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Prologue
In this literary review the researchers presented the concept of group work, types of group work, group work activities, forming and organizing groups, advantages and disadvantages of group work, the impact of teachers’ and students’ attitude towards group work activities, the teachers and students role in group work activity, factors affecting the implementation of group work activities in English language teaching (hereinafter referred as “ELT”). And also the concept of speaking, group work activities used to teach speaking and functions of speaking in group work. The reader/learner will be benefitted from the article.
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1. The Concept of Group Work
One of the most important strategies of learning and strengthening students' interaction is the group work. Different scholars define it from different perspectives. For example, Adams and Hamm (1990) defined group work as a form of cooperative learning in that several people work together to finish a certain task or achieve a certain learning goal. According to Hansen (2006), group work is one of the teaching learning strategy to improve our learning and overall skills. It is the way to develop students’ integrated skill by engaging them in group. Scrivener (2011) argues that group work is a learning strategy which allows students to develop their critical skills and helps them to challenge assumptions. He further states that this type of learning strategy helps students to evaluate their works and ideas thus they learn from each other. This indicates that it is an approach that makes students independent and helps each other.

Konopka (1963) defined group work as a method of social work that is utilized in order to ‘help individuals to enhance their social functioning through purposeful group experiences, and to cope more effectively with their personal, group or community problems. Burdett and Hastie (2009) noted that group work is a technique followed to provide an opportunity for students to engage in peer to peer learning. It gives chance to students to use the target language for communication rather than to practice it in situations to control students. These conditions are realized if students are put in-group activities. Furthermore, Badache (2011) defines group work as an instruction method where learners of different levels form small groups and work together towards a specific objective. Learners take the responsibility of their own learning and of those in the group, so the success of one member is a success of all members. Forsyth (2006) stated that group work enables students to move more readily from receiving knowledge to generating knowledge which involves students working collaboratively on set tasks, in or out of the classroom, includes any learning and teaching tasks or activities that require students to work in groups and any formal assessment tasks that require students to work in groups.

Brown (1994:8) provides a comprehensive definition of group work; he states that it provides a context in which individuals help each other. It is a method of helping groups as well as helping individuals; it can enable individuals and groups to influence and change personal, group and community problems. group work has been described as a valuable instructional approach which facilitates the learning process, provides opportunities for learners to explore the new content, creates positive interaction, process information, obtain new knowledge and skills, increase motivation, confidence in one’s social skills and academic achievement.

According to Brown (1991) group work is defined as a generic term covering a multiplicity of techniques in which two or more students are assigned a task that involves a cooperative work. He has also shown the significance of cooperation among members to deal with the given activity. Simply a collection of individuals sitting together without any coordination and common objectives may not mean group work. In order to say the collection of individuals group work learning, there must be a link among all group members that shows cooperation and collaboration to achieve a common goal of their learning.

Moreover, group work is a small discussion which has its own purpose, ideal for helping students to make meaning, take responsibility for learning, and practice effective strategies (Spiegel, 2005). When students work alone, of course they can make meaning. But group discussion provides opportunities for reflection and revision of meaning, opportunities that are less likely to occur when working alone. Furthermore, sharing their thoughts forces students to be explicit in their thinking, so they can present their ideas clearly. While the discussion is on,
accomplish a shared goal or task. Students consider the needs of other students within groups to encourage and build, announce, and conflict-management skills. These skills have to be taught just as purposefully and cooperation among group members. Students must have and use the needed leadership, administrative, trust-

needs to know who needs more assistance in completing the assignment, and group members need to know they can practice their oral language skills more efficiently in pair than in a whole-class setting.

Creating a more intimate and relaxed environment, two students working together in a group has more benefits than allowing the whole class to participate in a discussion. This helps students articulate their thinking with a peer partner before having to contribute in the large group, and works well in encouraging those reluctant learners to rehearse before speaking (Swain, 1980).

Another form of group work is cooperative learning. Kutnick et al. (2006) said that cooperative learning is more effective for students to share their cognitive, perspective and problem-solving skills than students working individually. However, cooperative learning is different from collaborative learning because it must include, and students need to demonstrate five specific principles for cooperative group work to be successful (Gillies, 2003).

According to him in structuring cooperative learning, it must include five key elements. They are positive interdependence, accountability, social and cognitive development and interaction. Cooperative learning is an effective way to encourage students to learn more effective social skills (Johnson and Johnson, 1991:15). In cooperative learning groups, each student has a specific role and students are able to produce work based on everyone’s input. Therefore, cooperative learning is an essential strategy for supporting in the classroom.

Positive interdependence: this point of group work shows that each group member depends on each other to accomplish a shared goal or task. Students consider the needs of other students with in groups to encourage and participate in the learning process all the time because without the help of one member the group is not able to reach the desired goal. According to Johnson and Johnson (1991) Students must believe that they are linked with others in a way that one cannot succeed unless the other members of the group succeed and vice versa. Students will also care about and get committed to each other's success as well as their own when they understand the goal, task, and resource and role interdependence. Furthermore, one member in a group will not give less value to other member's efforts when there is well structured reward interdependence that treats all members equally in a group.

Face-to-face interaction: this has a vital role in promoting success of group members by praising, encouraging, supporting, or assisting each other. This indicates that in the context of group work, students interact to help each other accomplish the task and promote each other's success. Students are expected to explain orally to each other how to solve problems, discuss with each other the nature of the concepts and strategies being learned, teach their knowledge to classmates, explain to each other the connections between present and past learning, and help, encourage, and support each other's efforts to learn (Harmer, 1999). The teacher help to guide the students, manage their activities, and direct their learning. Teachers are also expected to structure the groups so that students seat together and discuss through each aspect of the task given.

Individual accountability: each group member is held responsible for his or her work. Students learn together so that they can subsequently perform better as individuals. To ensure that each member is strengthened, students are held individually accountable to do their share of the work. According to Brumfit (1994) the performance of each individual student is assessed and the results given back to the individual and perhaps to the group. The group needs to know who needs more assistance in completing the assignment, and group members need to know they cannot get a ride on the work of others. Therefore, a level of accountability or responsibility must be structured into cooperative activities so as to help learners subsequently gain greater individual competence.

Social skills: group works set the stage for students to learn social skills. These skills help to build stronger cooperation among group members. Students must have and use the needed leadership, administrative, trust-building, announcement, and conflict-management skills. These skills have to be taught just as purposefully and
that groups of between 4 and 6 students seem to work best, though depending on the task, larger groups eight to
three to seven students.

Harmer (1991), it has been believed that the optimum number of students assigned to groups should not exceed
on the basis of students' experience and the time given for the effectiveness of cooperative learning. According to
and the aim and the type of activity in question. Some scholars believe that the size of the group should be decided
and cognitive styles. Allowing students to select their own group members can work well in small classes, but this
opportunities for social contact among students which are linked to student satisfaction, retention and enjoyment
of study, and they can have a motivational effect as students do not wish to let down other members of their group
(Bloxham and Heathfield, 1994).

There is some evidence that group work activities improve the achievement of lower ability students on
subsequent assignments although the reverse was found for higher ability students (Lejk et al., 1999). However,
group work assignments do present potential problems if not handled or organized well and it is recommended
that there should be a limit on the number in any student programmed (Falchikou, 2005). The existence of well
organized group work activities in the classroom can create good understanding between students and encouraging
student centered confidential atmosphere.

According to Cohen (1994) group work activity is said to include higher order thinking, better communication,
conflict management, greater understanding and development of skills transferable to later work environments.
Doing group work activities may be a very common activity to every student during the academic year. To handle
the activities, students choose to cooperate with others and work in groups. Working with group consequently
helps students improve their teamwork skill, in addition to critical thinking and confidence that are gained during
discussions. Groups surely need to divide the task into smaller parts, and as each student handle part they find
suitable most, the task can be done really effectively.

Group work is a form of cooperative learning. For many years, in secondary school have been grouping
students together to work on specific assignment. In the recent years, the investigation of group work is becoming
more popular in education. Engaging students with group learning activities can benefit them with high quality
learning outcomes and satisfaction, if teachers are assessed with valid and fair grading which is able to reliably
reflect the contribution of individual students and students are efficiently managed in group to work together.

However, if students are not clear about the objectives and expectations of the group work, or are questioning
the validity and fairness of the assessment, it may cause confusion and competition among the group. And the
educational benefit of group work is less effective.

3. Group Work Activities
Group work activities are one of the important class activities for developing students' communicative ability. It
refers to any classroom activity in which the whole class is divided up into pairs or larger groups. It is a form of
activities that it is organizing them in order to encourage collaboration among students. They increase the
opportunities for social contact among students which are linked to student satisfaction, retention and enjoyment
of study, and they can have a motivational effect as students do not wish to let down other members of their group
(Lotan, 2004) stated that group size should be in small number not greater than six students because as group
size increases, individual motivation decreases. Four to eight students in each group is an acceptable size, although
there is no one and clear group size (Byrne, 1987). This indicates that groups with smaller number of students are
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4. Forming and Organizing Groups
In the English language teaching and learning, where students have most often been rewarded for individual effort,
groups may not come naturally or easily for everyone. And even though, most students have worked together
informally in study groups or social organizations, they may never have thought carefully about the kinds of skills
that best promote group achievement. Most faculty who have included collaborative work in their courses agree
that groups of between 4 and 6 students seem to work best, though depending on the task, larger groups eight to
ten students can function successfully.

Harmer (2003) stated that determining how the groups will be formed can be more complicated, since ideally
the groups should be diverse enough to include students with a range of intellectual abilities, academic interests,
and cognitive styles. Allowing students to select their own group members can work well in small classes, but this
method always runs the risk of further isolating some students the class as a whole.

However, some of the most important aspect that EFL classroom teachers need to consider is the size of each
group. The choice of group size for English language practice actively will depend largely on the size of the class
and the aim and the type of activity in question. Some scholars believe that the size of the group should be decided
on the basis of students' experience and the time given for the effectiveness of cooperative learning. According to
Harmer (1991), it has been believed that the optimum number of students assigned to groups should not exceed
three to seven students.

Lotan (2004) stated that group size should be in small number not greater than six students because as group
size increases, individual motivation decreases. Four to eight students in each group is an acceptable size, although
there is no one and clear group size (Byrne, 1987). This indicates that groups with smaller number of students are
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better for some activities, but group with larger number may be also better if the teacher needs students to share ideas and experiences with their group members. Organizing groups are the aspects when forming groups in the process of English language teaching and learning. In order to assign students to groups, English teachers may take different positions because of the differences that exist among the students.

Different scholars have different views of organizing groups. For instance, Callahan and Clark (1988:159) stated that groups should probably be based on interest or perhaps specific skills, rather than on students' general ability. Another way, Johnson and Johnson (1990:123) propose random assignment of students to groups as an effective way. Unless special attention should be given, the intended objective in giving assignments can’t be achieved. Therefore, various ways of assigning students to groups, we see that some may tend to group students in terms of their ability as heterogeneous or homogeneous learning groups; some other may prefer random, interest, age, achievement, friendship or convenience grouping technique depending on the purpose and the type of the task.

According to Borch (2007) groups should be allowed to choose their leaders for effective and orderly interaction in group activities. Group leaders can be appointed by the teacher or nominated by groups. They should be well organized and have made time in their lives for their organization because they have significant roles in group activities. Group leaders act as facilitators by coordinating the efforts of group members towards a successful completion of an assignment. And teachers are grand group leaders who are accountable for the success or the failure of the class as a group. Besides, it encourages learners to feel responsibility for their own learning.

5. Advantages of Group Work in Speaking Classroom

According to Long and Porter (1985) the use of group work in classroom has long been supported to teachers for a number of years because of its perceived benefits to language learners. Brumfit (1984) stated that group work is seen as an essential element communicative language teaching in that it offers opportunities for cooperative learning and real language practice with consequent gains in language proficiency. In addition, group work provides a less threatening situation to the individual learners, who can experience lower levels of anxiety in the classroom when practicing language with sympathetic peers.

According to Exley and Dennick (2004:4-5) have listed out the following points which are the aim of engaging students in group activities. First, the development of intellectual understanding and of intellectual and professional abilities: by thinking and problem solving, e.g. analyzing, evaluating evidence, logical reasoning and synthesizing, by clarifying concepts and theories through discussing and accepting and seeing interrelationships and connections. Second, the development of communication skills and of group work skills: working in a group gives an opportunity to practice a variety of group management skills and group roles including leadership, planning and organization, giving support and encouragement to others, setting tasks, monitoring progress.

Through discussion practicing, giving explanations, listening, questioning, presenting, defending a position and giving constructive feedback are obtained. Third, personal growth and support for interdependence: by taking part in debate and discussion, students can test their values and attitudes while developing self esteem and confidence and by preparing for and taking part in small group teaching discussions and activities students accept their personal responsibility for the progress and direction of their own learning.

Finally, by reviewing and reflecting on their actions, students can learn from their successes and failures, so develop their skills and understanding, and plan future learning. It is important to analyze why EFL teachers use group work in speaking classroom. The researcher personally considers that group work is not just time-filler, or thoughtless activities that EFL teachers sometimes use for checking group work activities. Group work should not be used as class time for teachers to read, to rest. To prepare other classes, or just to imitate other teachers that are using group work without really understanding what that is and entails. The real purpose of working in groups in an EFL class goes beyond the actual command: “Get in a group, please, and answer the following questions,” which in most of the case, turns out to be individual work.

According to Harmer (2003) there have been many discussions on the value of group work for language learning which have confirmed that the advantages of group work. Group work gives students more chance to interact and use the target language more freely. Instead of just having a few seconds to talk in teacher-fronted classes, students can participate longer in small group and feel more confident to give their options and even make mistakes when just three or four classmates are looking at them.

Brown (2001) states that “small groups provide opportunities for students to initiate themselves, to encourage face-to-face interaction, to practice negotiation of meaning, to extend conversational exchanges, and to students’ adoption of roles, that would otherwise be impossible. Therefore using group work substantially increases the opportunities which students get to speak English. Group work creates a positive atmosphere in the sense that some students will not feel vulnerable to public display that may cause rejection or criticism (Porter, 1985). It is totally true that shy or low risk-taker students feel much more confident working in small groups than in teacher-fronted classes. They also said that when mutual goals are established, and ideas, material and information are shared, a collaborative partnership also develops in which students learn how to learn with one another. Students can develop social skills which were normally practiced only by the teacher such as changing topic, turn-taking,
asking for clarification and so on, appropriate materials to work on and problems to solve, students can engage in genuine information exchange.

Learner's responsibility give and autonomy are encouraged through group work. “The small group becomes a community of learners cooperating with each other in pursuit of common goals” (Brown, 2001:178). Students are not constantly relying on the teacher to complete their tasks. They learn that they can complete an activity successfully with the help of other classmates or by themselves. Students can be more autonomous and self-reliant; they can take on roles and adopt positions which are usually the teacher’s preserve. So that they can practice a range of language functions associated with those roles and positions, e.g. in problem solving exercises, they can learn to suggest, infer, qualify, hypothesize, generalize, or disagree.

Group work encourages students to become more engaged in material through discussion, debate, and the opportunity to articulate explanations to their peers (Swain, 1985). Such classroom practices allow students to check their understanding and construct new knowledge through interactions with each other and with course material which are the most important aspects for meaningful learning.

By using group work the teacher has the opportunity to teach turn taking mechanisms. As Kramsch (1992) suggests that teaching students how to take turns, as easy as this might seem, requires teaching a number of skills that are not automatically transferred from the mother tongue such as to tolerate silences, to direct gaze to addressees, to make use of floor-taking gambits, and to take long turns.

6. Disadvantages of Group Work in Speaking Classroom

Group work has also disadvantages that are important to explore. The first problem relates to noise. Obviously, students speak all at once trying to accomplish their task, and this causes noise that may bother other colleagues. But Doff (1991:141) states that the noise created by group work is usually good, noise since students are using English and are engaged in learning task. What a teacher can do to solve the “noise problem” is to make students aware that they do not need to shout to be heard and this will help to keep noise at moderate level. Another negative aspect of group work is the fact that some teachers may lose control of the class or have difficulties controlling the class, especially what concerns to discipline.

However, even if students are working in small groups and are in charge of the completion of a task, the teacher is still the director and manager of the class and needs to make students aware of this. Doff (1991:142) highlights that in order “to stop activities setting out of control, it is important to give clear instructions, to give clear defined tasks and to get up a routine so that the students exactly know how and what to do”. If the teacher circulates around the class to clarify doubts and to monitor what students are doing, there is no reason for losing control of the class.

The use of native language and lack of correction of mistakes represent another dislikeable future of group work. This is true even in teacher-centered classes. Students make use of any opportunity to switch to their native language. To avoid this, Brown (2001:180) suggests “encouraging students to practice using the target language in face-to-face contexts and to make them aware of the importance of some real uses for English in their own lives”. When working in groups, students are surely going to make mistakes. But Brown (2001:181) states errors are a necessary manifestation of inter language development, and we do well not to become obsessed with their constant correction. Well managed group work can encourage spontaneous peer feedback on errors within the small group itself.

In-group work activities one or two of the group members may force the passive learners to accept their ideas. This means some students are active participants than the others and these higher able students dominate the less able once. Regarding this idea, Arends (1997:135) stated that during cooperative learning, some students dominate group activity; others may be unwilling to participate. Sometimes those who avoid group work are shy students. Shy students are often very bright and they may work well alone or with one another. However, they find it very difficult to participate in a group. The rejected student is another type of student who may have difficulty to participate in-group activity. Finally, there is otherwise typical student who chooses for what every reason to work alone refuses to participate in cooperative group endeavors.

Cohen (1994) stated that students with high academic status are commonly believed by their teachers to do better in-group activity than those with low academic status. These make academically able students dominate the group alone. Regarding this, Cohen (1994:154) stated that high status students are generally expected to do well on new intellectual tasks, and low status students are generally expected to do poorly on the same task. When a teacher assigns a group work task, general expectations some into play and produce a self - fulfilling prophecy in which the high status students talk more and become more influential than the low status students.

In addition, Johnson and Johnson, (1989) states that there are several ways in which group efforts go wrong. They further go that less able students sometimes leave group’s task to others to be completed. Thus, the able members become ‘free riders’ of doing the majority of group activity. Regarding this, Waxman and Walberg, (1991:275) stated that in group learning high ability group members may be differed to and may make over the important leader ship roles in ways that benefit them at the expense of the other group members (‘the rich-get-
This implies that they accept students' mistakes in the language use as a necessary part of the language teaching attitude can play an important role in teaching and learning process. According to Verma (2005) in current trends linked to teachers' strategies for coping with challenges in their daily professional life and to their general well-being of language teaching, teachers have almost changed their role from being the controller of the class to facilitator. Effective language teaching approach can encourage students to be more positive towards the learning process in group work.

Group work activity provides an opportunity for students to engage in peer-to-peer learning. Learning is enhanced when students are able to share and clarify their knowledge, and build creative problem solving capabilities (Johnson and Johnson, 2005). Working together productively can result in more favorable attitudes to learning and persistence within degrees (Scott-Lad and Chan, 2008; Springer, Stanne, and Donovan, 1999) and academics often favor group work for its anticipated reduction in marking loads.

Students’ attitude plays an important role in language teaching-learning process. A learner’s attitude to the group work will impact the learner outside the classroom. The study done by Burden (2004) cited in Hagose (2012), showed that a positive attitude would motivate learners to achieve their learning goals. In teaching-learning process, if a student is eager to learn in group this positive attitude is helpful for his/her study.

Student attitudes toward group learning are an important component of the educational process for at least two reasons. First, students’ attitudes are hypothesized to reflect the quality of a student’s learning experience. Consequently, knowing students’ attitudes toward group work can facilitate the implementation of cooperative learning in classrooms. The way in which group learning is being implemented and the degree to which teachers persevere with this pedagogical approach may be enhanced by understanding the impact of student attitudes in this process.

A second reason why attitudes are important to the educational process is that student attitudes are hypothesized to influence group learning behaviors. It is possible that negative attitudes toward group work may expose group interactions and relationships, as well as student learning. Attitudes, once formed, influences how students think, feel, and behave. “Attitudes and beliefs are a subset of a group of constructs that name, define and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person’s actions” (Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer, 2004). The measurement of these student attitudes may yield important insights about how these attitudes enhance or hinder group work activities. Thus, a person who holds strong beliefs that positively valued outcomes will result from performing the behavior will have a positive attitude toward the behavior. Conversely,
a person who holds strong beliefs that negatively valued outcomes will result from the behavior will have a negative attitude. Language learning can be affected by the attitude of people in teaching and learning process.

8. The Teachers’ and Students’ Role in Group Work Activity

8.1. The teachers’ role in group work activity

Role is a duty that a responsible person has to carry out. According to Wright 1987:2, role is an actor’s part, or one’s function, what a person is appointed or predictable to do. The role of the teacher in group activities is considerably different from the role that is expected of him in traditional classes. Teachers should encourage equal participation between group members to structure each activity that has different parts and sections to be performed by different group members (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The tasks may require specific multiple abilities like: observation, manipulation, and assumption, hypothesizing and writing a report (Cohen, 1972). In the traditional way, the role of the teacher is lecturing, because he is expected of being a source of all knowledge. However, in communicative language teaching and group work in particular, the teacher is facilitator, organizer, guider and motivation reviver (Long and Porter, 1985).

Before the start of the group work activity, teachers should tell students what to do (the instructions and the tasks). They should decide the size of the group and group formation. They have to brief the roles of each group member and tell the time given for the task (Byrne, 1987; Harmer; 1999; Cohen; 1994). Teachers need to assign a role to group member and make explanations clear for all of the learners. In the other way, teachers should encourage students’ cooperation by assigning functionary roles such as a chairperson, secretary or reporter (Ur, 1981). Teachers can support balanced groups interactions by assigning roles to group members by reminding them the skills for cooperation. According to Jacobs and Ball (1996), structuring depends on students’ group experience after students gain enough group experience they will work together without the teacher structuring task for them.

During the group work activity, the role of the teacher is to control, guide, check the activities of the learners and stop if time is up. After group work activity, the teacher should permit learners to report their works, persuade students to comment and ask forward specific and general feed back and tell their results if the task is graded (Brumfit 1984; Byrne 1987; Nunan 1989; Mulat 2007). Therefore, for effective consumption of group work teachers should perform or play their expected responsibility.

Teachers are like good midwives, empower and find ways to activate students for they know that learning requires active engagement between the subjects and object matter and know when to hang back and be silent, when to watch and wonder at what is taking place all around them. They can push and they can pull when necessary just like midwives but they know that they are not always called upon to perform. Sometimes the performance is and must be elsewhere.

Hill (1980:48) influentially describes the shared vulnerabilities when teachers and students climb together: The Teacher as mountaineer learns to connect. The guide rope links mountain climbers together so that they may assist one another in the ascent. The teacher makes a ‘rope ‘by using the oral and written contributions of the students, by forging interdisciplinary and interdisciplin ary links where plausible, and by connecting the course material with the lives of students. The teachers’ role in group work activity is not only guiding them, he can help them by showing different examples.

8.2. The students’ role in group work activity

In order to accomplish group work activities, students need to interact or make a verbal exchange in the target language. In the process of interaction, they get experience to inclusive input, which refers to language features a bit beyond learners’ current level of understanding (Krashen, 1985). This linguistic input has to be negotiated through such strategies, classification, confirmation, checking comprehension and repetition for mutual understanding to take place among the learners in doing the task (Nation 1975).

Learning in group work activity gives high responsibilities for learners to improve their communicative competence Nunan(1989:80) suggested, “Learners must take responsibility for their own learning by developing autonomy and skills in learning how to learn”. Moreover, Cook (2001) stated that learning takes place in the learners’ mind in ways that teachers cannot control. This is an indication that although teachers play their responsibility, unless students perform their responsibility, the goal of learning in groups cannot be achieved. Therefore, students should carry out their different responsibilities.

Before group work activity, students should be clear with the instruction and ready to participate actively in the group work activity (Nunan 1989; Ellis1995; Harmer, 2001). For the achievement of the designed work, students should introduce each other, select group leader and secretary.

According to Harmer (2001) during the group work activity, students are expected to play different responsibility such as, group leader, who is responsible for all the discussion in the group, keeping the group on task for each activity and ensuring everybody assumes his share of the work involved. In general, members in the group work activity have to contribute different roles to perform the task. According to Byrne (1987) and Smith (2008) stated that every team member should support the work of the team, contribute ideas about content and
process and listen carefully to others. In addition, members of the group could help to move the team to its goal in order to keep on the task and maintain a positive attitude. As Weimer (2002:214) successful students exhibit a combination of successful attitudes and behaviors as well as intellectual capacity. Members in a group: are responsible and active by involving in their studies, accept responsibility for their own education, and are active participants in the group. They have legitimate educational goals and are motivated by representing in terms of career aspirations and life’s desires. They ask questions to provide the quickest route between ignorance and knowledge. They discuss about what they are learning and get to know something well enough that they can put into words and do not sit at the back and minimize classroom distractions that interfere with learning.

9. Factors Affecting the Implementation of Group Work Activities

Affect is the expression of one’s attitude towards a certain thing, situation or experience. In English language study, affect is one’s attitude, emotion, feeling and mood. The affective factors include motivation, self-esteem, self-confidence and self-image (Zhu & Zhou, 2012). However, the implementation of group work activities may be affected by many factors. These are: the teacher related factors, students related factors, the class size, and the physical environment, shortage of instructional materials, mother tongue interference, grouping factors and nature of the task.

9.1. Teachers Related Factors

According to Molalign (2011), factors like teachers’ belief, attitude, professional experience, motivation, training, and teachers’ understanding of innovation as the factors which affect the implementation of pedagogical innovations. The teacher must be well trained, must focus and monitor the educational process, be dedicated and respective to his or her students, and be inspirational. The teacher is also one of factor that affects the implementation of group work assignment in language learning. The well trained teacher who may perceive the important technique that helps to monitor educational process may affect group work assignment positively in language learning.

9.2. Students Related Factors

Students’ knowledge of how group work activity is implemented and what is expected of them highly influence the application of group work activities. Darry and Terry (1993) stated that the importance of students’ experience is a transformative rather than passive accumulation of knowledge. They notice that unless learners considered the implication of the ideas in their own lives and decide to the act know and believe in new ways, they are likely to adapt a passive acquaintance to the teachers’ knowledge structure. Internal factors related with psycho-social aspects which influence students learning include: attitude, motivation, age, and previous language learning experience are common. All of these will combine to form each student’s standard and the combination of individual standard will of course form the class standard.

Moreover, the student must have access, ability, interest, and value education (Palmer, 2007). As his view student by him/herself is one of the factors that affect his/her activities in language learning. If students have access to do activities or facilities which may help to practice, and students may be motivated to participate in the activities.

9.3. Class Size

It is not suitable to provide different group work activities having many students in overcrowded classroom. Bethel (2011) states that schools in many parts of Africa are composed of large number of students. Thus, giving enough attention and meeting the need of every different student, so as to engage actively in the learning process is difficult. For this reason, teachers attempt to, retain control and teach all the students all the same times by lecturing them. What may be said here is that, for proper implementation of group work activities, the number of student in the class should be optimum.

9.4. Physical Environment

A number of schools confirmed that the physical environment (class room arrangement, furniture arrangements, classroom appearance and lay out etc.) contribute a lot to promote cooperative learning (Leech and Wooster, 1986). A clean and well kept room with appropriate resource helps to establish a positive expectation towards an activity.

9.5. Instructional Materials

Instructional materials play a great role by giving opportunity to the learner to learn by themselves and enhance learners’ participation through active engagement activities. According to Brown (1994), the roles of instructional materials are: ensure longer retention of the information gain, motivate the students to pay attention to the lesson, to help students to integrate prior experience with the pre set varying from abstract to concrete. However, in the instructions, lack of instructional materials may hinder implementation of group work activities.
9.6. Mother Tongue Interference
McDonough and Shaw (1993) revealed that in small group discussion, some or all of the students might use their first language than the second language. But it is very natural to have such a situation and to use in time of frustration. However, to reduce such problems, the task should be easy and be designed to participate students using the targeted language. Moreover, the use of L1 may lead to the productive use of the targeted language if handled with care (Wilkins, 1974).

9.7. Grouping Factors
The other problem is the challenge of grouping. If their teacher groups students, they may conflict each other. In addition, if they are allowed to form groups by themselves, they talk/play other issues than the task, and shy students are at disadvantage. Therefore, they consider group work as a play than working (Hare, 1994). However, if group work is properly organized and handled and if students properly use or perform their expected roles, the problems will be reduced and it will pave the way for a good end in language learning.

9.8. Nature of the Task
According to Ur (1981) for tasks to be done through verbal interaction, point and purpose seems to be necessary so that they will have power to force interactions. After preparing necessary conditions, the teacher has to set tasks and materials for the groups. This is the stage where groups are actively engaged in their work to solve tasks in an effort to achieve high quality of group products.

The group members are expected to collaborate with each other and coordinate their offers using their target language English. The activities should be intrinsically interesting and challenging to encourage verbal interactions in line with the goal of group work (Nation, 1994). In addition, Nunan (1989) stated that teacher has to play three main roles and acting as facilitator, participant and observer. Parallel to this the students are taking greater initiative. The point is that learning is something only the learners can do for themselves.

Regarding how to overcome problems of low interactions resulting from the nature of the task Ur (1981) recommends selection of activities to be simple, interesting, challenging and encouraging for interaction. It is also necessary to adopt activities to the level, interest, age and background of the learners so as to solve the problems.

9.9. Academic Status and Language Proficiency of the students
In group work activities some members seems to be more influential than others even though they are equal in every respect. According to Cohen (1972) status is an agreed up on social ranking in which every body prefers to have a high rank than a low rank with in a given status order. To have equal benefit in the group, members of a group should have equal chance to talk, interact and contribute. Status difference inhibits the normal pattern of interaction and meaning negotiation. High status is often associated with competence. Some high status students tend to participate more actively than low status members are.

In relation to this Cohen (1972:28) stated that Status characteristics are general expectations for competence. High status individuals are expected to be more competent than low status individuals are across a wide range of tasks that are viewed as important. If a teacher assigns a task to a group of students, some of whom are higher and some lower on any of the status characteristics, which come in to play.

Academic status is a factor that affects the implementation of group work activity. According to Cohen(1972) a student who is seen as best in reading is likely to dominate group activity, on the other hand a student who is seen as poor in reading is very likely to be relatively inactive in other tasks. Academic status also creates a problem when it spreads to a wide range of new activities, which do not require the skill that has made up the status.

Language proficiency is also one of the problems that impede groups to accomplish their task. According to Ellis (1994) high proficient students are likely to participate in foreign language more actively than less proficient ones. In addition to this, Girma (2005:117) stated that, because of students very little proficiency, they do not participate when asked to work in groups. When they are asked, they say they do not understand. This is because the student’s proficiency in English is not good enough to enable them to use the language or to carry out a group work activities. Students resist to use English or to work in groups is due to their lack of proficiency.

Similarly, Jacobs and Ratmandia (1996) stated that, lack of language proficiency is a reason for student’s failure to do well in groups. Most important, high student’s motivation and high self-confidence, which are vehicles for any learning, on the other hand, low motivation and low self-confidence makes learning difficult.

When the gap between high and low achievers is meaningful and the atmosphere is competitive, the impact of language proficiency becomes harmful and result two disadvantages. Firstly, the dominance of few fluent speakers make the less proficient learners to give up the task. Secondly, they may return to use their mother tongue as an alternative to succeed. The main challenges often mentioned in using group work activity, according to Davies (1980) and Harmer (1991) are the desire to use the first language, which according to Ur (1981) when students have a threshold of the second language proficiency requires treatment for it counters the goal of group work. Harmer (1991) believes that this could be due to inability or unwillingness, which proposes convincing
students to use the target language or doing controlled activities until they are ready for communicative activities.

10. Concept of Speaking in group work activities
Speaking is the ability to communicate meaning successfully with partners when there are problems in communication process, has improved (Dornyei and Thurell, 1991). Also it is a way of verbalizing what you think and believe (Micula, 1999). He also stated that speaking is designed to provide you with the speech communication skill that is essential in talking with one person, in a group or in front of an audience.

Saville (2006) stated that the best learning occurs when learners feel comfortable and enjoy the classroom activities. Therefore, enjoying and participating the classroom activities in group without any anxiety their need to speak English higher and higher. Fakhar (2012) defined speaking is described as interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing and receiving and processing information. Speaking depends on the context or situation; context includes the physical environment (McDonough et al, 1993:132). Moreover, Speaking as mutual attempts of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where the requisite meaning structures.

11. Activities Used to Teach Speaking in group
Oral expression activities are conducted with group work to stimulate learners’ interest and to defeat their feeling of shyness and fear, as they are helpful in giving each learner, especially for overcrowded classes, the chance to participate within the group (Putnam, 1997). They are conducted through separating the class into groups, with a chief for each group and then give them the task.

After a limited period of time, all learners meet again and debate what they found as results. The teacher organizes his learners in the classroom according to two shapes, the first one is that learners sit roundly to see each other and to ease their contributions; and the second one is that learners are put into a group of two learners, and ask them to converse between each other one asks and the other one replies (Byrne, 1986). As he can help students with vocabulary and expressions necessary for the exercises as well as offering students the chance to contribute orally through paying the students’ attention to ask questions that need long answers, as he must correct just students’ errors that cause misunderstanding among them.

12. Functions of Speaking in Group Work Activities
Numerous attempts have been made to categorize the functions of speaking in human interaction. Brown and Yule (1983) state a useful distinction between the interactional functions of speaking, in which it serves to establish and maintain social relations and the transactional functions, which focus on the exchange of information in workshops with teachers and in designing my own materials. Jones (1996) pointed out that talk as interaction refers to what we normally mean by “conversation” and describes interaction that primarily social function. When people meet, they exchange greeting, engage in small talk, recount recent experiences, and so on, because they wish to be friendly and to establish a comfortable zone of interaction with others. The focus is more on the speakers and how they wish to present themselves to each other that on the message.

Such exchange may be either casual or more formal, depend on the circumstances, and their nature has been well described by Brown and Yule (1983). There are different functions of speaking explained in this section, for instance, use of interactional function, exchange of information, conversation that refer talk as interaction. With this regard, the researcher intended to investigate whether English language teachers use of group work activities to enhance learners’ speaking skill.
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