Language Production. Studies in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Gass, Susan; Varonis, Evangeline. (1986).**Sex Differences in NNS/NNS Interactions.In R. Day (Ed.), Talking to learn: Conversations in SLA.University of Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

**Golafshani, Nahid (2003)**Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. The Qualitative Repot Volume 8 Number 4<http://www.nov>

**Gower. R. (1987).**Speaking. Oxford: Oxford University Press

**Harmer, J. (1991).**The Practice of English Language. London: Longman.

**Harmer, J. (1995).**Taming the big 'T': Teacher Performance and Student Satisfaction. ELT Journal. London: Longman.

**Harmer, J. (2001).**The Practice of English Language Teaching. Harlow: Longman.

**Hawkins, B. (1985).**Is an "Appropriate Response" Always so Appropriate? In S. Gass& C. Madden (Eds.), Input and Second Language Acquisition Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

**Hedge, T. (2000).**Teaching and learning in the language classroom, Oxford University Press.

**Ibnauf Nahal M (2008)**Communicative Language Teaching as an Aid to Second Language Learning in Gebra District. Unpublished M.A Sudan

University of Science and Technology-College of Graduate, Department of English. Khartoum, Sudan.

**Ibnian Khalaf .S (2012)**Group Work and Attitudes of Non-English Major Students Towards Learning EFL The World Islamic Sciences and Education University (W.I.S.E.) Language Center, Amman, Jordan.

**Ibrahim A. M (2011)**Teaching speaking skills to Secondary School Students. A Case study of Secondary School Students in Wadi Alhayat-Libya. Unpublished M.A Sudan University of Science and Technology-College of Graduate Studies. Khartoum, Sudan.

**Johnson, K. E. (1995).** Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms (J. C. Richards, Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

**Kramer, Geoffrey P., Douglas A. Bernstein, and Vicky Phares (2009).**Introduction to Clinical Psychology. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, Print.

Krashen, S. (1985). The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications. New York: Longman.

**Krathwohl, D. R. (1998).** Methods of Educational & Social Science Research: An integrated approach. Reading, Massachusetts: Longman.

**Kundu, C. L, &Tutto, D.N. (1989).** Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers. Kutnick& C. Rogers (eds) Groups in Schools. London: Cassell.

**Leedy, P. D. (1993).** Practical Research: planning and design. 5th edition. New York:Macmillan.

**Leftwich, A. T. O. (2007).**Expert technology-using teachers: Visions, strategies, and development (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

**Light, P. & Perret-Clermont, A-N. (1990).** Social Context Effects in Learning and Lightbown Pasty M, Nina Spada 1993. How Languages are learned, Oxford University press.

**Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (1999).** How Languages Are Learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Long M.H& Porter, P.A (1985).**Group work Interlanguage Talk and Second Language Acquisition. TESOL Quarterly.

**Long, M. (1983).**Native-Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation and the Negotiation of Comprehensible Input. Applied Linguistics.

**Long, M. (1985).**Input and Second Language Acquisition Theory. In S. Gass& C. Madden (Eds.), Input and Second Language Acquisition. University of Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

**Long, M. (1996).**The Role of the linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

**MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1997).**Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence and Affiliation. Unpublished Manuscript.

**Mackey, A. (2002).** Beyond Production: Learners' Perceptions about the Interactional Processes. International Journal of Educational Research.London.

**Mackey, Alison. (1999).**Input, Interaction, and Second Language Development: An Empirical Study of Question Formation in ESL. Studies in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford Press

**Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999).**Designing qualitative research (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

**McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. (1993).**Materials and Methods in ELT. Oxford: Blackwell.

**McGroarty, M. (1989),**"The Benefits of Cooperative Learning Arrangements in Second Language Instruction", NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education.London.

**Mills, G. (2003).** Action Research: A Guide for the Teacher Researcher. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

**Muijs, D. & Reynolds, D. (2001).**Effective Teaching : Evidence and Practice. London :

**Najma R. (2012)**The Effectiveness of Group Work and Pair Work for Students of English at Undergraduate Level in Public and Private Sector Colleges. Hamdard Institute of Education and Social Sciences Hamdard University Karachi, Pakistan.

**Norman David, UleLevinh, Jan Anders Hedenquist. (1986).**Communicative ideas, Language Teaching Publication.

**Nunan, D. (1991).** Language teaching methodology. London: Prentice Hall International.

**Nunan,D& Lamb, C.(1996).**The Self-directed Teacher: Managing the Learning Process. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



**Ofsted.K. (1995).**The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools. London.

**Ohta, Amy. (2001).**Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

**Olsen, R. & Kagan, S. (1992).**About Cooperative Learning: Englewood Cliffs,NJ: Prentice Hall.

**Phipps, W. (1999).**Interactions in the Modern Language Classroom. London: CILT.

**Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985).** Input and Interaction in the Communicative Language Classroom: A Comparison of Teacher-fronted and Group Activities. In S. Gass& C. Madden (Eds.), Input and Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

**Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., &Linnel, J. (1996).** Language Learners' Interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? TESOL Quarterly.

**Pica, Theresa; Holliday, Lloyd; Lewis, Nora; Berducci, Dom; Newman, Jeanne. (1991).**Language Learning Through Interaction: What role does gender play? Studies in Second Language Acquisition.

**Richards, J. (1998).**Beyond Training: Perspectives on Language Teacher Education.Cambridge Press.

**Richards, J. (2003).** Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

**Richards, J.C, &Renandya, W.A. (Eds). (2002)**Methodologies in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Rimmer, W. (1999).**Review of 'Pair Work 2'. Modern English Teacher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Rivers,W(1987).**Interactive Language Teaching. London. Cambridge University Press.

**Russell, T. (1997).**Action Research: Who? Why? How? So what? Retrieved April 12, 2003, from <http://educ.queensu.ca/russellt/howteach/arguide.htm>

**Salmon, J (1988).**Phycology for Teachers. London: Hutchinson, Print.

**Sammons, P. Hillman, J. &Mortimore, P. (1995).**Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: A Review of School Effectiveness Research. Report Commissioned for the Office for Standards in Education. London: Institute of Education &OFSTED.

**Savignon, S. J. (1987).** Communicative Language Teaching. Theory into Practice. State of the Art. TESOL Quarterly.

**Schmidt, Richard(2001).**Attention .In P. Robinson (Ed),Cognition and Second Language Instruction.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Schmidt, Richard. (1993).**Awareness and Second Language Acquisition. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Scivener,J. (1998)**Learning Teaching. Mackmillan Publishers Limited.

**Seliger, H. W. and Shohamy, E. (1989).**Second language research methods. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Storch, N. (2001).**How Collaborative is Pair work? ESL Tertiary Students Composing Studies in Social Language Acquisition. . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Storch, Neomy (2002).**Patterns of Interaction in ESL Pair Work. Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Swain, Merrill. (2000).**The Output Hypothesis and Beyond: Mediating Acquisition Through Collaborative Dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Swain,M.(1985).**Commutative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Output in its Development: Rowley.MA:Newbury House.

**Torgerson, W. S. (1958).**Theory and methods of scaling. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

**Ur, Penny. (1996).**A course in language teaching, Cambridge University Press.

**Varonis, E., &Gass, S. (1985).**Non-native/Non-Native Conversations: A Model for Negotiation of Meaning. Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Vuong Thi Thao (2009)**Pair Work and Group Work Activities: It's Effect on the Speaking Skills of the First Year Students at the College of the Mechanics Metallurgy at Thai Nguyen City, Viet Nam.

**Vygotsky, L. (1978)**Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Mental Processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

**Watanabe, Yoshinori. (2004).**Collaborative dialogue between ESL learners of different proficiency levels: Linguistic and affective outcomes. Unpublished Master thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, The University of Toronto, Canada.

**Weaver. R.L, & Hybles .S. (2004)**Communicating Effectively. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

## ELT - Teachers' Questionnaire

**Part Two:** Please indicate the answer that shows the degree of your agreement/disagreement by (✓) one of the options as shown below.

Strongly agree

Agree

Not sure

Disagree

Strongly disagree

**Classroom activities:**

**Q1.** To what extent are pair and group works activities applied in teaching English as foreign language in Nyala secondary schools classrooms?

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Teachers' interest in applying pair work and group work activities in the classrooms.					
2. Teachers provide time for pair work and group work practice in classroom.					
3. Pair work and group activities provide opportunity for developing speaking skill.					
4. Classroom activities focus more on accuracy than fluency.					

**Q2.** Factors that lead to success of pair work and group work application in the classroom.

Factors	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
5. Interesting tasks.					
6. Suitable seating arrangement.					

### Class Tasks

**Q3.** What are the attitudes of teachers towards the application of pair work and group work in teaching English in Nyala secondary schools classrooms?

Tasks	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
7. Application of pair work and group work is regarded a positive mean in learning English language in the classroom.					
8. Gives students more chances to exchange ideas with each other.					
9. Encourages students to talk in English.					
10. Creates a relaxing learning environment.					

**Q4.** There are obstacles facing the teachers in implementing pair work and group work in the classroom.

Obstacles	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
11. Students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups.					
12. Students' lack of fluency and accuracy when using English.					
13. Students' shyness when talking in English.					
14. Implementation of prescribed textbook requires training and knowledge in application pair work and group work in the classroom.					
15. Some teachers have not been trained to apply pair work and group work in the classroom.					



**Q5.**There are benefits of having students work in pairs or groups in the classroom.

Benefits	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
16. It helps students solve tasks better and faster.					
17. It helps improve students' fluency.					
18. It enhances students' effective use of English when talking to each other.					
19. Students learn more about how to share the responsibilities when working in pairs/groups.					
20. It helps students feel more confident when speaking English.					

**Q6.**There are problems that face the teachers in applying pair work and group work in the classroom.

Problems	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
21. Noise					
22. Teacher's little control of the whole class.					
23. Classes over crowdedness.					

### Textbook (SPINES Series)

**Q7.** To what extent does SPINE series include sufficient practices of pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
24. SPINE series texts help in practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms.					
25. SPINES series includes sufficient exercises for practicing pair work and group work in the classrooms.					
26. Texts materials motivate students to learn English through pair work and group work application in the classroom.					
27. SPINE series has enough tasks to promote students' standards in applying pair work and group work.					

### **Class size and students seating**

**Q8.** To what extent do classes' size and students seating effect in teaching pair work and group work in secondary schools classrooms?

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly agree
28. Schools classes' capacity.					
29. Classes' size is suitable for applying pair work and group work.					
30. Students number in the classroom hinders pair work and group work application.					

THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

THANKS

## **Appendix (2)**

### **Students' Questionnaire**

**Dear Student,**

This questionnaire aims to investigate Pair Work and Group Work in Teaching English as Foreign Language and their Possible Suitability for Sudanese Secondary Schools Level. It is meant to assess Secondary level students' views about the study. Your co-operation in responding accurately to questions is greatly appreciated. The information provided in the questionnaire will be used for research purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation

**Omar El.Farug Adam Adoma**

**Ph.D. Candidate**

**Sudan University of Science and Technology**

**Put a tick ( v) in the appropriate square.**

**Gender:**      Male                      Female

Please indicate the answer that shows the degree of your agreement/disagreement by (v) one of the options as shown below.

Strongly agree / Agree / Not sure / Disagree / strongly disagree

#### **Classroom Activities**

**Q1.** What are the attitudes of students towards the application of pair work and group work in learning English in secondary level in Nyala?

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. There is some of time during teaching English periods for pair work and group work in the classroom.					
2. English teachers apply pair work and group work in the classroom.					
3. Pair work and group work have improved my speaking ability in the classroom.					

**Q2.** In your opinion, reasons that lead the students to insist on using Arabic, instead of English as requested, to communicate while working in pairs or groups in the classroom?

Reasons	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
4. Lack of vocabulary.					
5. Habit of using Arabic.					
6. Lack of confidence.					

## Class Tasks

**Q3.** The following tasks are often assigned to pairs and groups in classroom.

Tasks	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
7. Role play					
8. Discussion					
9. Dialogue					
10. Interview					

**Q4.** In your opinion, the benefits of having students work in pairs or groups.

Benefits	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
11. Students have more time for practicing speaking.					
12. Classroom atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing.					
13. Students can learn how to cooperate and to share tasks equally.					

**Q5.**Problems that pair work and group work can cause in the classroom

Problems	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
14. Noise					
15. Teacher's little control of the whole class.					
16. Students' inequality of sharing the responsibilities.					

**Q6.** There are some obstacles that prevent Pair work and group work implementation in the classroom.

Obstacles	Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly agree
17. The unsuitable seating arrangement.					
18. Students' unfamiliarity with working in pairs/groups.					
19. Students' weakness in English.					
20. Students' shyness when talking in English.					

THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

THANKS

## Appendix (3)

### Reliability

#### Before Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.665	20

#### Before Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
There is some of time during teaching English for Pair and group work	2.67	1.139	111
English teachers apply Pair and group work	3.49	1.220	111
Pair work and group work improved my speaking ability	1.83	.980	111
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary	1.75	.847	111
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to habit	2.35	1.133	111
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of confidence	2.08	.886	111
Role to play is assigned as task	1.86	.840	111
Discussion is assigned as task	2.01	1.004	111
Dialogue is assigned as task	1.83	.862	111
Interviews is assigned as task	2.28	1.089	111
students have more time to practicing speaking in group	2.38	1.129	111
class room atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing	2.20	1.174	111
students can learn how to cooperate and share task	1.92	.833	111
Pair and group work can cause noise in the classroom	2.05	1.205	111
Pair and group work cause in little control by the teachers	2.05	1.052	111
Pair and groups work cause inequality of sharing responsibilities	2.13	1.096	111
The unsuitable seating is obstacles for pair and group work	1.83	.851	111
Students unfamiliarity with working in pair and groups	1.91	1.180	111
students weakness in English is obstacles to pair and group work	1.80	1.052	111
students shyness is obstacles	1.89	1.073	111



### Before Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
There is some of time during teaching English for Pair and group work	39.63	54.362	.184	.660
English teachers apply Pair and group work	38.81	55.228	.113	.670
Pair work and group work improved my speaking ability	40.47	53.851	.274	.650
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary	40.55	55.759	.180	.659
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to habit	39.95	53.215	.257	.651
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of confidence	40.22	57.916	.004	.675
Role to play is assigned as task	40.44	53.522	.368	.642
Discussion is assigned as task	40.29	53.134	.315	.645
Dialogue is assigned as task	40.47	56.124	.146	.662
Interviews is assigned as task	40.02	50.727	.441	.630
students have more time to practicing speaking in group	39.92	53.039	.270	.650
class room atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing	40.10	54.908	.142	.666
students can learn how to cooperate and share task	40.38	56.710	.108	.665
Pair and group work can cause noise in the classroom	40.24	53.695	.204	.658
Pair and group work cause in little control by the teachers	40.24	53.077	.298	.647
Pair and groups work cause inequality of sharing responsibilities	40.17	53.016	.284	.648
The unsuitable seating is obstacles for pair and group work	40.47	56.851	.092	.667
Students unfamiliarity with working in pair and groups	40.39	50.858	.387	.635
students weakness in English is obstacles to pair and group work	40.50	49.816	.528	.620
students shyness is obstacles	40.41	53.461	.264	.651

### Before Items

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
There is some of time during teaching English for Pair and group work	Count	18	37	38	14	13	120
	% Percent	15.0%	30.8%	31.7%	11.7%	10.8%	100.0%
English teachers apply Pair and group work	Count	9	21	15	51	24	120
	% Percent	7.5%	17.5%	12.5%	42.5%	20.0%	100.0%
Pair work and group work improved my speaking ability	Count	49	58	3	4	5	119
	% Percent	41.2%	48.7%	2.5%	3.4%	4.2%	100.0%
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary	Count	49	63	2	2	4	120
	% Percent	40.8%	52.5%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	100.0%
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to habit	Count	21	69	5	15	9	119
	% Percent	17.6%	58.0%	4.2%	12.6%	7.6%	100.0%
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of confidence	Count	29	63	15	10	2	119
	% Percent	24.4%	52.9%	12.6%	8.4%	1.7%	100.0%
Role to play is assigned as task	Count	39	63	9	3	4	118
	% Percent	33.1%	53.4%	7.6%	2.5%	3.4%	100.0%
Discussion is assigned as task	Count	33	70	5	3	7	118
	% Percent	28.0%	59.3%	4.2%	2.5%	5.9%	100.0%
Dialogue is assigned as task	Count	41	63	7	3	3	117
	% Percent	35.0%	53.8%	6.0%	2.6%	2.6%	100.0%
Interviews is assigned as task	Count	26	59	17	10	7	119
	% Percent	21.8%	49.6%	14.3%	8.4%	5.9%	100.0%
students have more time to practicing speaking in group	Count	23	53	18	13	9	116
	% Percent	19.8%	45.7%	15.5%	11.2%	7.8%	100.0%
class room atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing	Count	41	38	20	12	7	118
	% Percent	34.7%	32.2%	16.9%	10.2%	5.9%	100.0%
students can learn how to cooperate and share task	Count	37	68	7	5	2	119
	% Percent	31.1%	57.1%	5.9%	4.2%	1.7%	100.0%
Pair and group work can cause noise in the classroom	Count	45	52	4	9	9	119
	% Percent	37.8%	43.7%	3.4%	7.6%	7.6%	100.0%
Pair and group work cause in little control by the teachers	Count	37	57	8	14	3	119
	% Percent	31.1%	47.9%	6.7%	11.8%	2.5%	100.0%
Pair and groups work cause inequality of sharing responsibilities	Count	35	61	9	8	7	120
	% Percent	29.2%	50.8%	7.5%	6.7%	5.8%	100.0%
The unsuitable seating is obstacles for pair and group work	Count	41	69	2	4	3	119
	% Percent	34.5%	58.0%	1.7%	3.4%	2.5%	100.0%
Students unfamiliarity with working in pair and groups	Count	58	33	10	12	6	119
	% Percent	48.7%	27.7%	8.4%	10.1%	5.0%	100.0%
students weakness in English is obstacles to pair and group work	Count	55	50	4	4	7	120
	% Percent	45.8%	41.7%	3.3%	3.3%	5.8%	100.0%
students shyness is obstacles	Count	46	58	3	4	8	119
	% Percent	38.7%	48.7%	2.5%	3.4%	6.7%	100.0%

### After Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.979	20

### After Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
There is some of time during teaching English for Pair and group work	2.14	.822	116
English teachers apply Pair and group work	3.66	.997	116
Pair work and group work improved my speaking ability	2.08	.440	116
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary	2.03	.894	116
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to habit	2.04	.936	116
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of confidence	2.17	.826	116
Role to play is assigned as task	2.01	.763	116
Discussion is assigned as task	1.95	.683	116
Dialogue is assigned as task	2.11	.832	116
Interviews is assigned as task	1.82	.753	116
students have more time to practicing speaking in group	1.83	.564	116
class room atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing	1.92	.592	116
students can learn how to cooperate and share task	1.89	.707	116
Pair and group work can cause noise in the classroom	1.78	.413	116
Pair and group work cause in little control by the teachers	2.00	.722	116
Pair and groups work cause inequality of sharing responsibilities	2.06	.935	116
The unsuitable seating is obstacles for pair and group work	1.78	.419	116
Students unfamiliarity with working in pair and groups	1.80	.422	116
students weakness in English is obstacles to pair and group work	1.69	.465	116
students shyness is obstacles	1.81	.455	116

### After Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
There is some of time during teaching English for Pair and group work	38.43	126.195	.913	.977
English teachers apply Pair and group work	36.91	125.384	.778	.979
Pair work and group work improved my speaking ability	38.49	136.896	.646	.980
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary	38.53	125.016	.897	.978
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to habit	38.53	123.608	.925	.977
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of confidence	38.40	126.989	.863	.978
Role to play is assigned as task	38.56	127.292	.921	.977
Discussion is assigned as task	38.62	128.359	.963	.977
Dialogue is assigned as task	38.46	126.181	.903	.977
Interviews is assigned as task	38.75	128.276	.874	.978
students have more time to practicing speaking in group	38.74	131.793	.899	.978
class room atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing	38.65	131.013	.913	.977
students can learn how to cooperate and share task	38.68	128.393	.926	.977
Pair and group work can cause noise in the classroom	38.78	136.536	.729	.979
Pair and group work cause in little control by the teachers	38.57	127.778	.946	.977
Pair and groups work cause inequality of sharing responsibilities	38.51	123.609	.926	.977
The unsuitable seating is obstacles for pair and group work	38.79	136.444	.728	.979
Students unfamiliarity with working in pair and groups	38.77	136.024	.767	.979
students weakness in English is obstacles to pair and group work	38.88	136.211	.675	.979
students shyness is obstacles	38.76	135.419	.766	.979

### After Items

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
There is some of time during teaching English for Pair and group work	Count	20	72	12	16	0	120
	% Percent	16.7%	60.0%	10.0%	13.3%	.0%	100.0%
English teachers apply Pair and group work	Count	8	12	0	88	11	119
	% Percent	6.7%	10.1%	.0%	73.9%	9.2%	100.0%
Pair work and group work improved my speaking ability	Count	6	96	14	4	0	120
	% Percent	5.0%	80.0%	11.7%	3.3%	.0%	100.0%
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of vocabulary	Count	28	72	0	20	0	120
	% Percent	23.3%	60.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	100.0%
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to habit	Count	28	72	2	12	6	120
	% Percent	23.3%	60.0%	1.7%	10.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Using Arabic to communicate in groups work is due to lack of confidence	Count	16	79	6	17	2	120
	% Percent	13.3%	65.8%	5.0%	14.2%	1.7%	100.0%
Role to play is assigned as task	Count	20	85	4	5	4	118
	% Percent	16.9%	72.0%	3.4%	4.2%	3.4%	100.0%
Discussion is assigned as task	Count	24	80	6	10	0	120
	% Percent	20.0%	66.7%	5.0%	8.3%	.0%	100.0%
Dialogue is assigned as task	Count	16	84	8	4	8	120
	% Percent	13.3%	70.0%	6.7%	3.3%	6.7%	100.0%
Interviews is assigned as task	Count	37	71	0	12	0	120
	% Percent	30.8%	59.2%	.0%	10.0%	.0%	100.0%
students have more time to practicing speaking in group	Count	29	79	8	4	0	120
	% Percent	24.2%	65.8%	6.7%	3.3%	.0%	100.0%
class room atmosphere is more dynamic and relaxing	Count	21	87	5	7	0	120
	% Percent	17.5%	72.5%	4.2%	5.8%	.0%	100.0%
students can learn how to cooperate and share task	Count	29	79	6	4	2	120
	% Percent	24.2%	65.8%	5.0%	3.3%	1.7%	100.0%
Pair and group work can cause noise in the classroom	Count	25	95	0	0	0	120
	% Percent	20.8%	79.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Pair and group work cause in little control by the teachers	Count	21	83	3	13	0	120
	% Percent	17.5%	69.2%	2.5%	10.8%	.0%	100.0%
Pair and groups work cause inequality of sharing responsibilities	Count	23	82	0	6	7	118
	% Percent	19.5%	69.5%	.0%	5.1%	5.9%	100.0%
The unsuitable seating is obstacles for pair and group work	Count	26	91	0	2	1	120
	% Percent	21.7%	75.8%	.0%	1.7%	.8%	100.0%
Students unfamiliarity with working in pair and groups	Count	24	92	1	2	1	120
	% Percent	20.0%	76.7%	.8%	1.7%	.8%	100.0%
students weakness in English is obstacles to pair and group work	Count	36	81	2	0	0	119
	% Percent	30.3%	68.1%	1.7%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
students shyness is obstacles	Count	24	92	0	3	1	120
	% Percent	20.0%	76.7%	.0%	2.5%	.8%	100.0%

### Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Before	42.13	108	7.683	.739
	After	40.68	108	12.084	1.163

### Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Before & After	108	.250	.009

### Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Before - After	1.454	12.597	1.212	-.949	3.857	1.199	107	.233 <sup>a</sup>

a. Result: No significant difference at 0.05 level of significance.