T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

EFL INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF GROUP-WORK AND PAIR-WORK SPEAKING ACTIVITIES AT INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS IN İSTANBUL

MASTER'S THESIS

YAMEN BONDOUCK

Department of English Language Teaching

English Language Teaching Program

JULY, 2022

T.C.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

EFL INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF GROUP-WORK AND PAIR-WORK SPEAKING ACTIVITIES AT INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS IN İSTANBUL

MASTER'S THESIS

YAMEN BONDOUCK

(Y2012.021058)

Department of English Language Teaching

English Language Teaching Program

Thesis Advisor. Assist. Prof. Dr. Osman SABUNCUOĞLU

JULY, 2022

ONAY FORMU

DECLARATION

I hereby declare with respect that the study "EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Group-Work and Pair-Work Speaking Activities at International Schools in İstanbul", which I submitted as a Master thesis, is written without any assistance in violation of scientific ethics and traditions in all the processes from the project phase to the conclusion of the thesis and that the works I have benefited are from those shown in the References. (11/08/2022)

Yamen BONDOUCK

FOREWORD

EFL INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF GROUP-WORK AND PAIR-WORK SPEAKING ACTIVITIES AT INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS IN İSTANBUL

ABSTRACT

Many English language teachers find it difficult to get students speaking. Language courses usually include activities focusing on accuracy rather than activities focusing on fluency or communication. Therefore, collaborative learning through pair work and group work has been a key research topic recently. The current study aims to explore EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities at international schools in İstanbul. To achieve the objectives, mixed-methods research combining elements of qualitative and quantitative methods was undertaken with a view to collecting and analysing the data. A questionnaire and an interview were used as data collection tools. 100 EFL instructors responded to the questionnaire and 10 EFL instructors were interviewed. The data obtained through the questionnaire were quantitative and were analysed statistically by using SPSS 25 while the data obtained through the interview were analysed qualitatively by using MAXQDA. In the light of the findings, the participants exhibited positive attitudes towards using pair-work and group-work speaking activities in the classroom. They also stated that they implemented pair-work and group-work activities to develop learners' speaking skills. Besides, the findings revealed that the students preferred to adopt collaborative learning through pair-work and group-work activities due to high level of motivation, development of social skills, being active and enhancing learner autonomy. On the other hand, the study found that some English language teachers did not benefit from pair-work and group-work activities because students tended to use their first language and also teachers did not monitor student learning and manage time well. Due to the significant role of pair work and group work in a successful language course, suggestions and recommendations for a further study to develop fluency have been made.

İSTANBUL'DAKİ ULUSLARARASI OKULLARDA İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN GRUP VE İKİLİ KONUŞMA AKTİVİTELERİ HAKKINDA ALGILARI

ÖZET

Birçok İngilizce öğretmeni öğrencileri İngilizce konuşturmanın zor olduğunu düşünmektedir. Dil programları ve ders planları akıcı konuşma ve iletişim odaklı etkinliklerden ziyade dili doğru kullanma odaklı etkinliklere dayanmaktadır. Bundan dolayı, grup ve ikili konuşma aktiviteleri vasıtasıyla işbirlikçi dil öğretim yöntemi son zamanlarda önemli bir araştırma konusu olmuştur. Mevcut çalışma, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin grup ve ikili konuşma aktiviteleri hakkında algılarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu hedefleri gerçekleştirmek amacıyla nicel ve nitel bilgi toplama araçlarını içeren karma yöntemle bilgi toplama süreci gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma, 100 İngilizce öğretmeninin katılımcı olduğu anket ve 10 İngilizce öğretmeninin katılımcı olduğu mülakattan oluşmaktadır. Ankette toplanan bilgiler SPPS 25 programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir ve mülakatta toplanan bilgiler MAXODA programı vasıtasıyla nitel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen bulgular ışığında İngilizce öğretmenlerinin grup ve ikili konuşma etkinlikleri üzerine pozitif bir tutum benimsediği görülmektedir. Ayrıca, katılımcılar grup ve ikili konuşma etkinliklerini uyguladıklarını belirtmişlerdir. İngilizce öğretmenlerinin bu tür işbirlikçi öğrenme tekniklerini tercih etmelerinin sebepleri arasında motivasyon, sosyal beceriler, özgüven gelişimi, öğrencinin aktif olması ve özerk öğrenme önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Diğer yandan, katılımcıların grup ve ikili konuşma aktivitelerini tercih etmemesinin nedenleri arasında öğrencinin ana dil kullanımı, öğretmenin öğrenciyi etkinlik sırasında gözlemlemesi ve zaman yönetimi sayılabilir. Başarılı bir dil öğrenme sürecinde ikili ve grup çalışma etkinliklerinin önemli bir rol oynamasından dolayı, akıcı bir yabancı dile sahip olma üzerine öneriler ve tavsiyeler mevcuttur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İkili Çalışma, Grup Çalışması, Konuşma Etkinlikleri, Konuşma Becerisi, İngilizce Öğretmenleri, Uluslararası Okullar.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I.   INTRODUCTION

A. Introduction

Many teachers find it difficult to get learners speaking. Students cannot communicate meaning or express feelings in English. They generally like to focus on accuracy as teacher-fronted learning takes place. They cannot emphasise fluency-based activities, such as pair-work and group-work speaking activities which are classified as learner-centred. Therefore, fluency development has been a key research topic recently. Although there is much research into English language teachers' views of accuracy-based activities, EFL instructors' attitudes towards pair-work and group-work speaking activities are not available in the literature. They prefer to design a grammatical syllabus based on grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Traditional teacher-centred instruction does not take into account learner needs, so this sort of language instruction cannot serve the purposes of language learning as teachers never involve students in learning what to learn, how to learn and how to be assessed. Students have no say about the language learning process.

Learners prefer to learn English to communicate with other people, which is the main purpose of language learning. They need to express their feelings in English because language is viewed as a message-oriented or meaning-focused process. They need to listen and say something for communication to take place. To achieve this objective or aim, teachers need to emphasise communication or fluency in the language classroom. Extensive language work which is made up of pair work and group work allows learners to use or produce language. Therefore, teachers who are aware of the importance of fluency in English put students in pairs or groups and ask them to talk to each other about what they are doing. Both pair work and group work are the best patterns of interaction and engagement. However, many language courses and lesson plans fail to meet learner needs as they do not consider learner needs, goals and preferences to be significant. In other words, instructors who want to make learners the focus of learning pay attention to communication and

interaction. So what can go into a successful language course and a language lesson plan to make learners the focus of language learning process?

Teachers need to balance four key elements of language learning when designing a language course or planning a lesson plan. Firstly, learners need to get exposed to the language through receptive skills: reading and listening. There is a well-known saying: the more exposure the better. As they get a lot of input or exposure, they can focus on what they can do with the language that they understand. Therefore, input or exposure must be comprehensible so that learners can make it usable. In other words, input must be based on understanding. Secondly, learners can use this language they hear or read through productive skills: speaking and writing. These two skills facilitate learners to use or produce language through speaking like structured-output and communicative output activities classified as speaking-as-skill. Both structured-output activities and communicative-output activities can be described as fluency-based. Thirdly, learners need to be fluent in four skills. To put it another way, they must be skilled at four macro skills. Therefore, a language course and a language lesson plan must balance four skills: listening, reading, speaking and writing. To succeed in fluency in speaking the teacher should pay attention to pair work and group work. Finally, the teacher must pay attention to the development of sub-skills. They should have knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, functions and discourse to be able to function effectively in English. Briefly, when one of these elements is not included in a language course or a lesson plan, successful language learning does not take place.

Fluency is a significant issue to research. The best way to achieve fluency in language classroom is collaborative learning through pair work-and group work. For this reason, this study aims to investigate EFL instructors' perceptions and attitudes towards group-work and pair-work speaking activities at international schools in Istanbul. It further seeks to examine the implementation of group-work and pair-work speaking activities at international schools in Istanbul. It also aims to unravel the advantages and disadvantages in the implementation of group-work and pair-work speaking activities at international schools in Istanbul.

B. Background to the Study

Collaborative learning means several instructional practices that promote learners to work together in which they apply the course material to create a project, solve problems, and answer questions (Colbeck et al. 2000). Pair-work and group-work speaking activities or activities focusing on communication containing discussions and interactions are a common practice in foreign language classrooms (Mayo & Zeitler, 2017). The advantages in using them are manifested in increasing the use of the target language, enhancing self-directed learning and student autonomy (Crookes & Chaudron, 2001).

Many researchers have done research on the role of pair work in language learning. Pair work has a positive impact on language learning in terms of enhancing vocabulary and also developing speaking skills, i.e. fluency. Pair work provides the students with the opportunities to interact and speak in the target language (Styati & Latief, 2018). In addition, pair work improves students' grammatical accuracy (Storch, 1999). Furthermore, it has a considerable impact on learning to write, especially cooperative writing (Shehadeh, 2011).

Group work is another most important pattern of interaction and might consist of at least three students or more who work towards solving a problem or posing a question (Raja & Saeed, 2012). Cohen and Lotan (2014) suggest that group work means learners working together in a small group. Students can learn English best when they solve a problem or make a decision in a group.

Students act as active student participants and collaborators. They participate in an activity focusing on communication actively and do their best to collaborate with their peers. Being active and collaboration help them use or produce English. On the other hand, teachers have the roles of communication facilitators and organisers. They make learning happen smoothly and organise the class into pairs and groups. They should also encourage fluency through collaborative learning. More importantly, the teacher's role in group work is embodied in organizing such groups of students to check students' comprehension and to give the students the opportunity to use the target language (Raja & Saeed, 2012).

Group work like pair work is considered to be student-centred because it makes students more autonomous and it encourages them to work collaboratively.

Group work is considered as one of the most prominent features of student-centred learning, particularly in a communicative language classroom that is supposed to address students with all learning styles and create the opportunities to speak and express themselves in the language classroom (Hung & Mai, 2020).

In a traditional classroom, learners have no say about the learning process. Learners are passive, so they receive knowledge passively; they have no control over their own learning because the teachers have the complete control over the students' learning by deciding on the topics and materials, the teaching activities and the various forms of assessment (Ahmed, 2013). This type of instruction is so-called teacher-centred approach, which inhibits the educational growth of the students (Duckworth, 2009).

In contrast with traditional teacher-centred instruction, pair-work and group-work speaking activities are student-centred. In student-centred learning teachers make students more engaged and active. To do so, they should manage the classroom in a manner that gives the students the control over the learning process. Teachers need to involve learners in what to learn, how to learn and how to be assessed. According to Wohlfarth et al. (2008), teachers adopt a collaborative, active, and engaging instruction in a learner-centred classroom. Collaborative learning environment has appeared in order to replace conventional lecture-oriented classroom with a student-centred one (Ferdous & Karim, 2019). Collaborative learning environment includes activities that are often performed by students through either group work or pair work; it creates the core of collaborative learning (Larsen & Freeman, 2000).

C. Statement of the Problem

Accuracy and fluency need to go hand in hand in foreign language learning and teaching. Teachers need to balance both of them as they complement one another so that learners can succeed in language learning. Language learning in Turkish context relies too much on accuracy-based practice or controlled practice. For example, many teachers choose to follow presentation, practice and production cycle (PPP). However, there is a problem with practice stage, which is based on meaningless practice and repetition. Also, while traditional grammar-first methods like Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) and PPP

methods are accuracy-based and teacher-centred, fluency-first methods like Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) are fluency-based and learner-centred. In addition, teachers do not balance both receptive and productive skills. They emphasise receptive skills, but they tend to neglect productive skills. As a result, students understand the language they hear and read, but they cannot produce or use language. To overcome this problem, group-work or pair-work speaking activities are considered as a free practice instrument that can be used to help students practise speaking English communicatively and to increase their collaboration in the classroom (Hung & Mai, 2020). They need to learn to communicate meaning as language is meaning-focused. As a matter of fact, there is not much research on teachers' perceptions of pair work and group work in Turkey. This study seeks to bridge the gap in the literature by investigating EFL instructors' perceptions of pair work and group work at international schools in Istanbul.

D. Significance of the Study

This research is important to EFL instructors, researchers, syllabus designers, course book writers, and course planners. Firstly, EFL instructors need to do pair-work and group work activities to facilitate communication and interaction in the language classroom. This study will raise their awareness of the role of pair work and group work in the development of fluency in speaking English. They should avoid doing too much meaningless practice and choose to do meaningful, guided and free practice. Teachers should also emphasise four skills and balance receptive and productive skills. This research will help them to see the role of the skill development in language learning and teaching. Teachers need to be aware of the benefits of getting exposed to language through reading and listening and producing or using language through speaking and writing. They should equally pay attention to meaning-focused input and meaning-focused output when planning a language course (Schmitt, 2010). Teachers can also reflect on or evaluate their lessons. Do they have their students do activities focusing on communication? This study will also be good for teachers to learn about the reasons for not using pair work and group work. This study is different from other studies because it investigates EFL instructors attitudes towards group-work and pair-work speaking activities at

international schools in Istanbul. Secondly, researchers who are interested in speaking can be given chances to be aware of EFL instructors' perceptions of speaking in the language classroom. Teachers' views of how people learn languages must be very important to researchers. Researchers can reach interesting results about the study because not many teachers focus on interaction or communication in the language classroom. Students cannot communicate or express meaning clearly and fluently. Researchers can make use of the findings of this research. Maybe they will think that teachers have a negative attitude towards fluency.

The significance of the study stems from the fact that it is one of the few studies to the best of the researcher's knowledge that investigates the attitudes of EFL instructors towards pair-work and group-work speaking activities in Turkey. Researchers will be able to learn whether pair work or group work is implemented in language classroom. Thirdly, syllabus designers can take into account the findings of this study when they design a syllabus. Learner needs, goals and preferences for learning should be considered when course designers design a syllabus. Learners should be involved in topics, materials, activities and assessment. How will the teacher use the materials which they have developed? Materials development and the design of activities to use materials should go hand in hand. Syllabus designers should pay attention to pair work and group work through communicative activities. Moreover, course book writers should include enough pair-work and group-work speaking activities in the course books which they have published. They should balance accuracy and fluency. Finally, this study can be good for teacher trainers in helping student-teachers become aware of the importance of group work and pair work in improving speaking and increasing student engagement in the classroom.

E. Objectives of the Study

This study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

a. to investigate EFL instructors' perceptions or attitudes towards group-work and pair-work speaking activities at international schools in Istanbul.

b. to examine the implementation of group-work and pair-work speaking activities at international schools in Istanbul.

c. to address the advantages and disadvantages of the implementation of group-

work and pair-work speaking activities among EFL instructors at international schools in Istanbul.

d. to identify the reasons why students are not willing to participate in pair work or group work.

F. Research Questions of the Study

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the overall perceptions of EFL language instructors regarding:

a) pair-work (PW) and group-work (GW) activities to practise speaking skills?

b) in-class application of pair-work (PW) and group-work (GW) activities to practise speaking skills?

c) the advantages of pair-work and group-work activities to practise speaking skills?

d) the disadvantages of pair-work and group-work activities to practice speaking skills?

RQ2: What are the suggestions of EFL language teachers regarding the application procedure of pair-work (PW) and group-work (GW) activities to practice speaking skills?

RQ3: What could be the reasons behind:

a) EFL students' not adequately benefitting from pair-work (PW) and group-work (GW) activities to practise speaking skills?

b) EFL students' not adequately taking advantage of pair-work (PW) and group-work (GW) activities to practice speaking skills according to English language instructors?

G. Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations of this study. Firstly, this study only took place at international schools in Istanbul. Secondly, this study was limited to 100 EFL instructors at different international schools in Istanbul. Thirdly, this study was

limited to the use of a questionnaire and an interview.

H. Definitions of Key Terms

   -Pair work: It is a method of enhancing language use and student participation in a pair by employing a variety of activities to enhance learners' ability to learn (Harmer, 2011).

   -Group work: It is defined as a classroom practice in which students work in groups to accomplish tasks and construct knowledge by collaborative interaction (Rance-Roney, 2010).

   - Speaking activity: It is defined as a skill that is not merely acquired by speaking but rather by listening. Improving this skill will reflect positively on the development of other skills, such as, grammar, reading, vocabulary, and listening (Tarigan, 1990).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

This study explores teaching speaking in many respects. Firstly, this chapter starts with the role of four skills. Secondly, the researcher moves onto the definition of teaching skills. Thirdly, the researcher defines teaching speaking. Fourthly, teacher roles and elements of a speaking lesson are explained in great detail. Fifthly, the researcher discusses the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work activities. Finally, previous studies on pair work and group work are explored.

B. Role of Four Skills in Language Development

Four macro skills are classified into two: receptive and productive skills. To begin with, learners need to get exposed to language through receptive skills: reading and listening. Exposure or input is based on understanding or comprehension. The language which learners receive must be comprehensible and this helps learners acquire a language. As they get a lot of input or exposure, they will be good at language. Learners are advised to get authentic input so that they can become fluent in English. Practice makes perfect at least fluent. Secondly, learners need to produce or use language through productive skills: speaking and writing. Students need to turn input which they have received into output. The input and output are the key to success. Teachers need to provide learners with many opportunities to get input and use output through effective materials and activities.

C. Four Strands of Successful Language Course

A well-balanced language course includes four important strands. First of all, learners need to get a lot of comprehensible input by learning through meaning-focused input. To put it another way, they can learn through listening and reading where their focus is on the ideas and messages which the language conveys. Secondly, learners need to use language by learning through meaning-focused

output. In other words, they can learn through speaking and writing where the learner attention is on conveying ideas and messages to another person. Thirdly, learners can learn through deliberate attention to language items and language features. In other words, they can learn language through direct vocabulary study, through grammar exercises and explanation, through attention to the pronunciation and through attention to discourse features. Finally, they can become fluent in four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing.

D.   Definition of Teaching Speaking in EFL Classroom

Speaking entails creating an image towards others without being conscious; thus, the meaning of an oral production of an individual does not only rely on the information, but it also depends on the manner of saying it (Olsson, 2018). According to Chaney (1998, p.13), speaking is "the process of sharing and expressing meaning by using both non-verbal and verbal symbol in various contexts." On the other hand, Nunan (1989) has made a more comprehensive definition of teaching speaking in the language classroom. Teaching speaking is to teach ESL learners to:

- produce the English speech sounds and sound patterns,

- use words and sentence stress, intonation patterns and the rhythm of the second language,

- select appropriate words and sentences according to the proper social setting, audience, situation and subject matter,

- organise their thoughts in a meaningful and logical sequence,

- use language as a means of expressing values and judgments,

- use the language quickly and confidently with few unnatural pauses, which is called fluency.

E.   Developing Fluency

One of the goals of language learning is to develop fluency in language use. Fluency is natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction and maintains comprehensible and on-going communication despite

limitations in his or her communicative competence. Fluency is developed by creating classroom activities in which students must negotiate meaning, use communication strategies, correct misunderstandings, and work to avoid communication breakdowns.

Activities focusing on fluency include the following features. Firstly, students use language naturally. They also focus on communication. In addition, they use language meaningfully. Thirdly, to succeed in communication they need to use communication strategies. Fourthly, whey they study in pairs and small groups, they can use unpredictable language and link language use to context. Finally, it is an open-ended discussion activity (Richards, 2013).

F. Collaborative Language Learning

Cooperative language learning focuses on the idea that teaching should make maximum use of cooperative activities and interactions. Teachers have to create a positive environment for high-quality language learning in the classroom. They have to find ways of engaging students in their lessons, use learning arrangements that encourage active student participation in lessons, acknowledge the diversity of motivations and interests learners bring to the classroom and use strategies that enable the class to function as a cohesive group that collaborates to help make the lesson a positive learning experience.

Students can construct knowledge either individually or cooperatively. Laal and Ghodsi (2012) state that collaborative learning enables students to complete given tasks and solve problems by working and learning in groups. According to Yulitrinisya and Narius (2018), pair work is considered as one of the interaction patterns utilized in the language classroom, such as English as a foreign language (EFL) or English as a second language (ESL).

Group work covers various teaching techniques in which two or more learners are given a task that contains self-initiated language and collaboration (Brown, 2001; Karim, 2015). Using group work in language classroom has a number of advantages: improving student-talking time quality, motivating students, creating a positive affective climate, and extending language practice opportunities (Long & Porter, 1985). Students working in groups are able to do better than students working

individually because learners of collaborative learning are presented with social skills required for their future (Linton et al., 2014).

There are a number of activities in which group work can be done in an EFL classroom. First, buzz groups are used to gauge student understanding, generate answers/ideas, and build student interests. Second, think-pair-share is used to encourage broad participation in plenary session, increase student confidence in their answers, and generate ideas. Third, circle of voices are used to equalize learning environment, generate ideas, engage student participation, and improve listening skills. Fourth, rotating trios are used to generate ideas and introduce learners to their peers. Fifth, jigsaw is used to develop teamwork and learn concepts in-depth. Sixth, snowball groups/pyramids are used to narrow down a topic, develop decision-making skills, and generate well-vetted ideas. Seventh, fishbowl is used to provide real clarifications for concepts, provide opportunity for analysis, and observe group interaction. Eighth, learning teams are used to increase confidence in participating and enhance relationship among learners (Romanov, 2021).

G. Definitions of Pair Work and Group Work

Pair work and group work are widely used in foreign language learning and teaching (Storch, 2002). It is worth mentioning that both pair work and group work give students the opportunities to practise the second language as opposed to teacher-led classroom activities which take place between the teacher and students (Storch, 2001). In contrast to teacher-student interaction, both pair-work and group-work activities take place between two or more students. Pair-work and group-work activities are usually based on free practice which requires learners to discuss an issue, communicate meaning and complete a task.

Richards (2013) defines pair work as a learning activity which involves learners working together in pairs. Similarly, Rance-Roney (2010) defines pair work as a good way to improve language use and production. Pair work can enhance student ability to speak English and also can allow students to engage and participate in learning through a variety of activities. On the other hand, Harmer (2011) defines group work as a classroom practice in which students work in groups to accomplish a task and to construct knowledge collaboratively. Likewise, group work is defined as a learning activity which involves a small group of learners working together. The

group may work on a single task, or on different parts of a larger task (Richards, 2013).

H. Teacher Roles in Teaching Speaking

EFL instructors assume many roles in a speaking lesson. Firstly, they need to be motivators. They must be good at motivating students to speak in the language classroom. Secondly, EFL instructors should be friendly with their students. They should establish a good rapport with their students. A good relationship which is based on respect and trust can encourage them to use or produce language. Thirdly, EFL instructors should be humorous. They should make it fun to teach English. Teachers should create a stress-free learning environment, where they acquire English. Fourthly, EFL instructors must be active in the language classroom. They should communicate enthusiasm and become active communication participants. Fifthly, EFL instructors should act as facilitators. They should facilitate communication and interaction. They should also make learning happen smoothly. Finally, EFL instructors should act as prompters to encourage learners to participate in activities. They can give key words or questions to students to help them speak.

İ. Elements of a Successful Speaking Activity

A communicative or speaking-as-skill activity must have the elements of a successful speaking activity. Firstly, teachers should provide appropriate input. In other words, they should start with a model text. Secondly, teachers should integrate skills with one another as skills can reinforce one another. A lesson can start with receptive skills: reading and listening and end with productive skills: speaking and writing. Input and output should go hand in hand. Thirdly, a variety of aids need to be used to help students to speak. For example, teachers can use flashcards, pictures or realia to encourage them to speak. Fourthly, teachers should create a purpose for speaking. Therefore, a speaking activity needs to have an outcome. For an activity to become a speaking activity learners must complete a task. Fifthly, a speaking activity needs to be based on a real-life-situation. Teachers should make it relevant to their lives. Moreover, teachers should tailor their teaching to their learners' needs. Learner needs, goals and preferences should be considered. Furthermore, teachers should increase the learners' role and responsibility. Learners should be actively

involved in learning process. They should be active communication participants. Besides, a speaking activity should be learner-centred rather than teacher-centred. Learners should be active, so teachers should involve them in the learning process, such as topic selection, materials choice, activity design, etc. In addition, teachers should minimise teacher-talking time and maximise teacher talking time. Also, teachers should do a variety of interaction patterns, such as pair work or group work. Teachers should see language as an interactive process. Finally, teachers should give feedback at the right time and know when, how and why to give feedback. For example, if it is a fluency-based activity, teachers should give feedback later. However, if it is an accuracy-based activity, teachers should give feedback immediately. Therefore, they should choose the right time to correct students and choose the right way to correct.

J.   Relationship between Communicative Approaches and Pair-Work or Group-Work Activities

Pair work and group work are highly supported by some models of language that have influenced teaching methods and approaches. Sociocultural theory developed by Vygotsky (1978) relies on interaction. According to sociocultural theory, language is seen as a communicative activity and knowledge is constructed through social interaction (Brown, 1994). Language is also seen as an interactive tool to study in pairs and groups. Interaction is considered to be the core of some methods like communicative language teaching (CLT), content and language integrated learning (CLIL) and task-based language teaching (TBLT). Pair work and group work are the major common classroom activities of communicative methods, which facilitate students to use or produce language and get across a message.

K.   Types of Speaking Activities

Speaking activities are categorized into communicative-based and fluency-based. Fluency-based activities focus on information and conveying the message, whether it is a simple weather report or an extended lecture on an academic topic. In communicative-based activities, the learners' main purpose is to complete a task, such as obtaining information, developing a travel plan, or creating a video. To complete the task, they may use the language that the instructor has just presented,

but they may also draw on any other vocabulary, grammar, and communication strategies that they know. In communicative-output activities, the criterion of success is whether the learner gets the message across.

To promote fluency, two types of activities can be used: structured-output activities and communicative-output activities:

1. **Structured-output activities**

   a) Information-gap

   b) Find the difference

   c) Information-sharing

   d) Find someone who

   e) Describe and draw

2. **Communicative-output activities**

   a) Interview

   b) Discussion or debate

   c) Presentation

   d) Story-telling

   e) Simulation

   f) Ranking

   g) Jigsaw

   h) Role play

   i) Communication game

The purpose of real communication is to accomplish a task, such as conveying a telephone message, obtaining information, or expressing an opinion. In real communication, participants must manage uncertainty about what the other person will say. Authentic communication involves an information gap; each participant has information that the other does not have. In addition, to achieve their purpose, participants may have to clarify their meaning or ask for confirmation of their own understanding.

To create classroom speaking activities that will develop communicative competence, instructors need to incorporate a purpose and an information gap and allow for multiple forms of expression. However, quantity alone will not necessarily produce competent speakers. Instructors need to combine structured output activities, which allow for error correction and increased accuracy, with communicative output activities that give students opportunities to practise language use more freely.

L. Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair Work

There are many advantages of pair work. To begin with, pair work provides students with opportunities for sustained interaction and has long been recommended as a key means of promoting both accuracy and fluency in language use. Teachers who put students in pairs or small groups can also take into consideration ability level, language and cultural background, and other factors that will facilitate a positive approach to learning. In addition, pair work increases student-talking time (STT) in contrast to whole-class teaching. Moreover, students interact independently. They do not depend on their teacher, so they can make their own decisions about their own learning. It promotes learner autonomy; they can take responsibility for their own learning. Besides, it is a good idea for students to study collaboratively. Two heads are better than one! Furthermore, it is highly sociable and is very useful for comparing answers, creating and practising dialogues, rehearsing role plays. Finally, it is easy for the teacher to organize a pair-work activity as it is practical enough to set up.

On the other hand, pair work offers many disadvantages. To start with, it can be very noisy. Students can also get distracted and go 'off-task'. They will start talking about something else. Moreover, students may veer off the point of the activity. Furthermore, students are not always fond of pair work. Some students do not always enjoy pair work; they prefer to work with a teacher or in groups. Finally, it depends who individuals are paired with.

M. Advantages and Disadvantages of Group Work

Group-based learning is widely used in all forms of teaching and significantly changes the interactional dynamics of the classroom. Group work offers many

advantages. Firstly, in language classes, it increases student-talking time for individuals in contrast to whole-class organization. Secondly, it helps promote self-esteem. Students will be more self-confident when studying in groups. Thirdly, it can increase student motivation by providing a risk-free environment for language practice. There are also opportunities for lots of different opinions. Students can express feelings freely. Fourthly, it encourages learner self-reliance through group decision-making. They can rely on themselves. Finally, it encourages co-operation and allows the students to work on a range of tasks, such as buzz groups, discussion, story-circle writing, story-reconstruction and planning.

On the other hand, group work offers many disadvantages. One disadvantage of group work is that it can be noisy. Group members can make a lot of noise and disturb one another. The second disadvantage is that some students get lost in groups. They cannot concentrate on the activity. The third disadvantage is that some students end up always fulfilling the same group role. The fourth disadvantage is that it can be difficult to organise. It is hard to put students in groups; it is not practical to set up an activity. The last disadvantage is that some students prefer whole-class teaching.

N. Challenges Students Face in Speaking Classes

There are some obstacles that hinder speaking in EFL classroom. According to Ali and Bin-Hady (2019), lack of motivation, lack of confidence, lack of interest, unwillingness to communicate, a high level of anxiety and a negative learning environment are the most essential factors that discourage students from developing speaking skills. Firstly, students who have no motivation are not involved in speaking activities. Secondly, students who are not self-confident at all cannot express themselves because fluency and self-confidence go hand in hand. Thirdly, students who have no interest in learning cannot succeed in learning to speak English. Fourthly, some students are unwilling to communicate in English, so they do not make any progress in the language learning process. Finally, some students experience a high level of anxiety. Al Hosni (2014) points out that both unwillingness and anxiety stop students from speaking English in the language classroom.

Likewise, Harmer(2011) lists the following challenges. To begin with, some learners are too shy to speak in class. Also, they cannot find anything to say about

the topic. Moreover, they do not enjoy participating in speaking activities because of low engagement or participation. In addition, they choose to use L1 or switch to L1, which is called code-switching.

O. Speaking Lesson Procedure

A typical speaking lesson procedure includes the following steps or stages:

a. The teacher introduces the speaking activity and perhaps provides some information input that will help students carry out the activity.

b. The teacher gives instructions for the activity. This might mean that the students read some instructions or perhaps role cards.

c. The students spend some time planning the content of the speaking activity.

d. The students do the speaking activity and the teacher monitors and listens in on their progress.

e. The teacher elicits or gives feedback either on the content or the performance of the speaking activity.

f. The teacher gives feedback on the language that students used in the activity and might highlight and correct mistakes that learners made during the activity.

P. Studies Done on Pair Work and Group Work

1. Studies on pair work and group work in western countries to improve speaking skills

Lin, Chen and Yu (2022) have investigated the impact of using pair work and individual work on improving student speaking skill. The study has examined how peer collaboration plays a positive role in improving student cognitive process and oral production. The participants are classified into two groups; the first group is individual group that consists of 11 EFL students whereas the second group is pair group that consists of 22 EFL students. The students in the second group are required to express their attitudes towards using pair work in improving their cognitive skill. To elicit data from the participants, a written discourse completion task is used. To analyse the data, pragmatic-related episodes are used to analyse the student oral production whereas the student perceptions are analysed by using 5-Point Likert

Scale. The findings have revealed that the content of individual group has outperformed those in collaborative group. However, the study has found that the forms of the collaborative group have outperformed those in the individual group. Regarding the cognitive processes, the individual group tends to plan the general outline of their writing before writing the written discourse completion task and pay more attention to socio-pragmatic content throughout writing. On the other hand, the collaborative group plans detailed information before the task and attends to pragma-linguistic forms more often throughout writing.

Huyen and Lan (2021) have examined the impact of using think-pair-share strategy to enhance learners in speaking lessons. The study aims at evaluating the impact of applying think-pair-share strategy in the classroom to enhance learner engagement and speaking skill in speaking activities. To this end, 35 learners in the advanced program have participated in the study. The sample has been selected from Economics and Business Administration at Thai Nguyen University. The data have been analysed qualitatively. The data are gathered by using three methods, namely, individual interview, focus group, and observation sheets. The findings reveal that the students participate and engage more in the discussion. Moreover, think-pair-share strategy has reinforced student critical thinking, speaking confidently, and engagement. The only limitation which students have faced is lack of thinking time and disagreement among group ideas. Interestingly, the study has found that students have positive attitudes towards using think-pair-share strategy to improve their speaking skill. The students have reported that using such a strategy is fun, exciting, interesting, and relaxing. The findings have also suggested that the participants generate good speech due to the use of think-pair-share strategy.

Febyanti and Sari (2021) have carried out a study on the impact of implementing storytelling and pair work on improving the speaking fluency for 5th-grade elementary students. The sample consists of both teachers and students. The data are analysed qualitatively by counting the number of words and phrases uttered by the students. The data are analysed by using observation, interview, document analysis, and analysing the students' personal communication with their teachers. The participants are required to work in pairs and retell the conversation by using storytelling. The findings have revealed that the students are able to speak more than one thousand words during two to three seconds' pause. The findings of the

observation reveal that the students enjoy using storytelling and studying in pairs to improve their speaking skills. The findings reveal that pair work enables the students to produce more spoken language.

Hasegawa (2021) has investigated the moment-by-moment 67 pair-work interactions. The participants are Japanese EFL students at beginner level. The study has used activities that are designed by the teacher and textbook. Each stage of pair work consists of opening, main body, and closing. The orientation to the on-going event contains two concurrent stages, namely, pedagogical activity and normative interaction. The first stage is established as individualistic and private while the second stage is normative-interaction that requires students to utilize regular interactional procedures by pointing to contingent, collaborative, and corrective nature. The investigation of pair-work cases with such stages have facilitated researchers to better understand the complexity and precision contained in the utilization of learning materials, along with the contradicting abilities of the materials, by pointing to a socio-material concept of non-human and human interaction.

Maca (2020) has examined the impact of pair work and group work on teaching speaking skill. The participants are chosen from Bosowa University. The sample consists of 40 students who are in the 4th-semester of Educational English Department. The participants are chosen randomly and they are assigned into two groups; experimental and control. The students in the experimental group work in pairs and groups and they are required to conduct 3 types of interview techniques. To clarify, 1 student is requested to ask 4 students and 4 students are requested to ask 1 student. The findings reveal that the participants have the courage and freedom to express their language by using pair work and group work. More importantly, the findings have revealed that pair work and group work stimulate the respondents to speak actively, fluently, and actively as opposed to traditional teaching methods. The study has found that 60% of the participants speak actively while 40% of the participants remain silent.

Rospinah et al. (2020) have investigated the impact of group work on improving student speaking skill. The study takes place in Indonesia. The sample consists of 8th-grade students at MTs Syekh Yusuf Sungguminasa. The study applies different group-work activities including jigsaw, snowball, and think-pair-share in

teaching English and aims to explore if group-work activities are more effective than regular instruction method. The sample consists of 40 students. The participants are divided equally into two groups, experimental and control. To achieve the objective of the study, a quasi-experimental research design has been used. The instruments that are used to collect data are recording and speaking tests that have been carried out as a pre-test before applying the treatment and as a post-test. The data are analysed quantitatively by using SPSS. The study has found that the students' scores in the post-test have outperformed their scores in the pre-test. The study has also found that using group work in the classroom has a considerable impact on improving student pronunciation, fluency, grammatical knowledge, and vocabulary knowledge.

Navarrete (2020) has investigated the impact of pair work on improving the oral production of EFL students. The sample consists of 14 EFL students: 6 male and 8 female students. The study takes place at a private university in Guayaquil. The study has used action research design. The data are analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The data are collected by using a pre and a post test, field notes, 3 learning logs, and a rubric. The findings of the quantitative data have showed considerable differences between the students' scores in the pre-test and post-test, indicating that pair work has a considerable impact on improving student oral production. The findings of the qualitative data have showed that the students exhibit positive attitudes towards using pair work in the classroom because they feel comfortable and confident when they speak with their partners. In other words, pair work has developed students' oral production. The study recommends using pair work in EFL classroom to improve students' oral production.

Pratiwi (2019) has investigated the effectiveness of using pair work and group work to improve student speaking skills. The study takes place in Indonesia. The sample consists of (63) 11th-grade students. The participants are divided into two groups: experimental and control group. The first group consists of 32 students whereas the control group consists of 31 students. To analyse the data, a statistical analysis method has been used. The findings indicate that the students who have used group work are able to improve their speaking skills significantly. The study has also found that group work is more effective than pair work. The study concludes that applying group work and pair work is more effective for students to improve their

speaking skills.

Yulitrinisya and Narius (2018) have carried out a study on the use of pair work in teaching speaking skill at junior high school. To achieve this objective, the study has implemented a pair-work technique in English speaking class by dividing the lesson into three phases, namely, pre-teaching, while-teaching, and post-teaching. Such stages entail using observation, experimenting, associating, questioning, and communicating. The findings indicate that pair work is highly effective for teaching junior high school students speaking compared to group or whole-class discussion because it gives each student the opportunity to speak. The findings have also revealed that using pair work increases student motivation and participation.

Hosseini, Bakhtiarvand, and Tabatabaei (2018) have explored the impact of individual, pair, and group work on improving student speaking skill. The sample consists of 77 Iranian EFL students. A placement test is given to the participants. The sample is classified into 3 groups: namely, individual-group, pair-group, and group-work students. Each group consists of 25 students. The participants in each group are given a task and they are required to do the tasks individually, while the students in the pair group are required to do the tasks with their partners whereas the students in the group work are required to do the tasks with their partners. The treatment lasts for 12 weeks. The findings of the study reveal that the students' speaking proficiency who work in pairs and in groups have outperformed those who work individually.

Mulya (2016) has addressed the impact of pair work on improving students' speaking skills compared to the students who work individually. To achieve the objective of the study, an experimental research design is used. The study which is quantitative takes place in Banda Aceh. The sample consists of 60 2nd-grade high school. The students are divided equally and placed into two groups: namely, experimental and control. To collect the data, a pre-test and a post-test are used. To analyse the data, a statistical analysis has been used, particularly T-test. The findings reveal that the students who work in pairs produce more oral language than students who work individually. The study has found that pair work is considered as an effective technique to improve the speaking skill for experimental group students. The study recommends that English language teachers use pair work to improve student speaking skill.

Usman (2015) has conducted a study on the impact of think-pair-share strategy on improving students' speaking skill. To attain the aim of the study, a collaborative classroom action has been used. The study consists of several steps, namely, planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. The study takes place in the Islamic Education Department of STAIN Ternate. The sample consists of 20 students. To collect data from the participants, the study has used a tape recorder, test, field notes, an observation checklist, and a camera. The data are analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The study is conducted in 2 cycles; the first one is an individual task that is unsuccessful whereas the second cycle is successful because the students are required to work in pairs. The study concludes that applying a think-pair-share strategy is successful in improving students' speaking skill.

Achmad and Yusuf (2014) have explored the impact of pair work on improving students' speaking skill. The sample consists of 16 students who have obtained 5.5 in IELTS. Each pair consists of a strong and a weak student. Eight pair-work activities have been used in the study. The participants are required to express their attitudes towards social life by using agree-and- disagree. The study has used observation to collect data. The findings reveal that 6 pairs out of 8 are able to successfully implement the task whereas the two pairs face difficulties in accomplishing the task. The stronger student in the first weak-pair has pointed to the weaker student to speak first. The stronger student in the second weak-pair has showed respect to the weaker students by using his first language. Therefore, the second weak-pair students have used their first language instead of the second language. The study recommends assigning roles and strengthening information-sharing to prevent a learner from controlling the activity with his/her pair. The study concludes that placing international students with unequal speaking abilities should be conducted effectively by teachers by determining their learning culture and abilities to enrich the learners' language resources.

Lasito and Storch (2013) have investigated the impact of using pair work and group work in EFL classroom. The sample consists of junior high school students and the study takes place in Indonesia. The study compares the students' interactions when they work in pairs and in groups. The oral language produced by the participants is recorded and transcribed. The study examines the amount of the target language which the participants have produced in their first language and the

functions it has served. To investigate the quantity, focus, and resolutions, the study has utilized language-related episodes. The findings reveal that the participants who work in pairs produce more language and language-related episodes than the students who have worked in small groups. As a consequence, the study has found that the students who work in small groups have produced less language and language-related episodes than the students who work in pairs.

Truong (2013) has investigated the impact of personalities on improving students' performance in pair-work and group-work speaking activities. The sample consists of first-year mainstream students. The study has sought to address the attitudes of the students towards the effects of their personalities on improving their speaking skill and to overcome such challenges by resorting to expertized teachers. The sample consists of 52 first-year students and two expert teachers. To collect the data, classroom observations, interviews, and questionnaire have been used. The study has found that the students have negative attitudes towards pair-work and group-work activities. The study concludes that using tasks and roles by teachers will reduce the negative impacts and increase positive ones.

Cordeiro (2017) has investigated the impact of pair work on improving EFL students' speaking skills. The sample consists of young learners. To collect the data, a number of activities are given to the students who are required to respond to such activities during a period of 3 cycles. Throughout such cycles, the students have accomplished pair-work activities and the questionnaire, which have enabled the researcher to observe the students' responses to pair-work activities. The study has found that the learners respond well to pair work; however, the students need an explanation regarding the reasons for doing pair work. Interestingly, the study has found that the students who are given an explanation respond better to pair work compared to other students.

Raba (2017) has carried out a study on the impact of think-pair-share strategy on improving the oral comprehension skill of EFL students. To achieve the objective of the study, the researcher has conducted an interview with EFL teachers to investigate their attitudes and the challenges they confront in pair work. The study takes place at An-Najah National University and the study has found that applying this strategy improves student speaking skills, creates a collaborative learning environment, and improves student motivation to learn better. The findings reveal

that the students in the applied sciences perform better than the students in human sciences.

Hamzah et al. (2010) have investigated the impact of group work activities on teaching speaking skill. The study investigates the attitudes of the students towards using group work in the classroom. The study takes place at SMK Damai Jaya in Malaysia. To collect data, the study has used three instruments: namely, observation, student interviews with their teachers, and an attitudinal questionnaire to investigate the students' attitudes towards group work. The sample consists of 33 students. The findings reveal that the students who work in pairs improve their speaking skills. Moreover, the study has found that the students have positive attitudes towards using group-work activities in the classroom.

2. Studies on the effects of pair work and group work on improving English skills

Abdullah (2016) has carried out a study at SMAN 2 Sigli. The study aims to improve student English skills by using group-work activities. The sample consists of 3rd -year students. The study has used a classroom action research project. The study has designed a lesson plan, has implemented the actions and has drawn conclusions and reflections. Four action research plans have been conducted in this study, containing planning an action, executing the plan, observing, and reflecting. The findings show that group work is effective for students to improve their fluency in speaking and for teachers to improve their teaching performance. The study has also found that the students have positive attitudes towards using group work in the classroom.

Storch (2002) has examined the nature of interaction in an EFL classroom. The nature of the study is longitudinal classroom-based. The study has been conducted at Australian University. The sample consists of 33 university students. Their ages range between 19 and 42. The majority of participants are international students. The participants have differed in terms of language background, their residential status, their length of residence, and their age. The majority of the students are from Asia. Ten pairs of adult EFL students during a range of language tasks and during one semester are examined. To collect data, 3 tasks that focus on both writing and grammatical accuracy are used. Such tasks that are used in the study

are a short composition, an auditing task, and a text reconstruction task. One version of the task is accomplished individually whereas 2 tasks are accomplished in pairs. To analyse the data, 2 stages have been used. Pair talks are analysed for the dyadic interaction pattern and the salient features that characterize such patterns. As for the second stage, both pair work and the tasks learners have accomplished individually to investigate the effect between individual work and pair work are analysed. The study has found 4 dyadic interactions among the students, namely, collaborative, dominant/ dominant, dominant/passive, and expert/novice. The findings reveal that the students who work in pairs perform better than those who work individually.

Otienoh (2015) has conducted a study on Kenyan Primary schools in Nairobi. The study aims at implementing pair work and group work to enhance learning and teaching in large classes by creating interaction opportunities for students. To collect the data, three methods are used: namely, interviews, structured observation, and unstructured observation. Surprisingly, the findings of the study indicate that pair work is not as successful in engaging the students as projected. The findings also show that group work is better than pair work in large classes.

Woźniak (2017) has investigated the impact of individual, pair, and group work on improving student academic achievements. The sample has been taken from 2 distinct first-grade classes. The participants consist of 25 students, who are taken from primary school. The participants are aged between 6-7 years old. The study compares the differences between students' performances in 2 different classes while working individually, in pairs, and in groups. In the first class the students are accustomed to each other because they have known each other since kindergarten, whereas the students in the second class have been newly acquainted to each other. Three consecutive English lessons are delivered among these groups. To achieve the objectives of the study, different types of classroom interaction are used in each class. Moreover, different types of teaching methods are followed namely: Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), the Natural Approach (NA), and Total Physical Response (TPR). The study has found that students who work individually have developed their autonomy and has enabled the students to maintain a relaxed and peaceful atmosphere in the classroom. The students who work in pairs have practised the target language and overcome the language challenges. The students who work in groups have improved their communication skills and the method based

on cooperating with each other is highly advantageous for them. However, the students who work in pairs are more comfortable than the students who work in groups.

Almond (2009) has conducted a contrastive study on group work and individual work. The sample consists of science undergraduate students. Each group consists of students with different language abilities. The sample consists of 46 science faculty students. The participants are placed into groups. Each group consists of 6 students. To analyse the data, the study has used self, peer, and tutor assessment. The findings reveal that the high achievers have performed lower than low achievers. Similarly, lower achievers have performed better than high achievers.

3.   **Studies on students' attitudes towards using pair work and group work**

Williams, Guy, and Shore (2019) have investigated the expectations of higher-achieving students towards group work in the classroom. The study has conducted a systematic literature review to investigate students' expectations towards group work. The study has reviewed 768 studies. The findings reveal that the expectations of high achievers towards group work in the classroom are manifested in prior rejection or acceptance of their group work contributions, choosing the student to work with in group work, having a supportive classmate in the group, fairness of the distribution of work, controlling over the group work structure, and the opinions of their parents are considered as variables that are correlated with the expectations of higher achievers towards group work. The findings reveal that higher achievers enjoy group work. Moreover, higher achievers prefer working with their friends more than other students. Interestingly, the study has found that the workload lies on talented students more than the rest of the students. More importantly, the study has found that teachers should engage and scaffold students before asking them to work in groups.

Huriyah et al. (2019) have investigated students' attitudes towards using peer dialogue to improve their speaking skills. A questionnaire has been conducted to the participants to investigate their attitudes. The data are analysed quantitatively by using SPSS. The sample contains 4 male and 32 female students at Islamic State University of Sunan Ampel. The findings reveal that the participants have positive attitudes towards using peer dialogue in the classroom. The students indicate that

using peer dialogue has improved their speaking skills. The students advocate using peer dialogue in the classroom to improve their fluency in speaking because it enables them to speak freely and to express their views without worrying about making mistakes.

4.   Studies on EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work

Hung and Mai (2020) have conducted a study on EFL instructors' perceptions of group work on improving speaking skill and its implementation in EFL classroom. The sample consists of 105 high school teachers. The study takes place in Dong Thap province, South of Vietnam. Four high schools in Vietnam are involved in the study. The study uses a questionnaire of 5-point Likert Scale and a video recording. The data are analysed quantitatively by using statistical analysis. The findings reveal that the majority of the participants have positive attitudes towards using group work in EFL classroom to improve students' speaking skills due to its role in increasing students' engagement, enjoyment, and motivation in the classroom. The study has found some challenges in the implementation of group work in the classroom that are manifested in the fact that not all students get the opportunity to speak and some students take a great time of speaking more than others.

Koc (2018) has examined the attitudes of English language teachers and students towards collaborative learning, particularly group activities. The sample consists of 486 EFL students and 25 Turkish English language teachers. To elicit the data from the participants, a questionnaire is distributed to the subjects of the study. Moreover, an interview is conducted with the participants. To analyse the questionnaire, statistical analysis is used while the interview is analysed by using content analysis. Accordingly, the data are analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. The findings reveal that the students prefer to work in groups rather than individually. However, the study has also found that the teachers have no tendency to do group activities due to the difficulties they confront in managing the classroom.

Leeuwen and Janseen (2019) have conducted a systematic literature review of teacher guidance during collaborative learning in both primary and secondary education. To this end, 66 quantitative and qualitative studies are reviewed. The study has examined the relationship between the guidance strategies of the teacher and the processes and findings of collaboration. The findings indicate that various

aspects of teacher guidance are highly correlated with student collaboration like when teachers shed light on learner problem-solving strategies. The study points out that the students in a pair-work or group-work activity are engaged in collaborative activities that enhance their learning processes. More importantly, the study has found that the teachers play a pivotal role in engaging students in collaborative activities that are reflected in their learning process.

Frykedal and Chiriac (2018) have investigated and described students' collaborative and processes in group work and the role of teacher supporting or impeding such transactions. To this end, the study has adopted Social Interdependence Theory. To elicit the data from the participants, observational data are used and the data are collected from video-recording group work. The study has used Black-Hawkins framework of participation for defining inclusion and for analysing collaborative and inclusive processes. The study concludes that there are some prerequisites that should be identified before placing students into groups. First, teachers should not have a traditional authoritative role. Second, teachers should give students feedback. The study has found that giving feedback and acting as a facilitator improve student active participation in the classroom.

Q. Conclusion

This chapter has provided a set of related studies on the impact of pair work and group work on language learning. The previous studies have found that using collaborative learning in the classroom improves fluency in speaking. This study seeks to investigate EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities at international schools in Istanbul.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Introduction

This study examines various aspects of the implementation of pair-work and group-work speaking activities from the EFL instructors' perspectives. This chapter presents the research design of the study, the research setting, the participants, the data collection instruments, and the data analysis procedures.

B. Research Design

The aim of this study is to explore EFL instructors perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities in English classes at international schools in Istanbul. Therefore, the study is descriptive in nature. Descriptive research refers to the methods that describe the characteristics of the variables under study. The primary focus of descriptive research is to simply describe the nature of the demographics under study instead of focusing on the "why".

Due to the nature of the study, it is both quantitative and qualitative. It is quantitative as it attempts to collect information and statistically analyse it. It allows a researcher to collect data and describe the demographics of the same with the help of statistical analysis. It is the methodology which researchers use to test people's attitudes and behaviours based on numerical and statistical evidence. However, a qualitative research design is a systematic subjective approach involves collecting and analysing non-numerical data to understand experiences, opinions or concepts. It can be used to gather in-depth insights into a problem or generate new ideas for research.

Studies that collect both qualitative and quantitative data are said to use a mixed-method approach. According to Creswell (2014), the mixed-methods research design provides a stronger understanding of the problem by means of implementing two approaches. The present study used a mixed-method research design of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The researcher used both of them to achieve

a better understanding of the research purpose.

In the present study, the researcher crosschecked the data from various sources. This is called triangulation. According to Heale and Forbes (2013), triangulation means using more than one source to research the questions of the study. In qualitative research, the aim of triangulation is to increase the reliability and validity of the results. According to Cohen and Manion (2000), triangulation is an "attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint" (p. 254). Altrichter et al. (2008) claim that it "gives a more detailed and balanced picture of the situation (p.147)" O'Donoghue and Punch (2003) state that triangulation is a "method of cross-checking data from multiple sources to search for regularities in the research data (p.78)." According to Morse (1991), triangulation aims to obtain sufficient information on the same subject.Triangulation entails using two methods of data collection that can be qualitative and quantitative (Graham, 2005).

C. Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the overall perceptions of EFL instructors regarding:

A. pair-work and group-work speaking activities?

B. in-class application of pair-work and group-work speaking activities?

C. the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities?

RQ2: What are the EFL instructors' suggestions about pair-work and group-work speaking activities?

RQ3: What are the possible reasons for not using pair work or group work?

D. Research Setting, Participants and Sampling

The study was carried out at nine international schools in Istanbul, Turkey. The students in these international schools take a placement exam and according to their scores they are placed into classes; each class consists of 15 to 26 students. These schools offer students English during two terms and they have got school from

Monday to Friday i.e. 5 days a week. Moreover, they organize extracurricular activities, such as dramas, online assignments, speaking clubs, and extensive reading activities. The English language programme involves two types of syllabuses: the aim of the first term is to enhance their general English proficiency skills in the first term and in the second term it emphasises English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses including the development of academic English language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They take skill-based tests and speaking exams that are tape-recorded.

The present study was conducted with 100 EFL instructors; 60 male and 40 female EFL instructors at nine different international schools in Istanbul. 60 of them have bachelor degrees, 30 of them have master's degrees, while 10 of them have doctoral degrees. They have teaching experience from 0 to 10 years.

The instructors were randomly selected from various international schools in Turkey. The sample was selected using simple random sampling. Simple random sampling is one of the probability sampling methods. In random sampling each sample has an equal probability of being selected. The term simple random sampling refers to a smaller section of a larger population (Cohen & Manion, 1994).

E. Data Collection Instruments

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, the researcher adopted a mixed-methods design combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches. To this end, two data collection tools were employed: an online questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. Quantitative data were collected through an online questionnaire and the qualitative data were collected through a semi-structured interview. Dörnyei (2007) feels that combining both data collection tools can help increase the strengths and decrease the weaknesses of the study. Moreover, combining both methods provides methodological flexibility. In other words, using both methods has great flexibility and most importantly, they are adaptable to many study designs (Sandelowski, 2003).

1.   The questionnaire

The questionnaire that this study used to collect data was identified after reviewing several articles that were published in the field and discussed the same

research problem in different contexts. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was originally developed by İlkyaz (2018) and it was used to explore English language teachers' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities. After getting the original developer's permission, the questionnaire was adopted and adapted by the researcher because it was found to be the most relevant to the study in comparison to the other instruments used to investigate the pair-work and group-work practices and perspectives in the context of international private schools in Istanbul.

The first instrument used for this study is an online questionnaire prepared via Google Forms. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part of the questionnaire aimed to collect demographic information about the sample. The second part of the questionnaire was categorised into five sections. Each section was made up of ten items. The first section elicited the EFL instructors' overall perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, the second section elicited information about in-class application of pair-work and group-work speaking activities. The third section elicited information about the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities. The fourth section of the questionnaire aimed to elicit information the EFL instructors' suggestions about pair-work and group-work speaking activities. The fifth section of the questionnaire elicited information about the EFL instructors' possible reasons for not using or inadequate benefitting from pair-work and group-work speaking activities.

The researcher used a five-point Likert scale for all five sections in the second part of the questionnaire. A Likert scale is a type of rating scale used to measure attitudes of the participants. In this study, participants were asked to rate the items on a level of agreement: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree.

2.   Interview

The interview that this study used was identified after reviewing several articles that were published in the field and discussed the same research problem in different contexts. The interview (see Appendix B) was originally developed by İlkyaz (2018) and it was used to investigate the English language teachers' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities in international schools in İstanbul. After getting the original researcher's permission, the interview was

adopted and adapted by the researcher because it was found to be the most relevant to the study in comparison to the similar instruments used to investigate the pair-work and group-work speaking activities in the context of international private schools in Istanbul.

The researcher conducted an interview with 10 EFL instructors and the interview involved 19 open-ended questions. The interview lasted for about 30 minutes. The interview consisted of two parts. The first part of the interview included some questions on academic qualifications and teaching experience. The second part of the interview included five sections: the first section was about EFL instructors' overall perceptions of pair-work and group-work (RQ1A). The second section was about in-class applications of pair-work and group-work (RQ1B). The third section was about the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work (RQ1C). The fourth section was about suggestions related to pair-work and group-work (RQ2), and the fifth part was about possible reasons for inadequate benefitting from pair-work and group-work (RQ 3).

The demographic information about the instructors who participated in this interview was illustrated in Table 1 below. In terms of the background of the 10 instructors who were interviewed, one of them was a teacher trainer from British International School in Istanbul and the others were EFL instructors at international schools in İstanbul. Regarding their educational background, the instructors completed their bachelor studies at prestigious and reputable universities in Turkey. Their majors were American Culture and Literature, English Language and Literature and English Language Teaching.

Table 1 Demographic Information of the Participants

Instructors	Years of Experience	BA	MA	Ph.D.
T1	0	Cerrahpasa İstanbul	✓	✓
T2	10	İstanbul	✓	✓
T3	9	Ankara	✓	✓
T4	8	Ankara	✓	
T5	2	İstanbul	✓	
T6	8	Cerrahpasa İstanbul	✓	✓
T7	9	Cerrahpasa İstanbul	✓	
T8	9	Cerrahpasa İstanbul	✓	
T9	7	Ege	✓	
T10	3	Ege	✓	

As can be seen in Table 1, with regard to teaching experience, the participants ranged from 0 year to 10 years of teaching experience. There were both experienced and inexperienced EFL instructors in the interview sample. In terms of their educational background, four of them held a master's degree and a PhD, four of them were doctoral candidates and one of them held a master's degree.

F.   Data Collection Procedures

The researcher did a lot of research into the research methods and decided to collect data through a questionnaire and an interview. The researcher made the necessary modifications on both of them and then handed them in to Ethics Board of İstanbul Aydin University in order to get the permission to conduct them at international schools. After receiving the email of approval from the administration of the university, the questionnaire was prepared online through 'Google Forms' and e-mailed to the 100 participants.

The data of the study were collected in two stages between February and May 2022. Stage one consisted of an online questionnaire that collected the quantitative data the topic addressing RQ1, RQ2 and RQ3. Stage two consisted of a semi-structured interview that was conducted between April and May 2022. Qualitative data that were gathered from the interviews provided in-depth information to answer the three research questions.

Oral consent of the respondents was obtained during the interviews and their statements regarding their permission to conduct the interview was recorded. The researcher used mobile phones to digitally record the interview. The researcher conducted the interview in English. To increase the trustworthiness and the reliability of the data, two experienced instructors cross-checked the transcription of oral data.

The researcher did a lot of research into the research methods and decided to collect data through a questionnaire and an interview, which were elements of quantitative and qualitative research instruments. The researcher made the necessary modifications on both methods and then handed them in to Ethics Board in order to get the permission to conduct them at international schools. After receiving the email of approval from the administration of the university, the questionnaire was prepared online through 'Google Forms' and e-mailed to the 100 participants.

The data of the study were collected in two stages between February and May 2022. Stage one consisted of an online survey collecting quantitative data on EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, addressing RQ1, RQ2 and RQ3. Stage two consisted of structured interviews conducted between April and May 2022. Qualitative data gathered from interviews provided more information to answer the three research questions.

Oral consent of the respondents was obtained during the interviews and their statements, regarding their permission to conduct the interview was recorded. The researcher used mobile phones to digitally record the interview. The researcher conducted the interview in English. To increase the trustworthiness and the reliability of the data, 2 experienced instructors cross-checked the transcription of oral data.

G. Data Analysis

The data that were collected through the interviews and questionnaire were analysed by using the qualitative and quantitative methods. The data of the questionnaire were analysed quantitatively by using SPSS v25 to analyse the items of the questionnaire. The researcher converted the responses into numbers before transferring them to the SPSS. Then, the frequencies and percentages were counted.

The data obtained through the interview were analysed qualitatively by classifying the data into themes, coding them, and then analysing them by using the qualitative data analysis software MAXQDA. Data analysis was described by Bogdan and Biklen (1982) as the process of identifying, classifying, and then interpreting the data, and determining the data that were selected. Considering this definition, the procedures for analysing the qualitative data included identifying the raw data, converting them into codes, interpreting them and analysing the interpreted data. The researcher discussed the results of data interpretation to come to a conclusion.

H. Reliability and the Validity of the Study

Two raters coded the open-ended questions and the transcribed data to increase the reliability and credibility of the study. After each rater completed the coding procedure, they cross-checked their codes to guarantee that the current codes

had inter-rater reliability. The open coding process was completed after each rater checked each other's coding. In the second step of the analysis, categories were discovered in axial coding in which raters found correlation among codes to form categories. Core categories in the last step so-called themes were identified by the raters. The triangulation methods including crosschecking were used to enhance the reliability of the data by guaranteeing trustworthiness as well.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Introduction

This study aims to explore EFL instructors' views of pair-work and group-work speaking activities at international schools in İstanbul. This chapter presents findings of the data analysis done on the data derived from a questionnaire filled in by 100 EFL teachers and semi-structured interviews conducted with 10 English language instructors at international schools in İstanbul. The quantitative and qualitative elements relevant to each research question are provided together.

B. Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Variables

The following tables show the distribution of sample members based on demographic variables.

Table 2 Frequency and Percentage of Participant's Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	60	60.0%
Female	40	40.0%
Total	100	100%

As can be seen in Table 2, although 60 % of the participants are male EFL instructors, 40 % of the participants are female. This indicates that the number of male EFL instructors outweighs that of female instructors.

Table 3 Frequency and Percentage of Participant's Education Level

Education level	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor Degree	60	60.0 %
Master's Degree	30	30.0%
PhD	10	10.0%
Total	100	100%

According to Table 3, 60 % of the participants are bachelor holders, 30 % of the participants are master's degree holders and 10 % of the participants are PhD holders. This proves that EFL instructors are open to professional development and therefore, they want to do postgraduate or refresher courses to continue life-long learning.

Table 4 Frequency and Percentage of Participant's Teaching Experience

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percentage
0-3	20	20%
4-7	70	70%
8-10	10	10%
Total	100	100%

As can be seen in Table 4, 70 % of the participants have 4-7 years of teaching experience, 20 % of the participants have 0-3 years' experience of teaching English and 10 % of the participants have 8-10 years' experience as an EFL instructor. This indicates that international schools prefer to employ experienced staff.

C. Findings on Research Questions (RQ1A, RQ1B, RQ1C, RQ1D & RQ2, RQ3)

The results of the questionnaire are presented below in tables.

1.   RQ1A: What are the overall perceptions of EFL instructors regarding pair-work and group-work speaking activities to practise speaking skills?

The findings of the analysis done on the quantitative data derived from the first part of the questionnaire are presented here. RQ1A was about EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group work speaking activities. There were 10 five-point Likert scale items in this section. The results demonstrated that more than half of the participants had a positive attitude towards pair-work ($n=350$, 87.5%) and group-work ($n=310$, 77.5%).

Table 5 EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities to Practise Speaking Skills

No.	Statement	N	Mean	Median	Code	Std. Deviation
1	The students get bored if the speaking task takes too long.	100	3.41	3.00	3	0.621
2	The students will not be bothered by the attitude of the instructor to the pair work and group-work activities.	100	3.52	3.00	3	0.652
3	The students find it difficult to talk about topics that they are not familiar with.	100	3.50	2.00	3	0.751
4	The students like pair-work activities in speaking.	100	3.26	2.00	2	0.652
5	The students like group work speaking activities.	100	2.60	3.00	2	1.021
6	The students would like to take part in the speaking activity if the task is easy.	100	3.58	3.00	4	0.752
7	The students would prefer speaking activity when the instructor is eager for the task.	100	4.01	3.00	4	0.748
8	The students find shorter speaking activities much more fun.	100	4.08	3.00	4	0.895
9	The students would not like to take part in the speaking activity if the task is difficult.	100	4.15	2.00	4	0.902
10	The students perform better when they are familiar with the topics in the speaking task.	100	3.55	3.00	4	0.852

As it is seen in Table 5, the averages for the questionnaire results on EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities range between (2.60 – 4.15), and the highest arithmetic mean was in the first rank for paragraph (9). "The students would not like to participate in the speaking activity if the task is difficult," the arithmetic mean was (4.15) and the standard deviation was (0.393), and the arithmetic mean was in the second rank of the paragraph (8)."The students find shorter speaking activities much more fun," where it reached (4.08) and the standard deviation was (0.401),in the third rank was the paragraph (7)"The students would prefer a speaking activity when the instructor is eager for the task," the arithmetic mean was (4.01) and the standard deviation was (0.423), in the fourth rank was the paragraph (6)"The students would like to participate in the speaking activity if the task is easy," the arithmetic mean was (3.58) and the standard deviation was (0.452), in the fifth rank was the paragraph (10). "The students would like to

take part in the speaking activity if the task is easy," the arithmetic mean was (3.55) and the standard deviation was (0.552), in the sixth rank was the paragraph (2). "The students will not be bothered by the attitude of the instructor to the pair-work and group-work activities," the arithmetic mean was (3.52) and the standard deviation was (0.652), the seventh rank was the paragraph (3). "The students find it difficult to talk about topics that they are not familiar with," the arithmetic mean was (3.50) and the standard deviation was (0.751), and the eighth rank was the paragraph (1)."The students get bored if the speaking task takes too long," the arithmetic mean was (3.41) and the standard deviation was (0.854), and the ninth rank was the paragraph (4)"."The students get bored if the speaking task takes too long," the arithmetic means was (3.26) and the standard deviation was (0.952), and the lowest arithmetic mean was the paragraph (5). "The students like group work speaking activities," the arithmetic means was (2.60) and the standard deviation was (1.021).

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics about Perceptions of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
1.	The students get bored if the speaking task takes too long.	45.1%	25.4%	12.5%	9.5%	7.5%	3.41
2.	The students will not be bothered by the attitude of the instructor to the pair work and group-work activities.	52.1%	19.2%	15.3%	9.3%	4.1%	3.52
3.	The students find it difficult to talk about topics that they are not familiar with.	58.2%	14.2%	13.4%	8.7%	5.5%	3.60
4.	The students like pair-work activities in speaking.	60%	15.2%	8.6%	8.3%	7.9%	3.26
5.	The students like group work speaking activities.	55.4%	22.1%	10.9%	8.5%	3.1%	2.60
6.	The students would like to take part in the speaking activity if the task is easy.	56.2%	23.4%	8%	9.8%	2.6%	3.58
7.	The students would prefer speaking activity when the instructor is eager for the task.	67.2%	16.5%	8.8%	4.5%	3%	4.01

Table 6 (con) Descriptive Statistics about Perceptions of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
8.	The students find shorter speaking activities much more fun.	66.2%	11.5%	15.6%	5.4%	1.3%	4.08
9.	The students would not like to take part in the speaking activity if the task is difficult.	53.2%	19.2%	15%	8.8	3.8%	4.15
10.	The students perform better when they are familiar with the topics in the speaking task.	58.2%	20%	13%	6%	2.8%	3.55

Note: white colour=number, green colour= frequency.

Table 6 shows the averages and frequencies of the questionnaire items according to the Likert scale, and the arithmetic mean was between (2.60-4.18) and the highest arithmetic mean was the paragraph (9). "The students would not like to participate in the speaking activity if the task is difficult," and the lowest arithmetic mean was the paragraph (5). As it is demonstrated in Table 4.5, the most agreed item (n=350, 87.5%) was 'The students like pair-work activities in speaking," (Item=4). The majority of the respondents (n=350) agreed with this item. On the contrary, the least agreed item was (n=240, 60%) 'The students would prefer a speaking activity when the instructor is eager for the task,' (Item=7). Another highly agreed item was "The students perform better when they are familiar with the topics in the speaking task," (Item=10) with a percentage of 85% of the participants who agreed on this item (n=340).

A great majority of the participants (77.5%) agreed that the students like group-work speaking activities (item=5/n=310), stating that the students will not be bothered by the attitude of the instructor towards the pair-work and group-work activities (item=2/n=308, 77 %). In addition, a great number of instructors (n=300, 75%) said that the students get bored if the speaking task takes too long. Additionally, a majority of the instructors agreed that the students would not like to participate in the speaking activity if the task is difficult (n=291, 72.75%). Finally, more than half of the instructors (n=265, 66.25%) stated that the students find shorter speaking activities much more fun.

2. Overall perceptions of instructors on pair-work and group-work speaking activities (Interview 1A)

The researcher conducted an interview with the instructors to investigate their attitudes towards pair-work and group-work speaking activities. The qualitative data of the analysis are presented here. As it can be observed in Table 4.6 below, the first theme is *EFL instructors' attitudes toward pair-work and group-work speaking activities*, and there are two categories: namely, *supporters and opponents*. The most commonly raised issues by the participants will be unravelled in detail, along with the excerpts elicited from the interview.

Table 7 EFL Instructors' Attitudes towards Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

Theme 1: EFL Instructors' Attitudes towards Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities			
Category	Frequency	Code	Frequency
1. Supporters	70	Pair work is more frequently applied than group work	30
		Pair work activates students' previous knowledge more than group work	20
		Pair work improves students' speaking skill more than group work	10
		Pair work and group work improve students' critical thinking and their ability to solve problems	10
2. Opponents	30	Pair work and group work hinder the students from thinking individually	20
		Working in pairs or groups is loud and noisy	10

To begin with, under the first category 'supporters', 'P*air work is more frequently applied than group work*', was the most commonly raised issue among EFL instructors who advocate pair-work and group-work speaking activities. The majority of the participants stated that pair-work speaking activities can be easily applied to the students compared to group-work speaking activities. The participants justified their inclination towards pair-work speaking activities for several reasons. To elaborate, instructors 1 and 5 asserted that working in pairs gives the students the opportunity to be more engaged, motivated, and relaxed, whereas some of the students who work in groups are embarrassed to speak among their classmates, particularly low achievers. However, respondent 3 claimed that working in pairs makes the students more confident than working in groups.

Another interesting topic emerged from the data that *pair work activates students' previous knowledge more than group work*. The interviewees indicated that the students who speak with their classmates in pairs or in groups attempted to recall their previous knowledge and to connect it with the new knowledge, which in turn, improved their memory. Instructor 2 suggested that pair work and group work stimulate a recall of prior knowledge in which the students incorporate prior learning into current activities. Instructor 4 added that the students unknowingly relate their previous knowledge to current knowledge as illustrated in the following excerpt:

Pair work and group work create rapport atmosphere in the classroom. The students are more relaxed, motivated, and engaged when they are speaking with their classmates. Such feelings increase their previous knowledge that is applied into current knowledge.

Instructor 4

One of the participants believed that pair-work speaking activities improve students' speaking skills and students are more engaged in speaking activities when the task is concerned only with the improvement of their language proficiency level.

Instructor 6 indicated that she put her students in pairs and small groups to enable them to use the target language freely. She pointed out that she used this activity in the lead-in to warm the students up and to elicit the target language from them.

Another respondent indicated that pair-work and group-work speaking activities improve students' critical thinking and their ability to problem-solve. Instructor 7 stated that when he placed the students into pairs or groups, they thought critically of the task in which the students collaborated with each other to solve the task.

3. **RQ1B: What are the EFL instructors' overall perceptions of in-class application of pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking skills?**

The quantitative data derived from the second section of the questionnaire are presented here. The second section of the survey was about EFL instructors' perceptions of the implementation of pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking skills. There were 10 five-point Likert scale items in this section

as indicated in Table 7.

Table 8 Overall EFL Instructors' Perceptions of In-class Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work to Practise Speaking Activities

No.	Statement	N	Mean	Median	Code	Std. Deviation
1	The students find it easy to focus on the pair-work speaking activities.	100	3.61	3.00	4	0.562
2	The students use their mother tongues during pair-work speaking activities.	100	2.40	3.00	2	0.841
3	The students try to use English during pair-work speaking activities.	100	2.37	2.00	2	1.032
4	The students find it hard to focus on the task during pair-work speaking activities.	100	3.09	2.00	3	0.652
5	The students would like to have more pair-work speaking activities in the classroom.	100	2.31	2.00	2	1.025
6	The students try to share equal responsibilities with their partners during pair-work and group work speaking activities.	100	3.65	3.00	4	0.452
7	The students would prefer their partner to take more responsibilities than them during pair-work speaking activities.	100	3.41	3.00	4	0.509
8	There is an adequate number of pair-work speaking activities in the classroom.	100	3.28	3.00	3	0.552
9	There is adequate number of group-work speaking activities in the classroom.	100	2.46	3.00	2	0.652
10	The topics of the speaking tasks are appropriate to use previously learned grammar structures.	100	3.60	2.00	4	0.685

As it can be seen in Table 8, the averages for the questionnaire results on EFL instructors' perceptions of in-class application of pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking skills range between (2.31 – 3.65), and the highest arithmetic mean was the first rank for paragraph (6). "The students try to share equal responsibilities with their partners during pair-work and group-work speaking activities," the mean was (3.65) and the standard deviation was (0.453), where the arithmetic mean was the second rank of the paragraph (1). "The students find it easy to focus on the pair-work speaking activities," where it reached (3.61) and the

standard deviation was (0.562),in the third rank was the paragraph (10). "The topics of the speaking tasks are appropriate to use previously learned grammar structures," the arithmetic mean was (3.60) and the standard deviation was (0.685), in the fourth rank was the paragraph (7). "The students would prefer their partner to take more responsibilities than them during pair-work speaking activities," the arithmetic mean was (3.41) and the standard deviation was (0.509), in the fifth rank was the paragraph (8). "There is an adequate number of pair-work speaking activities in the classroom," the arithmetic mean was (3.28) and the standard deviation was (0.552), in the sixth rank was the paragraph (4). "The students find it hard to focus on the task during pair-work speaking activities," the arithmetic mean was (3.09) and the standard deviation was (0.652), in the seventh rank was the paragraph (9). "There is an adequate number of group-work speaking activities in the classroom," the arithmetic mean was (2.46) and the standard deviation was (0.652), in the eighth rank was the paragraph (2). "The students use their mother tongues during pair-work speaking activities," the arithmetic mean was (2.40) and the standard deviation was (0.841) and in the ninth rank was the paragraph (3). "The students try to use English during pair-work speaking activities," the arithmetic mean was (2.37) and the standard deviation was (1.032) and the lowest arithmetic mean was in paragraph (5). "The students would like to have more pair-work speaking activities in the classroom" was (2.31) and the standard deviation was (1.025).

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics about In-Class Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
1.	The students find it easy to focus on the pair-work speaking activities.	52.2%	30%	12%	4%	1.8%	3.61
2.	The students use their mother tongues during pair-work speaking activities.	55%	25.5%	10%	6%	3.5%	2.40
3.	The students try to use English during pair-work speaking activities.	45.5%	32%	15%	6%	1.5%	2.37
4.	The students find it hard to focus on the task during pair-work speaking activities.	55%	20%	10%	11%	4%	3.09

Table 9 (con) Descriptive Statistics about In-Class Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
5.	The students would like to have more pair-work speaking activities in the classroom.	59%	22%	8%	6%	5%	2.31
6.	The students try to share equal responsibilities with their partners during pair-work and group work speaking activities.	54%	25%	10%	6%	5%	3.65
7.	The students would prefer their partner to take more responsibilities than them during pair-work speaking activities.	52%	20%	10.2%	9.5%	8.3%	3.41
8.	There is an adequate number of pair-work speaking activities in the classroom.	48.5%	32%	14.2%	4%	1.3%	3.28
9.	There is adequate number of group-work speaking activities in the classroom.	40.5%	35.2%	15.5%	5.6%	3.2%	2.46
10.	The topics of the speaking tasks are appropriate to use previously learned grammar structures.	45%	30.3%	10%	10.6%	4.1%	3.60

Note: white colour=number, green colour= frequency.

Table 9 shows the arithmetic averages and frequencies of the questionnaire items according to the Likert scale. The arithmetic mean was between (2.31-3.65) and the highest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (6). "The students try to share equal responsibilities with their partners during pair-work and group-work speaking activities," while the lowest arithmetic mean was in paragraph (5).

As it is shown in Table 9, the most agreed item (n=346, 86.5%) was 'There is an adequate number of pair-work speaking activities in the classroom," (Item=8). The majority of the respondents (n=346) agreed on this item. On the contrary, the least agreed item was (n=240, 60%), 'The students use their mother tongues during pair-work speaking activities,' (Item=2). Another highly agreed item is "There is an adequate number of group-work speaking activities in the classroom," (Item=9) with 86.25% of the participants who agreed on this item (n=345).

A great majority of the participants (80%) agreed that the students would prefer their partner to take more responsibilities than them during pair-work speaking activities (Item=7/*n*=320) and stated that the students find it easy to focus on the pair-work speaking activities. (Item=1/*n*=260, 65 %). In addition, a great number of instructors (*n*=257, 64.25%) said that the students get bored if the speaking task takes too long. Additionally, a majority of the instructors agreed that the topics of the speaking tasks are appropriate to use previously learned grammar structures (*n*=254, 63.5%). Finally, more than half of the instructors (Item=3, *n*=250, 62.5%) stated that the students try to use English during pair-work speaking activities.

4.   RQ1B: In-class application of pair-work and group-work activities to practise speaking skills

The qualitative data analysis done related to the research question 'RQ1B' derived from the interviews with the instructors is illustrated here. As it can be observed in Table 9 under the second theme, the application *of pair and group-work*, six categories emerged which are *determining the number of implementing pair-work and group-work, monitoring, error correction, differentiated instruction* and *identifying the students' needs*. The most commonly raised issues by the instructors will be identified in detail in the following part with the excerpts elicited from the interviews.

Table 10 Theme 2: In-Class Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

Category	Frequency	Codes	Frequency
Pair-Work and Group-Work Number	40	Pair work activity should be implemented in each lesson.	20
		The pair work should be applied three times per weak	10
		Group work should be implemented twice a weak	10
Monitoring	20	Setting a time for the activity, giving the students clear-cut instructions, and checking students' comprehension.	20
Error Correction	20	I tend to use observation while the students are working in pairs or in groups in order to write and correct their errors in the second stage, namely, error correction.	20
Using their first language	10	The intermediate level students tend to use their first language during speaking activities due to their inability to use the second language.	10
Identifying the Students' Needs	10	I do not ask the students to choose their partners, but rather I change the partner from time to time.	10

Under the first category 'pair work and group work number', '*pair-work activity should be implemented in each lesson*', was the most commonly raised issue among EFL instructors who are in favour of applying pair work on a daily basis. Twenty per cent of the participants stated that pair-work speaking activities should be applied in the lead-in to engage the students and as freer practice by the end of the lesson. The participants believed that using pair-work speaking activities daily enables the students to use the target language, which in turn improves student fluency. To elaborate, instructors 1 and 3 asserted that using pair-work activities twice in the lesson plan enables the students to be more accustomed to using the target language, which plays a pivotal role in improving their communicative competence.

However, instructor 4 argued that pair work should be applied three times per week. He claimed that individual work should be implemented twice a week, whereas pair work should be implemented twice a week. He pointed out that there should be a balance between individual work and pair work because the former increases student autonomy while the latter improves student engagement. On the other hand, instructor 2 pointed out that group work should be implemented twice a week. He indicated that he tends to use group-work activities in the classroom to improve student language proficiency by diversifying his teaching methods, focusing on real-world and authentic scenarios, and giving written and clear instructions.

Under the second category 'monitoring', one interesting issue was aroused, namely, 'setting a time for the activity, giving the students clear-cut instructions, and checking student comprehension in which instructors 5 and 7 claimed that the teacher should monitor the students while placing them into pairs and groups by grading his/her language, and giving them clear instructions, asking the students if everything is comprehensible to guarantee that the activity is comprehensible.

Another interesting topic aroused from the data that *error correction* is considered as one of the important topics to be implemented in the classroom. The interviewees 6 and 8 indicated that they tend to use observation while the students are working in pairs or in groups in order to write and correct their errors in the second stage, namely, error correction. They claimed that after pair-work and group-work speaking activities, error correction in the classroom is one of the most important stages to correct the student errors and to give them summative feedback.

They indicated that they used indirect corrective feedback without embarrassing the students i.e., by writing their errors on the board and asking them how the whole class can improve these sentences.

The fourth category that springs from 'the implementation of pair-work and group-work speaking activities' is using the first language while speaking with their classmates. Instructor 9 said that mixing students with different abilities and learning styles might constitute a challenge for low achievers who are unable to compete with high achievers as indicated in the following excerpt:

Some of the low-level students avoid speaking in front of their classmates who are higher than them. Therefore, they tend to use their first language while speaking with their classmates. Therefore, I give the students simple tasks that are compatible with their levels. I tell them that they will be awarded if they use the second language purely without first language interference. I deliberately inclined towards doing that to encourage the students.

Instructor 9

The last intriguing topic that emerges from the second theme is 'identifying students' needs'. Instructor 10 pointed out that pair-work and group-work activities are not applied randomly, but rather they are applied after identifying the students' needs, interests, abilities, preferences, and motivations.

The interviewees further highlighted the importance of improvised speech or *impromptu speech*. They underscored the importance of speaking freely and spontaneously without being prepared. To support this claim, instructor 3 indicated that it is advantageous for students to speak in pairs or in groups to improve their speaking fluency. However, if they speak beforehand, it will hinder them from improving their speaking fluency. Instructor 9 is in line with instructor 3 by revealing that the students have the opportunity to practise daily life and authentic conversations by impromptu speaking activities.

5.   RQ1C&D: What are the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking skills?

The findings of the analysis done on the quantitative data derived from the third section of the questionnaire are presented here. The third section of the survey

was about the EFL instructors' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities.

Table 11 Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

No.	Statement	N	Mean	Median	Code	Std. Deviation
1	Pair work and group work are an appropriate technique used in English speaking classrooms.	100	3.61	3.00	3	0.824
2	Pair work and group work give students more opportunities to speak English in the class.	100	2.24	2.00	2	0.984
3	When students work in pairs and groups, they are more active than in other classroom setting.	100	2.19	2.00	2	1.015
4	Students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually.	100	2.01	2.00	2	1.025
5	Pair work and group work are an effective technique for dealing with mixed- ability speaking classes.	100	2.30	2.00	2	0.912
6	Through pair work and group work, students can make up for lacking of language items.	100	3.41	3.00	4	0.845
7	Pair work and group work create more chances for students to discover their own speaking ability.	100	3.51	3.00	4	0.895
8	Pair work and group work create more opportunities for students to increase their talking time as much as possible.	100	3.45	3.00	4	0.751
9	Pair work and group work maximize students' usage of language, reduces stress and requires students to think.	100	4.02	3.00	4	0.652
10	There may be ineffective communication when pair and group members seem to be misunderstanding each other.	100	4.09	3.00	4	0.548

As can be seen in Table 11, the arithmetic averages of the questionnaire results on EFL instructors' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities range between (2.01 – 4.09), and the highest arithmetic mean was the first rank for paragraph (10). "There may be ineffective communication when pair and group members seem to be misunderstanding," the mean was (4.09) and the standard deviation was (0.548),

where the arithmetic mean was in the second rank of the paragraph(9). "Pair work and group work maximize students' usage of language, reduces stress and requires students to think," where it reached (4.02) and the standard deviation was (0.652), in the third rank was the paragraph (1). "Pair work and group work are appropriate techniques used in English language classrooms, "the arithmetic mean was (3.61) and the standard deviation was (0.824), in the fourth rank was the paragraph (7). "Students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually," the arithmetic mean was (3.51) and the standard deviation was (0.895), in the fifth rank was the paragraph (8). "Pair work and group work create more opportunities for students to increase their talking time as much as possible," the arithmetic mean was (3.45) and the standard deviation was (0.751), in the sixth rank was the paragraph (6). "Through pair work and group work, students can make up for lack of language items," the arithmetic mean was (3.41) and the standard deviation was (0.845), in the seventh rank was the paragraph (5). "Pair work and group work are effective techniques for dealing with mixed-ability speaking classes," the arithmetic mean was (2.30) and the standard deviation was (0.912), in the eighth rank was the paragraph (2). "Pair work and group work give students more opportunities to speak English in the class," the arithmetic mean was (2.24) and the standard deviation was (0.984), and the ninth rank was the paragraph (3). "When students work in pairs and groups, they are more active than in other classroom setting, "the arithmetic means was (2.19) and the standard deviation was (1.015) and the lowest arithmetic mean was in paragraph (4). "Students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually," the arithmetic mean was (2.01) and the standard deviation was (1.025).

Table 12 Descriptive Statistics about Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
1.	Pair work and group work are an appropriate technique used in English speaking classrooms.	67.5%	20%	2.5%	6.25%	3.75%	3.61
2.	Pair work and group work give students more opportunities to speak English in the class.	65%	15.2%	3.41%	14.25%	2.14%	2.24
3.	When students work in pairs and groups, they are more active than in other classroom setting.	55.4%	32.2%	3.5%	2.5%	6.4%	2.19
4.	Students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually.	35.2%	55.6%	12.5%	4.7%	4.5%	2.01
5.	Pair work and group work are an effective technique for dealing with mixed- ability speaking classes.	65%	20.5%	10.2%	2.2%	2.1%	2.30
6.	Through pair work and group work, students can make up for lacking of language items.	49.2%	32.2%	15%	2.5%	1.1%	3.41
7.	Pair work and group work create more chances for students to discover their own speaking ability.	45.5%	33.6%	11.1%	5.4%	4.4%	3.51
8.	Pair work and group work create more opportunities for students to increase their talking time as much as possible.	58%	18.8%	12.3%	1.1%	9.8%	3.45
9.	Pair work and group work maximize students' usage of language, reduces stress and requires students to think.	48.2%	21%	14.2%	6.6%	10%	4.02
10.	There may be ineffective communication when pair and group members seem to be misunderstanding each other.	52.1%	20.2%	10.3%	8.4	9%	4.09

Note: white colour=number, green colour= frequency.

Table 12 shows the arithmetic averages and frequencies of the questionnaire

items according to the Likert scale, and the arithmetic mean was between (2.01-4.09) and the highest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (10). "There may be ineffective communication when pair and group members seem to misunderstand each other while the lowest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (4). "Students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually."

As it is shown in Table 12, the most agreed item (n=380, 95%) was "when students work in pairs and groups, they are more active than in other classroom setting," (Item=3). The majority of the respondents (n=380) agreed on this item. On the other hand, the least agreed item was (n=285, 71.25%). "Pair work and group work give students more opportunities to speak English in the class," (Item=2). Another highly agreed item was "pair work and group work create more chances for students to discover their own speaking ability," (Item=7) with 94.25% of the participants who agreed on this item (n=377).

A great majority of the participants (90.75%) agreed that through pair work and group work, students can make up for lack of language items, (Item=3/n=363), and stated that pair work and group work are appropriate techniques used in English speaking classrooms, (Item=1/n=350, 87.5 %). In addition, a great number of instructors (n=349, 87.25%) stated that the students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually. Additionally, the majority of the instructors agreed that pair work and group work create more opportunities for students to increase their talking time as much as possible, (n=335, 83.75%). Finally, three quarters of the instructors (item=10, n=313, 87.25%) stated that there may be ineffective communication when pair and group members seem to misunderstand each other.

6.   Advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities

Findings on the RQ1D of the first research question collected from the interviews with the instructors are illustrated here. As demonstrated in Table 4.12 below, under the second theme, *the Advantages of Pair Work and Group Work,* three categories appeared *improving student speaking fluency, increasing student collaboration and engagement,* and *improving student creativity and problem-solving skills.* The most commonly raised issues by the instructors will be unravelled

in detail in the following part with the excerpts elicited from the interviews.

Table 13 Advantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

Theme 3: Advantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities			
Category	Frequency	Code	Frequency
Improving students' speaking skill.	60	Pair-work activities increase student- talking time.	30
		Pair work activities enable the students to give their opinions independently.	20
		Group work activities improve students' oral production.	10
Increasing students' collaboration.	20	Pair work increases students' engagement and collaboration.	10
		Group work improves students' social skills.	10
Improving students' creativity and problem-solving skills.	20	In pair work and group work the students become more creative in solving the task.	20

The first category that falls under the theme 'the advantages of pair work and group work speaking activities' is entitled 'improving student speaking skill', was the most frequently raised topic among the respondents who believe that both pair-work and group-work activities play a pivotal role in improving students' communicative competence. Thirty per cent of the respondents claimed that pair-work activities are student-centred rather than teacher centred. Three respondents T1, T3, and T4 stated that the students play a critical role in pair-work or group-work activities because they give the students the opportunity to speak and to use the target language as illustrated in the following excerpt:

The teacher only facilitates the information in pair-work and group-work activities, while the biggest role lies in the students who work in pairs or in groups; the students seek as much as possible to use the target language.

Teacher 4

On the other hand, twenty per cent of the instructors believed that pair-work speaking activities enabled the students to give their opinions independently. Two participants T2 and T5 stated that pair-work speaking activities enabled the students to become confident and independent as indicated in the following excerpt:

The students who work in pairs give their opinions, discuss a certain topic

and talk about their experiences without fear of making mistakes or being judged. Therefore, pair work improves student autonomy and makes the students independent learners.

Teacher 2

Similarly, ten per cent of the instructors indicated that group-work speaking activities improved student speaking skills. One EFL instructor T7 suggested that each student in group-work activities expresses ideas and listens to classmates. As a result, their speaking proficiency improved as indicated in the following excerpt:

Group-work activities increase the negotiation skill among the students who discuss with each other a particular subject by using the second language. I tend to place the students into groups to increase their critical thinking and to enable them to use the target language. After using this strategy for several times, I observed that the students' speaking skill improved significantly.

Teacher 7

The second category that falls under the third theme entitled "increasing student collaboration," was the second frequently raised topic among the participants. One of the participants T6 postulated that pair work increased student engagement and collaboration. The participant pointed out that the students are more engaged when they work in pairs more than working individually as indicated in the following excerpt:

Pair work improves student motivation, collaboration, and engagement. All of these aspects are essential to increase student productivity. The students listen to their partners' ideas, experiences, and solutions and suggest their ideas as well. As a consequence, they become more engaged.

Instructor 6

However, another EFL instructor T8 argued that group work increased students' social skills. He believed that group work enabled the students to respect their classmates, to listen to them, and to pay more attention. Therefore, group work enhances students' social skills.

Under the third category 'improving students' creativity and problem-solving skills', twenty per cent of EFL instructors suggested that in pair work and group

work the students become more creative in solving the task. Two participants T9 and T10 pointed out that either in pair- work or group-work activities the students develop their creativity by giving their point of views and their ideas towards solving the problem as indicated in the following excerpt:

Placing students into pairs or groups has a number of advantages that are not only reflected on their ability to improve their communicative competence but also reflected on their ability to solve problems, give their opinions, and develop their creativity.

7. Disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities

The analysis of the qualitative data concerning RQ1Dion (c) of the second part of first research question elicited from the interviews with the instructors is illustrated here. As it can be indicated in Table 4.13 under the fourth theme, *the disadvantages of pair and group-work*, five categories emerged which are *language interference in group work, students' attitudes and behaviours in group work, and poor communication in pair work*. The following section presents the commonly raised topics by EFL instructors in detail with the excerpts taken from the interviews.

Table 14 Theme 4 Disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

Category	Frequency	Codes	Frequency
Language interference in group work.	50	Students might not be engaged and feel bored.	20
		Lack of students' vocabulary knowledge.	10
		The inability to compose English sentences.	10
		The students' lack of comprehension of the task.	10
Students' attitudes and behaviours in group work.	30	The students' demotivation.	10
		The students' feelings of embarrassment.	10
		The students' unfamiliarity with the target language.	10
Poor communication in pair work.	20	The poor of communication skills.	20

As shown in Table 14 above, three categories stem from the fourth theme entitled "the disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities". Under the first category "first language interference in group work" four codes are

emanated; students might not be engaged and feel bored, the students might not have sufficient vocabulary knowledge, the students might be unable to compose English sentences, and the students' inability to comprehend the task. The first category was the most frequently raised topic among the participants with a percentage of 50%. To elaborate, two of the respondents T1 and T3 claimed that the students might not be engaged and they might feel bored during group-work activities; thus, they use their first language as illustrated in the following excerpt:

The students might not be engaged or motivated to perform a task in group-work activities, particularly when the students are unfamiliar with the speaking activity. Such a situation leads them to use their first language. To overcome this problem, the teacher should identify students' needs and preferences.

Instructor 3

One of the respondents T4 pointed out that the first language interference in group activities is attributed to the fact that the students do not have sufficient knowledge of vocabulary. Ten per cent of the participants believed that such a problem leads to first-language interference in group activities as illustrated in the following excerpt:

The lack of knowledge of vocabulary hinders the students from communicating with each other. Therefore, some of them avoid speaking with each other because they do not have solid vocabulary knowledge. To overcome this problem, the teacher should acknowledge the students with a number of vocabulary items that might be used in the speaking activities.

Instructor 4

Another interviewee T6 indicated that some students face difficulties in composing well-structured sentences. Ten per cent of them pointed out that they are unable to put words together to form grammatical sentences as indicated in the following excerpt:

The lack of grammatical knowledge among the students hinders them from communicating with their classmates. In other words, their inability to put their ideas into words hinders them from applying group-work activities effectively.

Instructor 6

Along with similar lines, interviewee T7 argued that the students' lack of comprehension of the task obstructs them from performing the speaking task effectively with their classmates. Ten per cent of them indicated that the students should fully comprehend the task as illustrated in the following excerpt:

The students might not be interested in performing the speaking activity because they do not comprehend the task or their role. Therefore, the teachers should check students' comprehension before placing them into pairs or groups by writing the instructions on the board and modelling the task to guarantee that all the participants are on the right path.

Instructor 7

Under the second category "*students' attitudes and behaviours*", three codes are emanated, namely, *the students' demotivation, the students' feeling of embarrassment,* and *the students' unfamiliarity with the target language*. The second category was the second frequently raised topic among the participants with a percentage of 30%. To illustrate, ten per cent of the participants claimed that the students might be demotivated towards applying the speaking activity because they have negative attitudes towards applying this activity. The following excerpt revealed T2 perception regarding such an issue:

There are a variety of reasons for students' demotivation towards applying speaking activities in the classroom; including students' high level of anxiety, the students' inability to engage with their classmates nor with the activity, the students' fear of making mistakes, and the students' fear of being observed by their teacher and their classmates.

Instructor 2

Another interviewee claimed that the students might be embarrassed of speaking in public. Ten per cent of the participants stated that such a feeling is considered as a major reason for the disadvantages of group-work speaking activities as indicated in the following excerpt by T8:

The reasons for students' feelings of embarrassment towards speaking is considered as one of the negative attitudes that hinders students' from improving

their speaking fluency and from participating with their classmates because of their fear of making mistakes, their lack of self-esteem, and their poor communication skills. Therefore, they avoid and loath group- work speaking activities.

Instructor 8

Ten per cent of the respondents indicated that the students might have negative attitudes towards group-work speaking activities due to their unfamiliarity with the target language. T9 indicated that the students' unfamiliarity with the target language is attributed to their lack of exposure to the target language as pointed out in the following excerpt:

The students' lack of exposure to the target language in terms of speaking, listening, reading, and writing limits the students' knowledge of the second language, which in turn, hinders them from using it effectively.

Instructor 9

Under the third category 'poor of speaking skill', 20% of the interviewees stated that poor communication skills in pair work hinder students from communicating with their classmates. T5 and T10 believed that lack of comprehension, lack of motivation, shyness and anxiety are the main reasons and the fact that some students steal the spotlight without giving other students the opportunity to speak.

D. RQ2: What are the Suggestions of EFL Instructors Regarding the Application Procedure of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities in Practicing Speaking Skills?

The findings of the quantitative data analysis stemmed from the fourth part of EFL instructors' questionnaires are elaborated here. The fourth part of the survey revolved the suggestions of EFL instructors concerning the execution of pair and group work activities in practicing speaking skills. There were 10 four-point Likert scale items in such section.

Table 15 EFL instructors' Suggestions about Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

No.	Statement	N	Mean	Median	Code	Std. Deviation
1	The students would like their teacher to determine the speaking topic.	100	3.68	3.00	4	0.504
2	The students would like their teacher to determine their speaking partner.	100	2.35	2.00	2	0.785
3	The students would like their teacher to pre-teach the target vocabulary about the task.	100	2.26	2.00	2	0.658
4	The students would like their teacher to guide them about the speaking task.	100	2.19	2.00	2	1.056
5	The students would like to change their speaking partner for each task.	100	2.09	2.00	2	1.021
6	The students would like to have a different-proficiency-level partner for each task.	100	3.41	3.00	4	0.756
7	The students would like to practice the task with their partners only.	100	3.50	3.00	4	0.652
8	The students would like to perform the task to all their classmates.	100	3.59	3.00	4	0.325
9	The students would like to have speaking classes in addition to the main course.	100	3.60	3.00	4	0.569
10	The students would like to have time for preparation to the task.	100	3.40	3.00	3	0.552

Table 15 indicates that the arithmetic averages for the questionnaire results on EFL instructors' suggestions about pair-work and group-work speaking activities range between (2.09 - 3.68), and the highest arithmetic mean was in the first rank for paragraph (1). "The students would like their teacher to determine the speaking topic, "the mean was (3.68) and the standard deviation was (0.504), where the arithmetic mean was in the second rank of the paragraph (9). The students would like to have speaking classes in addition to the main course," where it reached (3.60) and the standard deviation was (0.569),in the third rank was the paragraph (8)." The students would like to perform the task to all their classmates," the arithmetic mean was (3.59) and the standard deviation was (0.325), in the fourth rank was the paragraph (7)." The students would like to practise the task with their partners only" the arithmetic mean was (3.50) and the standard deviation was (0.652), in the fifth rank was the paragraph (6). "The students would like to have a different-proficiency-level partner for each task," the arithmetic mean was (3.41), the standard deviation

was (0.756) and in the sixth rank was the paragraph (10). "The students would like to have time for preparation to the task," the arithmetic mean was (3.40), the standard deviation was (0.552) and in the seventh rank was the paragraph (2). "The students would like their teacher to determine their speaking partner," the arithmetic mean was (2.35), the standard deviation was (0.785) and in the eighth rank was the paragraph (3). "The students would like their teacher to pre-teach the target vocabulary about the task," The arithmetic mean was (2.26), the standard deviation was (0.658) and the ninth rank was the paragraph (4). "The students would like their teacher to guide them about the speaking task, "The arithmetic mean was (2.19), the standard deviation was (1.056), while the lowest arithmetic mean was in paragraph (5). "The students would like to change their speaking partner for each task" the arithmetic mean was (2.09), the standard deviation was (1.021).

Table 16 Descriptive Statistics about EFL Instructors' Suggestions

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
1.	The students would like their teacher to determine the speaking topic.	52.2%	26%	12%	6%	3.8%	3.68
2.	The students would like their teacher to determine their speaking partner.	50%	25%	11%	9.5%	4.5%	2.35
3.	The students would like their teacher to pre-teach the target vocabulary about the task.	57%	19%	14%	4.8%	5.2%	2.26
4.	The students would like their teacher to guide them about the speaking task.	51.2	26%	11%	8.7%	3.1%	2.19
5.	The students would like to change their speaking partner for each task.	49.2%	30%	14%	1.3%	5.5%	2.09
6.	The students would like to have a different-proficiency-level partner for each task.	48.4%	23.2%	14.5%	5.5%	8.4%	3.41
7.	The students would like to practice the task with their partners only.	45%	30%	14%	9.2%	1.8%	3.50
8.	The students would like to perform the task to all their classmates.	55%	17%	12%	10%	6%	3.59
9.	The students would like to have speaking classes in addition to the main course.	49%	24%	13.5%	8%	5.5%	3.60
10.	The students would like to have time for preparation to the task.	45.2%	35%	7.1%	7.2%	5.5%	3.40

Note: white colour=number, green colour= frequency.

Table 16 shows the arithmetic averages and frequencies of the questionnaire items according to the Likert scale, and the arithmetic mean was between (2.09-3.65) where the highest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (1). "The students would like their teacher to determine the speaking topic," while the lowest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (5). "The students would like to change their speaking partner for each task,

"As it is shown in Table 16, the most agreed item (n=380, 95%) was "The students would like to have a different-proficiency-level partner for each task," (Item=6). The majority of the respondents (n=380) agreed on this item. However, the least agreed item was (n=294, 73. 5%) "The students would like to change their speaking partner for each class," (Item=5). Another highly agreed item was "The students would like their teacher to pre-teach the target vocabulary about the task," (Item=3) with 85.75% of the participants who agreed on this item (n=343).

The great majority of the participants (84.75%) agreed that the students would like their teacher to determine their speaking partner (item=2/n=339), stating that the students would like their teacher to determine the speaking topic, (item=1/n=330, 82.5 %). In addition, a great number of instructors (n=310, 77.5%) stated that the students would like to perform the task to all their classmates. Additionally, the majority of the instructors agreed that they would like their teacher to guide them about the speaking task (n=309, 77.25%). Finally, more than half of the instructors (item=7, n=300, 75%) said that the students would only like to practise the task with their partners.

1.   EFL Instructors' Suggestions on the Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

The analysis of the qualitative data concerning the second research question elicited from the interviews with the instructors is illustrated here. As it can be indicated in Table 16 under the fifth theme, *the suggestions about pair-work and group-work*, three categories emerged which are *students' preferences and needs, allocating sufficient time for the speaking activity, and monitoring the students*. The following section presents the commonly raised topics by EFL instructors in detail with the excerpts taken from the interviews.

Table 17 Theme 5 EFL Instructors' Suggestions on the Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

Category	Frequency	Codes	Frequency
Students' preferences and needs	60	The speaking activities might not achieve the learning objectives.	40
Allocating time for speaking activity	20	The speaking activities might take a long time or vice versa.	20
Monitoring the students	20	Poor monitoring	20

As it is seen in Table 17, there are three categories emanated from the fifth theme entitled 'EFL instructors' suggestions about pair-work and group-work speaking activities.' Under the first category 'students' preferences and needs,' one code is stemmed, namely, the speaking activities might not achieve the learning objectives. The first category was the most frequently raised topic among the participants with the percentage of 60%. To illustrate, six of the interviewees T1, T3, T5, T6, T8, and T10 pointed out that the students' communicative competence might not be improved when the speaking activities do not fulfil students' needs and inclinations as illustrated in the following excerpt:

The teacher should identify the students' weak and strong points, their tendencies, and their needs. The speaking activities should have a particular objective, which is improving students' communicative competence or improving students' critical thinking.

Instructor 8

Under the second category "allocating time for speaking activities," one code is emanated which is the speaking activities might take a long time or vice versa. To elaborate, two of the interviewees T2 and T4 indicated that the teacher should allocate a reasonable time for the speaking activities as indicated in the following excerpt:

The time for the speaking activities should be sufficient for the whole students to be involved. The teacher should determine the time for each speaking activity because it varies from one speaking activity to another. Therefore, the time of pair-work and group-work speaking activities relies heavily on the task.

Instructor 4

Under the third category "monitoring the students", one code is emanated

which is poor monitoring. To clarify, two of the interviewees T7 and T9 indicated that the teacher should monitor the students without affecting the flow of communication as indicated in the following excerpt:

Placing the students into pairs or groups might make the classroom sound noisy and loud. Therefore, the teacher should give clear instructions for the tasks, check students' comprehension, guide the students with learning difficulties, and observe the students to guarantee that all of them are engaged.

E. RQ3: What are the EFL Instructors' Possible Reasons for Inadequate Benefitting of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities in Practising Speaking Skills?

1. Possible reasons for inadequate benefitting of pair-work and group-work speaking activities

The findings of the quantitative data analysis stemmed from the fifth part of EFL instructors' questionnaires are elaborated here. The fifth section of the survey focused on the suggestions of EFL instructors concerning the application of pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking skills. There were 10 five-point Likert scale items in each section.

Table 18 EFL Instructors' Possible Reasons for inadequate Benefiting

No.	Statement	N	Mean	Median	Code	Std. Deviation
1	The lack of motivation of the instructor to conduct speaking activities.	100	2.84	3.00	3	1.012
2	The lack of motivation of the student to perform speaking activities.	100	3.64	3.00	4	0.751
3	Time constraint to implement speaking activities.	100	2.38	3.00	2	0.995
4	Overcrowded class that hinder the application of speaking tasks.	100	3.26	2.00	2	0.652
5	Loaded curriculum on a daily or weekly basis.	100	2.01	2.00	2	1.112
6	Speaking tasks that do not appeal to their interest.	100	3.54	3.00	4	0.741
7	Tasks that are above the students' proficiency level.	100	3.41	3.00	4	0.658
8	Tasks of the book that do not attract their attention.	100	4.02	3.00	4	0.598
9	The students are unable to transfer their emotions by using the second language.	100	4.18	3.00	4	0.487
10	The students are not familiar with pair and group work activities in their mother tongue classes.	100	4.12	3.00	4	0.551

As It is seen in Table 18, the arithmetic averages for reasons for inadequate benefiting range between (2.01 – 4.18) and the highest arithmetic mean was the first rank for paragraph (9)."The students are unable to transfer the students' emotions to the second language," the highest arithmetic mean was (4.18) and the standard deviation was (0.487), where the arithmetic mean was in the second rank of the paragraph(10). "The students are not familiar with pair-work and group-work activities in the students' mother tongue classes," where it reached (4.12), the standard deviation was (0.551) and the third rank was the paragraph (8). "Tasks of the book that do not attract the students' attention," the arithmetic mean was (4.02), the standard deviation was (0.598), and in the fourth rank was the paragraph (2). "Lack of motivation of the student to perform speaking activities," the arithmetic mean was (3.64), the standard deviation was (0.751) and in the fifth rank was the paragraph (6). "Speaking tasks that do not appeal to their interest," the arithmetic mean was (3.54) and the standard deviation was (0.741), in the sixth rank was the paragraph (7). "Tasks that are above the students' proficiency level," the arithmetic mean was (3.41), the standard deviation was (0.658) and in the seventh rank was the paragraph (3). "Time -constraint to implement speaking activities, " the arithmetic mean was (2.38), the standard deviation was (0.995) and in the eighth rank was the paragraph (4). "Overcrowded class that hinders the application of speaking tasks," the arithmetic mean was (3.26),the standard deviation was (0.652), and the ninth rank was the paragraph (1). "Lack of motivation of the instructor to conduct speaking activities," the arithmetic mean was (2.84) and the standard deviation was (1.012), while the lowest arithmetic mean was in paragraph (5). "Loaded curriculum on a daily or weekly basis," the arithmetic mean was (2.01) and the standard deviation (1.112).

Table 19 Descriptive Statistics about Reasons for Not Using Pair-Work and Group-Work

No.	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means
1.	The lack of motivation of the instructor to conduct speaking activities.	44%	35%	15%	4%	2%	3.65
2.	The lack of motivation of the student to perform speaking activities.	52%	28.2%	5.8%	9%	5%	3.75
3.	Time constraint to implement speaking activities.	46%	31%	12%	5%	6%	3.26
4.	Overcrowded class that hinder the application of speaking tasks.	47%	27.5%	11%	6.9%	7.6%	3.17
5.	Loaded curriculum on a daily or weekly basis.	48%	23%	18%	3.8%	7.2%	3.25
6.	Speaking tasks that do not appeal to their interest.	60%	20%	7%	6%	5%	3.61
7.	Tasks that are above the students' proficiency level.	289	54	24	23	10	3.15
8.	Tasks of the book that do not attract the students' attention	46.5%	10.5%	20.4	15%	7.6%	3.64
9.	The students are unable to transfer the students' emotions to the second language.	50.2%	12.5%	13.55%	15.25%	8.5%	3.55
10.	The students are not familiar with pair and group work activities in the students' mother tongue classes.	55.6%	15.3%	20.3%	6.3%	2.5%	3.59

Note: white colour=number, green colour= frequency.

Table 19 shows the arithmetic averages and frequencies of the questionnaire items according to the Likert scale, and the arithmetic mean between (2.01-4.18) and the highest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (9). "The students are unable to transfer the students' emotions to the second language," while the lowest arithmetic mean was in the paragraph (5).

As it is shown in Table 19, the most agreed item was (n=360, 90%), "The students are not familiar with pair-work and group-work activities in their mother

tongue classes," (Item=10). The majority of the respondents (n=360) agreed on this item. On the contrary, the least agreed item was (n=304, 76%) "time- constraint to implement speaking activities," (Item=3). Another highly agreed item was "Speaking tasks that do not appeal to their interest," (Item=6) with (86.75%) of the participants agreed on this item (n=347).

A great majority of the participants (85.75%) agreed that the tasks are above the students' proficiency level (Item=7/n=343), stating that the curriculum was loaded on a daily or weekly basis (Item=5/n=341, 85.25 %). Additionally, a great number of instructors (n=330, 82.5%) indicated that the instructor lacked motivation to conduct speaking activities. Additionally, the majority of the instructors agreed that the students lacked motivation to perform speaking activities, (n=318, 79.5%). Finally, more than half of the instructors (item=4, n=308, 77%) stated that overcrowded class hindered the application of speaking tasks.

2.   4.5.2 EFL Instructors' Reasons for Not Using Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

The analysis of the qualitative data concerning the third research question elicited from the interviews with the instructors is illustrated here. As it can be indicated in Table 18 under the sixth theme, *the possible reasons for inadequate benefitting*, four categories emerged which are *the regular use of similar speaking activities from the book, the teacher might not take into consideration students' profile, the quality of speaking task,* and *the cultural factors affect the students from indulging in speaking activities.* The following section presents the commonly raised topics by EFL instructors in detail with the excerpts taken from the interviews.

Table 20 Theme 6 EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Possible Reasons of
Inadequate Benefitting of Pair and Group Work Speaking Activities

Category	Frequency	Codes	Frequency
The regular use of similar speaking activities from the book.	50	The feeling of boredom.	30
		The stability of students' speaking performance.	20
		The lack of motivation.	10
The teacher might not take into consideration students' profile.	30	The speaking activities might not be in line with students' proficiency levels and age.	20
		The speaking activity might not attract the students.	10
The quality of the speaking task.	10	The speaking task might be beyond the students' levels or vice versa.	10
Cultural factors.	10	The dialectal differences.	10

A closer inspection of Table 20 above reveals that there are four categories emanated from the sixth theme entitled 'EFL instructors' perceptions of possible reasons for inadequate benefitting from pair-work and group-work speaking activities'. Under the first category 'students' preferences and needs'; three codes are emanated from the first category, namely, the feeling of boredom, the stability of students' speaking performance, and the lack of motivation. The first category was the most frequently raised topic among the participants with the percentage 50%. To illustrate, three per cent of the respondents T2, T10, and T6 indicated that the students' feelings of boredom due to the repetitive use of the speaking activity is considered as one of the reasons for inadequate benefitting from pair-work and group-work speaking activities as illustrated in the following excerpt:

The feeling of boredom due to the repetitive use of the speaking activities from the book without preparing more fun speaking activities for the students obstruct the students from taking advantage of pair-work and group-work speaking activities.

Instructor 6

The second code that stems from the first category is the stability of student speaking performance. Twenty per cent of the participants, particularly T1 and T4 stated that the speaking activities that are repeated frequently might not achieve the learning objectives. The following excerpt shows T1 perception towards such a code:

Repeating the speaking activities over and over again will stabilize the students' levels because they are not acquiring new information. Therefore, the teacher should diversify the speaking activities in the classroom.

Instructor 1

The third code that stems from the first category is the lack of student motivation. Ten per cent of the interviewees indicated that the repetitive use of speaking activities might make the students demotivated. The following excerpt embodies T3 perception towards this code:

The students become demotivated when the speaking activities are not creative or when they are repeated in a considerable manner. The teacher should pay attention to this aspect because when the students are demotivated, they will not be productive.

Instructor 3

Under the second category 'The teacher might not take into consideration student profile" two codes are emanated: the first one is that the speaking activities might not be in line with student proficiency levels and age, whereas the second code is that the speaking activity might not attract the students. The second category was the second commonly raised topic among the participants with a percentage of 30. To clarify, twenty per cent of the interviewees, particularly T4 and T5 pointed out that the speaking activities might be different from students' levels and age as indicated in the following excerpt:

The students might avoid participating in speaking activities that are different from their levels and their age. We cannot give intermediate students the same speaking activities that are given to the advanced students or vice versa. Moreover, the speaking activities that are provided to the 5 year-old- students are inapplicable for 15 year-old-students. Therefore, such differences should be taken into account.

Otherwise, pairing and/or grouping students will be in vain.

Instructor 5

Ten per cent of the respondents indicated that the speaking activities might sound boring, repetitive, and insignificant. As a result, the students might not feel interested in participating in such activities. The following excerpt illustrates T7's perception regarding such a code:

The speaking activities that are boring and insignificant might alienate students from engaging with their classmates. The teacher should renew the tasks and speaking activities for the students to increase students' engagement and participation.

Instructor 7

Under the third category 'the quality of the speaking task' one code is emanated, namely, the speaking task might be beyond the students' levels or vice versa. Ten per cent of the participant believed that the speaking activities should not be too difficult or too easy for the students, but rather it should be in-between. The following excerpt illustrates T8's perception concerning such a category:

The speaking activities should not be extremely difficult for the students to the extent that increases their fear of speaking. Similarly, they should not be too easy to the extent that stabilizes their English proficiency level.

Instructor 8

Ten per cent of the participants argued that the cultural factor is regarded as one of the reasons for inadequate benefitting from pair-work and group-work speaking activities, which falls under the fourth category. One code is emanating from the fourth category, which is the dialectical differences. The following excerpt reveals T10's perception regarding the fourth theme:

Undoubtedly the cultural factors affect the students from indulging in speaking activities, particularly the dialectal differences among the students, which might constitute a barrier that obstructs the students from participating in pair- work and group-work speaking activities.

F. Discussion

The main findings of the research are provided in five different sections: EFL instructors' overall perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, their perceptions of in-class application of pair-work and group-work speaking activities in language classroom, their perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work activities, their suggestions about the implementation of pair-work and group-work activities, their possible reasons why students do not adequately benefit from pair-work and group-work speaking activities.

1. EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities

The first research question examined EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work activities to develop students' speaking skills. In Table 4.20 the summary of EFL instructors' views of pair-work and group-work speaking activities is available.

Table 21 EFL Instructors' Attitudes towards Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

EFL instructors' perceptions or attitudes towards pair-work and group-work speaking activities (Questionnaire)
The students are not willing to participate in the speaking activity if the task is difficult.
The students find shorter speaking activities much more fun.
The students would prefer to participate in a speaking activity when the instructor motivates them to do the task.
The students would like to participate in the speaking activity if the task is easy.

According to the findings of the questionnaire, nearly all of the EFL instructors stated that the students would like to participate in the speaking activity when the task is easy. The instructors also indicated that the students will do well when the teacher is a good motivator. Possibly, the teacher will motivate and engage students in pair work and group work. According to Kopinska and Azkarai (2020), pair-work and group-work speaking activities increased students' motivation and decreased their anxiety. It could also be inferred from the findings that students prefer shorter tasks and they also believed that teachers' motivation will be reflected on their good teaching.

In order to answer the first research question, an interview with the instructors was also conducted. The findings of the qualitative data provided two categories under the theme of teachers' perceptions of pair-work and group-work activities, which the researcher categorises as supporters and opponents. In Table 21, the overall summary of EFL instructors' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities is illustrated:

Table 22 EFL Instructors' Perceptions or Attitudes towards Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities (Interview)

Pair work is more frequently applied than group work.
Pair-work activates students' previous knowledge more than group work.
Pair work improves students' speaking skills more than group work.
Pair work and group work improve students' critical thinking skills and their ability to solve problems.
Pair work or group work is a good way to construct knowledge cooperatively.
Working in pairs and groups is loud and noisy.

Under the category of supporters, the findings show that all ten EFL instructors utilized pair-work speaking activities more than group-work activities in their English language classes. They explained that pair-work speaking activities are more frequently applied than group work. They indicated that pair work increased students' previous knowledge because it enables them to elicit the information. They also stated that pair work improves students' speaking skills more than group work. These findings support what Hung and Mai (2020) think about pair work and group work. They both stated that EFL instructors had positive attitudes towards using group-work in EFL classroom to improve students' speaking skill due to its role in increasing students' engagement, enjoyment, and motivation in the classroom. Besides, the participants indicated that pair-work speaking activities improved students' speaking skills. This finding is compatible with Lin, Chen, and Yu (2022), who argued that pair work and group work improved students' speaking fluency and communicative competence because the students use their second language when speaking with their classmates. In this regard, Febyanti and Sari (2021) claimed that pair-work speaking activities enabled the students to produce more spoken language.

As for the opponents, 30% of EFL instructors stated that pair-work and group-work speaking activities discourage the students from studying individually. They are against constructing knowledge cooperatively. Besides, when students study in pairs and in groups, the classroom becomes noisy and loud. This distracts

the students from learning in a nice atmosphere. Possibly, the teachers do not engage the students sufficiently before placing them into pairs or groups. According to Williams, Guy, and Shore (2019), teachers should engage and scaffold students before asking them to work in groups.

2.   EFL instructors' perceptions of in-class application of pair-work and group-work speaking activities

EFL instructors' perceptions of in-class application of pair-work and group-work speaking activities in practicing speaking skills were explored. In Table 22, EFL teachers' views of in-class application of pair-work and group-work speaking activities are presented.

Table 23 EFL Instructors' Perceptions In-Class Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

The students try to share equal responsibilities with their partners during pair-work and group-work speaking activities.
Speaking tasks improve students' grammatical knowledge.
The students find it easy to focus on pair-work speaking activities.
Pair work should be applied constantly in the classroom.
The teacher should monitor student learning.
The teacher should discover students' needs and interests.

The majority of teachers agreed that the students prefer to share equal responsibilities with their partners without dominating each other. The results are in line with the study of Achmad and Yusuf (2014), who stated that placing international students with unequal speaking abilities should be conducted effectively by teachers by determining their learning culture and abilities to enrich the learners' language resources.

Besides, they believe that there is a strong correlation between speaking activities and grammatical knowledge. According to Storch (1999), pair work improves students' grammatical accuracy. Similarly, Rospinah et al. (2020) claimed that group-work speaking activities improved students speaking skills, vocabulary knowledge, grammatical knowledge, fluency, and pronunciation. The students are more able to focus on pair-work speaking activities than on group-work activities. In this regard, Yulitrinisya and Narius (2018) indicated that pair-work speaking activities are more effective than group-work speaking activities.

The study found that the effectiveness of pair-work and group-work speaking activities relied heavily on good mentoring, observation, and error correction. The use of observation and monitoring in pair-work and group-work speaking activities are advocated by a variety of scholars (Yulitrinisya and Narius, 2018; Usman, 2015; Achmad and Yusuf, 2014; Truong, 2013; Otienoh, 2015). The findings showed that the implementation of pair-work and group- work speaking activities relied primarily on students by assessing learner needs, interests, and preferences.

3.   EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

EFL instructors' perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group- work activities in practising speaking skills were discussed.

Table 24 EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities

Advantages	Disadvantages
Pair-work and group-work speaking activities expose students to the target language, reduce their anxiety, and increase their motivation.	Lack of misunderstanding among students might hinder their comprehension.
Pair-work and group-work speaking activities are an effective technique used in fluency-based English speaking activities.	
They create more chances for students to discover their own speaking ability.	

EFL instructors indicated that there are a variety of advantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities. They indicated that pair-work and group-work speaking activities improve students' speaking skills, reduce their high anxiety levels, increase their motivation, and enable the students to discover their ability to speak confidently. In accordance with the present findings, the previous study of Huyen and Lan (2021) indicated that pair-work increased students' engagement, motivation, relaxation, and improved students' speaking skills. Also, Kopinska and Azkarai (2020) pointed out that pair-work speaking activities increase student motivation and decrease their anxiety. According to Hyde (1993), pair-work and group-work speaking activities improve students' fluency in speaking.

As for the disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, lack of comprehension might hinder the students from understanding each other,

which makes the students feel bored. This finding is consistent with the research conducted by Shrestha (2013), who claimed that students lack understanding one another, so they have to ask for clarification. This might make the other students bored in the class.

Regarding the interview questions on the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work activities, the results of the interview provided three categories under the first theme entitled 'improving students' speaking skill', namely, maximise student-talking time, enhance learner autonomy, and develop student creativity and problem-solving skills. In this respect, Crookes and Chaudron (2001) indicated that the advantages of using pair-work and group-work speaking activities are described as increasing the use of the target language, enhancing self-directed learning and enhancing student autonomy.

Two categories emanated from the second theme entitled 'increasing student collaboration', namely, pair-work increases student engagement and collaboration and group work improves student social skills. One category is provided under the theme "improving student creativity and problem-solving skills." As for the disadvantages, 4 categories are provided under the theme 'language interference in group work,' 3 categories are provided under the theme 'students' attitudes and behaviours in group work,' 1 category is provided under the theme 'poor communication in pair work,' as illustrated in the Table.

Table 25 EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Advantages and Disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

Advantages	Disadvantages
Pair-work and group-work speaking activities improve students' speaking skills.	Lack of comprehension hinders the communication flow in pair-work and group-work speaking activities.
Pair-work and group-work speaking activities improve student collaboration.	Students might not be engaged and feel bored.
Pair-work and group-work speaking activities develop student creativity and problem solving skills.	Students switch to L1 and transfer from their L1.
	Students lack knowledge of vocabulary.
	Students lack grammatical knowledge.
	Students lack self-esteem.
	Students do not get exposed to the target language.

EFL instructors indicated that pair-work and group-work speaking activities offer a variety of advantages. They claimed that pair-work and group-work speaking

activities improve students' speaking skill, collaboration, creativity, and problem-solving skills. In accordance with the present findings, pair work or group work is a good technique to develop fluency. For example, Abdullah (2016) found that group work improved students' speaking fluency. In his contrastive study, Woźniak (2017) deduced that pair work improved student oral production while group work improved student collaboration.

As for the disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, the findings revealed that lack of comprehension among the group of students hinders them from communicating effectively. There is also a possibility of disengagement and boredom. Students may lack self-esteem or self-confidence. Therefore, they will not speak English confidently. Moreover, they will feel shy and embarrassed, so they will not be willing to participate in pair work and group work. Students will lack exposure to the target language. Students lack knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. As a result, they cannot use language accurately. According to Dabao (2014), pair work increased students' vocabulary knowledge and improves students' grammatical accuracy (Storch, 1999). Therefore, the researcher believes that applying pair work and group work might overcome the poor vocabulary knowledge and grammatical knowledge among the students.

4. EFL Students' and Language Instructors' Suggestions about the Implementation of Pair-Work and Group-Work Activities

The second question of the study examined EFL instructors' suggestions about the application of pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking activities. The findings of the questionnaire revealed that students wanted their speaking topic to be identified by their teacher. Also, they indicated that the speaking task should be taken along with the main course. They agreed that the students inclined to practice their speaking task with their partners. Besides, they would like to perform the task to all their classmates. What is more, they revealed that the students would like to have a different-proficiency-level partner for each task. Additionally, the students like to be fully prepared before engaging in speaking activities. In this regard, Hyde (1993) recommends that teachers prepare and do action research before placing the students in pairs or groups.

The results of the interview indicated that the speaking activities should be in line with the student needs, goals and preferences. They advised EFL instructors not to force students to be engaged in the speaking activities, but rather they should be according to their tendencies and they should be objective. Therefore, the researcher believes that the teachers should diversify their teaching methods by using various speaking activities. In this respect, Shrestha (2013) indicated that applying pair work and group work might be interesting in the classroom if they are applied by using activities such as role-plays.

Moreover, EFL instructors should allocate sufficient and reasonable time for the speaking activities. Also, EFL instructors should monitor student learning by observing them and writing down the errors that they have made in using the language to the last stage of the lesson to improve oral production of the students. According to Zohairy (2014), the effectiveness of pair work and pairing strategies rely on observation; the teacher should observe the students while they are working in pairs.

5. Possible reasons why EFL students do not adequately benefit from pair-work and group-work activities

The third research question examined the possible reasons why students do not adequately benefit from pair-work and group-work activities in practising speaking skills. Firstly, it could be inferred from the results that the students' inability to transfer their emotions by using the second language is considered one of the biggest challenges facing students. Furthermore, students are unfamiliar with pair-work and group-work speaking activities in their mother tongue. The participants indicated that the inability of the students to understand the core of the speaking task hinders their adequate benefiting from the speaking activities. The findings further revealed that the students' lack of motivation hinders them from taking advantage of the speaking activities.

In addition to EFL instructors' views of students, EFL instructors listed the reasons why students did not participate in pair work and group work. It could be deduced that the regular use of speaking activities increases boredom, leads to the stability of the speaking performance and causes demotivation. What is more, students' proficiency levels and ages have a negative effect on the speaking

activities. A possible explanation of this finding might be attributed to the fact that the speaking activities that are easy for advanced students or very difficult for intermediate students might hinder the students from taking advantage of these activities. More importantly, the respondents claimed that some of speaking activities might not attract the students' attention. It is worth mentioning that the dialectical differences among international students might weaken the communication among the students. However, Hung and Mai (2020) indicated that one of the biggest challenges in group work is manifested that not all of the students are involved in the speaking activities. Besides, some of them might speak more than other students.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

This study was conducted with the purpose of gaining in-depth understanding of EFL instructors' perceptions of EFL pair-work and group-work speaking activities at international schools in İstanbul. The data collection process included a questionnaire with 100 EFL instructors and a semi-structured interview with 10 language instructors. The questionnaire and the interview were adopted from (Akın, 2018) with some modifications to serve the purpose of the study. The questionnaire included two parts. The first part was about the participants' demographic background and the second part included three sections. The second part of the questionnaire required EFL instructors to give information about their perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, in-class applications of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, the advantages and disadvantages of pair-work and group-work speaking activities, suggestions about pair-work and group-work speaking activities, and the possible reasons for inadequate benefitting from pair-work and group-work speaking activities. After collecting the data from the questionnaire, the analysis of the data was conducted on the statistics program SPSS. The quantitative parts in the questionnaire were coded by employing constant comparative method.

The questions of the interview were identical to the research questions that were used in the questionnaire. The questions were adopted to gain in-depth understanding of the topic under investigation and they were in line with the parts in the questionnaire. The data of the interviews were analysed by the researcher through codes, frequencies, categories, and themes by using the qualitative data analysis software MAXQDA.

This chapter discusses the findings that emerged from the questionnaire and the interview. It further provides pedagogical implications, suggestions for future studies, and limitations to the study.

B. Pedagogical Implications

This research has many pedagogical implications for EFL instructors, researchers, syllabus designers, course book writers, and course planners.

1. To begin with, EFL instructors should balance activities focusing on accuracy-based and fluency-based.

2. They should avoid doing too much meaningless practice. Instead, they should do meaningful and free practice.

3. They should focus on the development of fluency. To achieve this aim, they should pay attention to collaborative learning through pair-work and group-work speaking activities.

4. Teachers should focus on meaning-focused input, i.e. reading and listening. Learners need to get exposed to language to develop their comprehensible input. Teachers should provide students with a model text.

5. Teachers should also focus on output, i.e. speaking and writing. They need to use or produce language. Learners need to understand and produce a text.

6. In addition to EFL instructors, researchers can utilise the results of this study. This study suggests that the main goals of language learning are meaningful and real communication and interaction. Fluency must be an essential component of a language course.

7. Moreover, syllabus designers should design a multi-strand syllabus which includes all aspects of language, learning and learners and social context.

8. Course book writers should also reflect the features of communicative language teaching (CLT), such as balancing four skills and sub-skills, including pair-work and group-work activities which aim to develop communication and fluency.

9. Finally, course planners should plan a language course, considering a learner-centred syllabus. They should assess learner needs, set course goals, identify topics, select materials, design activities, deliver teaching and assess learning.

C. Recommendations for EFL Instructors

The researcher gives EFL instructors some advice they should follow:

- The teacher can facilitate second language learning when learners are engaged in interaction (pair work and group work) and meaningful communication.

- The teacher should prioritise real and meaningful communication which results from students processing content (topics and materials) that is relevant, purposeful, interesting and engaging. The teacher should make use of content that connects to students' lives and interests. The teacher should use authentic stimulus material that students will see in their everyday lives, such as videos, blogs.

- The teacher should assume three main roles in a speaking class. The role of the teacher in the language classroom is that of a facilitator, who creates a classroom climate conducive to language learning and provides opportunities for students to use and practise the language and to reflect on language use and language learning. The teacher also acts as an organiser and puts students in pairs and small groups. The teacher organises the class into a variety of patterns of interaction, depending on the type of activity. The teacher should have the role of prompter and encourage students to participate in the activities by giving them prompts like key words and questions to help them speak.

- The teacher should create a positive and supportive learning environment where learners learn through collaboration and sharing. Students communicate meaning, get across a message and construct knowledge cooperatively.

- The teacher should encourage engagement and interaction involving student-student activities by using pair discussions, games, interactive activities and role-plays, puzzle solving and other collaborative tasks.

- The teacher should create specific opportunities for conversation in pairs and small groups, ensuring that they have a clear context, clear roles and an obvious purpose for doing the activity or task.

- The teacher should prioritise fluency over accuracy to build confidence. They will have the chance to develop fluency. Fluency and confidence go hand in hand.

- They create the need for communication, interaction, and negotiation of meaning through the use of activities, such as problem solving, information sharing, and role play.

- They allow students to personalize learning by applying what they have learned to their own lives.

- Learners develop their own routes to language learning, progress at different rates, and have different needs and motivations for language learning. Diversity in the language classroom should be considered when planning a language course. Their motivational level is likely to increase.

- EFL instructors should engage the whole students in the speaking to increase students' motivation and engagement because the students would like to perform the task to all classmates.

- Instructors, curriculum designers, and teachers should apply short and interesting speaking activities that attract students' attention and motivate them to be engaged in these activities.

- It can be inferred from the findings of the study that poor monitoring of the students in the classroom would not achieve the desired learning outcomes. Therefore, the teacher should monitor learning and give learners support and guidance.

- Teachers should consider some factors which discourage students from participating in pair-work and group-work activities. It can be elicited from the findings that poor time-management hinders the students from taking advantage of the speaking activities. Therefore, the teacher should allocate particular time before engaging the students in the speaking activities. According to Hung & Mai (2020), some students do not benefit from pair work and group work when they speak less than others, which is considered to be one of the biggest challenges that hinders the implementation of pair-work and group-work speaking activities.

- EFL instructors should build interest, provide a model text, pre-teach some unfamiliar vocabulary, teach some useful language, set the task, monitor learning, and give feedback.

- EFL instructors should give the students clear, short and simple instructions

before setting up the speaking activities. It is a good idea to demonstrate the activity with a student to make sure that students understand the task.

- EFL instructors who participated in this study indicated that the reasons that hinder the students from benefitting from speaking activities are attributed to the tasks in the school curriculum that do not attract students' attention. Therefore, the tasks should motivating, relevant and interesting.

- **5.4 Recommendations for Further Research**

This research paper provides only a glimpse of a broad research area. Therefore, in the lights of the findings obtained from this study, some suggestions can be made for further research. First of all, this study was limited in the questionnaire and the interview. Thus, a further study can consider employing other data collection instruments such as classroom observation in order to obtain more comprehensive results. Moreover, the current study was conducted only at international schools. Therefore, a further study can also involve conducting in different settings like universities in Turkey. Furthermore, the same study can be conducted with learners' perceptions of pair-work and group-work speaking activities in different contexts, such as at secondary schools, at high schools or even at university preparatory schools.

VI.   REFERENCES

BOOKS

ALTRICHTER, H., FELDMAN, A., POSCH, P. & SOMEKH, B. **Teachers investigate their work; An introduction to action research across the professions**. UK: Routledge, 2008.

BOGDAN, R., & BIKLEN, S. K. **Qualitative research for education**. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1997.

BROWN, H. D. **Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.** Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents. (2nd ed.). White Plains, London: Longman, 1994.

BROWN, H. D. **Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy**. New York: AW Longman, 2001.

CHANEY, A. L., & Burk, T. L. **Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8.** USA: Pearson, 1998.

COHEN, L., & MANION, L. **Research methods in education**. UK: Routledge. p. 254. (5th edition, 2000.

HAMZAH, M. H., Ting, L. Y., & PENDIDIKAN, F. **Teaching speaking skills through group work activities: A case study in SMK Damai Jaya**. A Case Study, 2010.

HARMER, J. **The Practice of Teaching Language.** Cambridge University, Longman, 2011.

JEJO, S., & HAJI, S. **Teaching Strategies to Increase EFL Speaking Skills in a Communicative Learning Environment**, Malmo University, 2020.

JOHNSON, K. & JOHNSON, H. **Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics: a handbook for language teaching**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1998.

JOHNSON, R., JOHNSON, D. W. **The social integration of handicapped**

students into the mainstream. In Reynolds, M. (Ed.), Social acceptance and peer relationships of the exceptional child in the regular classroom. Reston VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1980.

LARSEN-FREEMAN, D. **Techniques and principles in language teaching**. Oxford University, 2000.

LUNDHAN, Bo. **Texts, topics and tasks: Teaching English in years 4-6**. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2014.

NUNAN, D. **Designing tasks for the communicative classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

O'DONOGHUE, T., PUNCH, K. **Qualitative Educational Research in Action: Doing and Reflecting**. UK: Routledge. 2003.

OLSSON, S. **Speaking in the EFL classroom: A qualitative study of how four compulsory school teachers view the role of oral proficiency**, Linnaeus University, 2018.

RICHARDS, J. **Approaches and Methods in English Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

SCHMITT, N. (Ed.). **An introduction to applied linguistics**. UK: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd, 2010.

TRUONG, T. P. **Influences of personalities on student performance in pair-work and group-work in speaking lessons of first-year mainstream students**, Felte, Ulis, 2010.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. **Mind in society: The development of higher mental process**. USA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

WOZNIAK, E. **Individual work, pair work, and group work in Teaching English as a Foreign Language to first graders**, Jagiellonian University Repository, 2017.

ARTICLES

ABDULLAH, A. Group work activities for improving speaking skills. **English Education Journal,** *7*(3), 389-401, 2016.

ACHMAD, D., & YUSUF, Y. Q. Observing pair-work task in an English speaking

class. **International Journal of Instruction**, 7(1), 2014.

AHMADIAN, M., & TAJABADI, A. Patterns of Interaction in Young EFL Learners' Pair Work: The Relationship between Pair Dynamics and Vocabulary Acquisition. 3L: **Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies**, *23*(1), 2017.

RANCE-RONEY, J. A. Reconceptualizing Interactional Groups: Grouping Schemes for Maximizing Language Learning. **In English teaching forum,** Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 20-26, 2010.

AHMED, A. K. Teacher-centred versus learner-centred teaching style. **Journal of Global Business Management,** 9(1), 22, 2013.

AL HALIM, M. L. The effectiveness of pair work and group work on students' achievement in giving writing task. JALIE; **Journal of Applied Linguistics and Islamic Education,** 2(2), 225-253, 2019.

AL HOSNI, S. Speaking Difficulties Encountered by Young EFL Learners. **International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)** 2 (6), 2-30, 2014.

AL-HASSAANI, A. M. A., & QAID, A. F. M. Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Speaking Skills to the Yemeni EFL Learners at Aden University: A Case Study. **Arab World English Journal,** 12(1), 498-514, 2021.

ALMOND, R. J. Group assessment: Comparing group and individual undergraduate module marks. **Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education**, 34(2), 141-148, 2009.

COLBECK, C. L., CAMPBELL, S. E., & BJORKLUND, S. A. Grouping in the dark: What college students learn from group projects. **The Journal of Higher Education,** 71(1), 60-83, 2000.

DOBAO, A. F. Vocabulary learning in collaborative tasks: A comparison of pair and small group work. **Language Teaching Research**, 18(4), 497-520, 2014.

DUCKWORTH, E. Helping students get to where ideas can find them. **The New**

Educator, 5(3), 2009.

FEBYANTI, J. R., & SARI, D. M. M. Implementation pair work and storytelling in teaching speaking fluency in elementary school. **Journal of Teaching and Learning in Elementary Education (JTLEE)**, 5(1), 11-18, 2021.

FERDOUS, T., & Karim, A. Working in Groups outside the Classroom: Affective Challenges and Probable Solutions. **International Journal of Instruction,** 12(3), 341-358, 2019.

FRYKEDAL, K., & HAMMAR CHIRIAC, E. Student collaboration in group work: Inclusion as participation. **International journal of disability, development and education**, 65(2), 183-198, 2018.

GRAHAM, R. W. Illustrating triangulation in mixed-methods nursing research. **Nurse researcher**, 12(4), 2005.

HASEGAWA, A. Sociomateriality of Semiscripted Pair-Work Prompts in Beginner-Level Japanese-as-a-Foreign-Language Classrooms. **The Modern Language Journal**, 105(S1), 65-85, 2021.

HEALE, R., & FORBES, D. Understanding triangulation in research. **Evidence-based nursing**, 16(4), 98-98, 2013.

HIRMORI, T. Anatomizing Students' Task Engagement in Pair Work in the Language Classroom. **Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning**, 3(1), 88-106, 2021.

HOSSEINI, S. H., BAKHIARVAND, M., & TABATABAEJ, S. (2013). A Comparative Study on the Effect of Individual, Pair and Team Work on Speaking Fluency of Iranian Elementary EFL Learners. **International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences**, 4.

HUNG, D. M., & MAI, L. T. T. (2020). High School Teachers' Perceptions and Implementations of Group Work in English Speaking Classes. **International Journal of Instruction**, 13(2), 445-462.

HURIYAH, L., NURIAWARTI, F. A., ZAHRO, S. F., & HARDININ, W. A. (2019). Peer dialogue as an effective way for teaching speaking: Indonesian EFL Students' Voices. **Atlantis Press**, 235-237.

HUYEN, P., & LAN, D. (2021). Using think-pair-share strategy to support students in speaking lessons. **Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics**, 3(4), 01-08.

HYDE, M. (1993). Pair Work - A Blessing or a Curse? An analysis of pair work from pedagogical, cultural, social and psychological perspectives. **System**, 21(3), 343- 348.

KARIM, U. (2015). Implementation of group work in the classroom**. LINGUA: Journal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya,** 12(1), 97-106.

KOC, E. (2018). Exploring collaborative learning with a focus on group activities in EFL classrooms**. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,** 19(3), 582-597.

KOPINSKA, M., & AZKARAI, A. (2020). Exploring young EFL learners' motivation: Individual versus pair work on dictogloss tasks**. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching**, 10(3), 607-630.

LAAL, M., & GHODSI, S. M. (2012). Benefits of Collaborative Learning. Procedia—**Social and Behavioral Sciences**, 31, 486-490.

LASITO, & STORCH, N. (2013). Comparing pair and small group interactions on oral tasks. **RELC Journal**, 44(3), 361-375.

LIN, M. F., CHEN, Y. S., & WU, H. J. (2022). Individual versus pair work on L2 speech acts: production and cognitive processes. **Applied Linguistics Review.**

LONG, M. H., & PORTER, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. **TESOL quarterly**, 19(2), 207-228.

MACA, S. (2020). Teaching English Speaking Skill through Pair and Group Interview Techniques. Ethical Lingua: **Journal of Language Teaching and Literature**, 7(2), 329-337.

MAYO, M. D. P. G., & ZEITLER, N. (2017). Lexical language-related episodes in pair and small group work. **International Journal of English Studies,** 17(1), 61-82.

MCDONOUGH, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group

activities in a Thai EFL context. **System**, 32 (207-224).

MULYA, R. (2016). Teaching speaking by applying pair work technique. English **Education Journal**, 7(1), 74-86.

OTIENOH, R. O. (2015). Implementation of Pair Work and Group Work for Creation of Interaction Opportunities for Learners in Large Classes: The Viability of the Two Strategies. **Journal of Education and Practice**, 6(10), 171-179.

RAJA, N., & SAEED, A. (2012). The effectiveness of group work and pair work for students of English at undergraduate level in public and private sector colleges. **Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business**, 4(5), 155-163.

ROSPINAH, R., AMPA, A. T., & NAPPU, S. (2021). The Effect of Group Work Activities to Improve Students' Speaking Skill. IDEAS: **Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature**, 9(1).

SHEHADEH, A. (2011). Effects and Student Perceptions of Collaborative Writing in L2 Effects and Student Perceptions of Collaborative Writing in L2. **Journal of Second Language Writing.** Vol. 20(4), 286–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.05.010.

SHRESTHA, P. N. (2013). English language classroom practices: Bangladeshi primary school children's perceptions**. RELC Journal**, 44(2) (147-162).

STORCH, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair Work and Grammatical Accuracy. **System.** Vol. 27, 363-374.

STORCH, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. **Language Learning.** Vol. 52. No. 1, 119–158.

STYATI, E. W., & LATIEF, M. A. (2018). Investigating dominant and passive students on pair work towards the students' writing performance. **3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies.** Vol 24(3): 142 – 154

TENG, M. F. (2020). The effectiveness of group, pair and individual output tasks on learning phrasal verbs. **The Language Learning Journal**, 48(2), 187-

200.

USMAN, A. H. (2015). Using the think-pair-share strategy to improve students' speaking ability at Stain Ternate. **Journal of Education and Practice**, 6(10), 37-45.

WILLIAMS, J. M., CERA GUY, J. N., & SHORE, B. M. (2019). High-achieving students' expectations about what happens in classroom group work: A review of contributing research. **Roeper Review**, 41(3), 156-165.

YULITRINISYA, W., & Narius, D. (2018). Using pair work technique in teaching speaking at junior high school. **Journal of English Language Teaching**, 7(1), 157-163.

ZASWITAa, H., & Ihsan, R. (2019). The effectiveness of pair work activities technique on writing ability of students in vocational school. **Indonesian TESOL Journal**, 1(2), 1-73.

ZHANG, M. Collaborative writing in the EFL classroom: The effects of L1 and L2 use. **System**, 76, 1-12, 2018.

ZOHAIRY, S. Effective pair work strategies to enhance Saudi pre-intermediate college students' language production in speaking activities. **European Scientific Journal**, 10(2), 2014.

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

ALI, J.K.M., & BIN-HADY, W. R. A. (2019). A Study of EFL Students' Attitudes, Motivation and Anxiety towards WhatsApp as a Language Learning Tool. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL (5).* 289-298 DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call5.19.

DORNYEJ, Z. (2001). Motivational strategies in the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge Books Online. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667343

LINTON, D. L., Farmer, J. K., & Peterson, E. (2014). Is Peer Interaction Necessary for Optimal Active Learning? CBE—Life Sciences Education, 13, 243-252. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.13-10-0201

LUOMA, S. (2004). Assessing Speaking [E-book]. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press National Agency for Education. (2011a). Språkstudien ESLC. https://www.skolverket.se/statistik-och-utvardering/internationella-studier/sprakstudien-eslc. Downloaded: 2017-12-17.

NATIONAL AGENCY for EDUCATION. (2011b). Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the recreation centre. https://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/publikationer/visaenskildpublikation?_xurl_=http%3A%2F%2Fwww5.skolverket.se%2Fwtpub%2Fws%2Fskol bok%2Fwpubext%2Ftrycksak%2FBlob%2Fpdf2687.pdf%3Fk%3D2687. Downloaded: 2018- 01-10.

DISSERTATIONS

CORDEIRO, M. D. C. (2017). Pair work for developing speaking skills (Doctoral dissertation).

İLKYAZ, A. (2018). EFL student and instructor perceptions of pair and group work speaking activities: a case study at a state university in Turkey (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University).

NAVARRETE, L. (2020). Pair Work to Increase EFL Students' Oral Production (Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado).

PRATIWI, A. I. (2019). Group work and pair work to teach speaking skill for a large class (A Comparative Study at The Eleventh Grade Students of SMAN 05 Bengkulu Selatan in Academic Year 2019/2020) (Doctoral dissertation, Ian Bengkulu).

ROMANOV, Y. O. (2021). Group work in EFL classroom (Doctoral dissertation, ТОВ" Планета-Прінт").

STORCH, N. (2001). An investigation into the nature of pair work in an ESL classroom and its effect on grammatical development (Doctoral dissertation).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: The Questionnaire

APPENDIX B: The Interview

APPENDIX C: Ethics Committee Approval

APPENDIX A: The Questionnaire

Dear Colleagues,

I am Yamen Bondouck and am doing my Master's study on ELT. For the necessary data for my study, I have prepared a questionnaire on the topic "EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities at International Schools in Istanbul". The findings will be used to gain insights into impacts of pair-work and group-work activities on improving students' speaking skills from the perspectives of EFL instructors. The study will help in stimulating the adoption of pair-work and group-work activities on improving speaking skill. Responding to the survey will require no more than 10 minutes of your time. Your responses will be used for academic purposes only. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and all respondents anonymous. No one of the respondents will be revealed in any way in the study. Your co-operation is very much appreciated and will be a valuable contribution to the success of this study.

Part One: Demographic Information

1. Which university did you graduate from?

2. How long have you been teaching English?

3. How many different educational institutions have you worked in so far?

4. For which proficiency levels have you taught English?

Part Two: EFL Instructors' Perceptions of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities at International Schools in Istanbul

Section One: EFL Instructors' Overall perceptions of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities (RQ 1A) Please tick the box that best suits you.

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	The students get bored if the speaking task takes too long.					
2.	The students will not be bothered by the attitude of the instructor to the pair work and group-work activities.					
3.	The students find it difficult to talk about topics that they are not familiar with.					
4.	The students like pair-work activities in speaking.					
5.	The students like group work speaking activities.					
6.	The students would like to take part in the speaking activity if the task is easy.					
7.	The students would prefer speaking activity when the instructor is eager for the task.					
8.	The students find shorter speaking activities much more fun.					
9.	The students would not like to take part in the speaking activity if the task is difficult.					
10.	The students perform better when they are familiar with the topics in the speaking task.					

Section Two: In-class Application of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities. **(RQ 1B) Please tick the box that best suits you.**

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	The students find it easy to focus on the pair-work speaking activities.					
2.	The students use their mother tongues during pair-work speaking activities.					
3.	The students try to use English during pair-work speaking activities.					
4.	The students find it hard to focus on the task during pair-work speaking activities.					
5.	The students would like to have more pair-work speaking activities in the classroom.					
6.	The students try to share equal responsibilities with their partners during pair-work and group work speaking activities.					
7.	The students would prefer their partner to take more responsibilities than them during pair-work speaking activities.					
8.	There is an adequate number of pair-work speaking activities in the classroom.					
9.	There is adequate number of group-work speaking activities in the classroom.					
10.	The topics of the speaking tasks are appropriate to use previously learned grammar structures.					

Section Three: The advantages and disadvantages of Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities (RQ 1C) Please tick the box that best suits you.

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Pair work and group work are an appropriate technique used in English speaking classrooms.					
2.	Pair work and group work give students more opportunities to speak English in the class.					
3.	When students work in pairs and groups, they are more active than in other classroom setting.					
4.	Students who work in pairs and groups gain more than students who work individually.					
5.	Pair work and group work are an effective technique for dealing with mixed-ability speaking classes.					
6.	Through pair work and group work, students can make up for lacking of language items.					
7.	Pair work and group work create more chances for students to discover their own speaking ability.					
8.	Pair work and group work create more opportunities for students to increase their talking time as much as possible.					
9.	Pair work and group work maximize students' usage of language, reduces stress and requires students to think.					
10.	There may be ineffective communication when pair and group members seem to be misunderstanding each other.					

Section Four: EFL Instructors' Suggestions about Pair-Work and Group-Work Speaking Activities (RQ 2) Please tick the box that best suits you.

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	The students would like their teacher to determine the speaking topic.					
2.	The students would like their teacher to determine their speaking partner.					
3.	The students would like their teacher to pre-teach the target vocabulary about the task.					
4.	The students would like their teacher to guide them about the speaking task. The students would like their teacher to monitor them during the speaking task.					
5.	The students would like to change their speaking partner for each task.					
6.	The students would like to have a different-proficiency-level partner for each task.					
7.	The students would like to practice the task with their partners only.					
8.	The students would like to perform the task to all their classmates.					
9.	The students would like to have speaking classes in addition to the main course.					
10.	The students would like to have time for preparation to the task.					

Section Five: Possible reasons for inadequate benefiting (RQ 3) Please tick the box that best suits you.

No.	Statement	Agree	Strongly Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	The lack of motivation of the instructor to conduct speaking activities.					
2.	The lack of motivation of the student to perform speaking activities.					
3.	Time constraint to implement speaking activities.					
4.	Overcrowded class that hinders the application of speaking tasks.					
5.	Loaded curriculum on a daily or weekly basis.					
6.	Speaking tasks that do not appeal to their interest.					
7.	Tasks that are above the students' proficiency level.					
8.	Tasks of the book that do not attract their attention.					
9.	The students are unable to transfer their emotions to the second language.					
10.	The students are not familiar with pair and group work activities in their mother tongue classes.					

APPENDIX B: The Interview

Section One: Overall Perceptions: (RQ1A)

Interview Questions

Please answer the following questions about your overall perceptions of pair-work and group- work speaking activities:

1. What do you think about the proficiency level of the partners in a speaking task?

   - Do you match similar or different proficiency level students as pairs?

   - Do you pay attention to it in a group-work or pair-work activity?

2. What do you think about impromptu speech and manuscript speech of the students during pair-work speaking activities?

   - Which one do you prefer more frequently in your classes? Why?

3. When do you think the students are more eager to join speaking tasks: when the task is in the same line with the exam or when the task is only for the improvement of their language proficiency level?

Section Two: In-Class Applications (RQ1B)

1. How often do you use pair work activities in your classes?

   - Would you like to use pair-work speaking activities more frequently? Why?

2. How often do you use group-work activities in your classes?

   - Would you like to use group-work activities in your classes more frequently? Why?

3. Who chooses the speaking partners in a pair-work activity, you or your students? Which one do you think is more efficient? Why?

4. Do you observe that your students speak in Turkish with their partners from time to time?

   - In which situations do you think it happens?

   - Do you have any ideas about the reasons?

Section Three: Advantages and Disadvantages (RQ1C)

1. What do you think about the pair-work activities used in English language

classes of the prep school?

- What do you think can be the advantages of these activities?

- What do you think can be the disadvantages of these activities?

2. What do you think about the group-work activities used in English language classes of the prep school?

- What do you think about the advantages of these activities?

- What do you think about the disadvantages of these activities?

3. Do you think that pair-work activities improve your students' speaking skills?

- If so, in which ways and how?

- If not, why?

4. Do you think that pair-group and group-work activities are effective to improve students' other language skills in addition to speaking skills? For example,

   a. Vocabulary

   b. Grammar

   c. Writing

   d. Listening

   e. Reading

- Which of them improve during pair-work and group-work activities? Why?

- Do you think that pair-work and group-work speaking activities help students to practise the subjects learned in the class? How?

   Section Four: Suggestions (RQ 2)

1. Do you help your students while monitoring pair-work activities? In which parts do you help them?

2. Do you monitor your students when they are on task? What are the advantages and disadvantages of it?

3. Do you ask your students to present the used pair-work speaking activities to the whole class? If so, why?

4. How long do you think a pair-work speaking activity should last on average?

5. How much time should it take? Why?

Section Five: Possible reasons for inadequate benefitting (RQ 3)

1. Where do you choose pair-work activities, from the book that you use in the lesson or you prepare them by yourself?

• What do you think about the tasks in the book?

2. Do you think that the used speaking tasks in the classes are appropriate for your students' proficiency level, age, general world knowledge and interests?

3. Do you think that the quality of the tasks affects the success of the students' during the task? If so, how?

4. Do you think that cultural factors can be the reason when your students are not successful enough in speaking activities? Could you exemplify it?

APPENDIX C: Ethics Committee Approval

T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : E-88083623-020-51948   31.05.2022
Konu : Etik Onayı Hk.

Sayın YAMEN BONDOUCK

Tez çalışmanızda kullanmak üzere yapmayı talep ettiğiniz anketiniz İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'nun 26.05.2022 tarihli ve 2022/09 sayılı kararıyla uygun bulunmuştur.
Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Alper FİDAN
Müdür Yardımcısı

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu : BSR4BDZRV2 Pin Kodu : 00682   Belge Takip Adresi : https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/istanbul-aydin-universitesi-ebys?

Adres : Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Küçükçekmece / İSTANBUL   Bilgi için : Hicran DEMİR
Telefon : 444 1 428   Unvanı : Yazı İşleri Uzmanı
Web : http://www.aydin.edu.tr/
Kep Adresi : iau.yaziisleri@iau.hs03.kep.tr

107

RESUME

Name Surname: Yamen Bondouck

Education:

2003-2007 Damascus University-English Language and literature Department

2020-2022 İstanbul Aydın University-Master in English Language teaching (ELT)

Work Experience:

2005-2006 English Language Teacher at Omer Bin Abd Al Aziz School (Damascus).

2007-2010-English Language Teacher at Al Farabi School (Damascus).

2010-2011 Lecturer at Damascus University and Al Kalamoon Private University.

2011-2015 Translator and IP Assistant at Abu- Ghazaleh Intellectual Property - TMP Agents.

2015-2018 English Language Teacher at Çinar Koleji (Istanbul).

2018-2019 English Language Teacher at Bil Koleji (Istanbul).

Languages:

-Arabic: Native Language

-English: Advanced

-Turkish: Intermediate

Skills:

-Communication, Teamwork, Problem Solving, Flexibility, Creativity

- Computer skills (Microsoft Office) and others