To my beloved family

STUDENTS' AND TEACHERS'
PERCEPTIONS OF INTERACTION TYPES

Graduate School of Education

of

Bilkent University

by

ÖZLEM KAYA

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
The Degree of MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2007

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

June 12, 2007

The examining committee appointed by The Graduate School of Education

for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Özlem Kaya

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title:	Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Interaction Types
Thesis Advisor:	Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydinli Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
Committee Members:	Visiting Asst. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program
	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu Middle East Technical University , Faculty of Foreign Language Education

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

…………………………………………
(Assist. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydinli)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

…………………………………………
(Visiting Assist. Prof. Dr. JoDee Walters)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

…………………………………………
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

…………………………………………
(Visiting Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands)
Director

ABSTRACT

STUDENTS' AND TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF INTERACTION TYPES

Özlem Kaya

M.A. Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı

July 2007

This thesis investigated the perceptions of students at various proficiency levels and their teachers toward interaction types used in language classes, exploring students' and teachers' affective reactions to interaction types, along with their impressions of these interaction types' effectiveness as learning tools.

The study was conducted with the participation of 238 students from various proficiency levels (two classes from each level), and their Speaking-Listening course teachers at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages in the spring semester of 2007. The data were gathered through perception questionnaires and interviews.

The analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data revealed that students and their teachers perceived group work as a more effective learning tool, and they had more have positive affective reactions to this interaction type than whole-class teaching, which suggested that students and their teachers had tendencies towards

learner-centered learning. Moreover, there was no significant difference of perception across the proficiency levels, and opinions of students did not clash with those of their teachers to a great extent.

This study implied that group work is an effective and enjoyable interaction type, which should be employed more frequently in addition to whole-class teaching in language classes. Further, it suggested that group work can become more effectively and smoothly implemented at all levels if students receive strategy training on group work.

Key Words: Interaction types, group work, whole-class teaching, perception, proficiency level.

ÖZET

ÖĞRENCİLERİN VE ÖĞRETMENLERİN ETKİLEŞİM TİPLERİNE

KARŞI TUTUMLARI

Özlem Kaya

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez yöneticisi: Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı

Temmuz 2007

Bu tez, farklı dil kurlarındaki öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerinin etkileşim tiplerini nasıl algıladıklarını incelemiştir. Bu çalışmada ayrıca öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin etkileşim tiplerine olan duygusal reaksiyonları, öğrenme aracı olarak bu etkileşim tiplerini nasıl etkili bulduklarına ek olarak araştırılmıştır.

Çalışma farklı dil kurlarından 238 öğrencinin (her kurdan iki sınıf olmak üzere) ve bu öğrencilerin konuşma-Dinleme derslerine giren öğretmenlerinin katılımı ile Anadolu Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda 2007 bahar döneminde gerçekleşmiştir. Veri algı anketleri ve mülakatlar aracılığıyla toplanmıştır.Nicel ve nitel veri analizi, öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin grup çalışmasını sınıfça çalışmadan daha etkili bir öğrenme aracı olarak algıladıklarını, ve grup çalışmasına sınıfça çalışmadan daha pozitif duygusal reaksiyon gösterdiklerini ortaya koymuştur. Bu,

öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin öğrenci-merkezli öğrenmeye daha meğilli olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, dil kurları arasında anlamlı bir algı farklılığı bulunmamış, ve öğrencilerin fikirleri öğretmenlerininki ile büyük ölçüde çatışmamıştır.

Bu çalışma, grup çalışmasının etkili ve eğlenceli bir etkileşim tipi olduğunu, ve dil sınıflarında sınıfça çalışmaya ek olarak daha fazla uygulanması gerektiğini göstermiştir. Ayrıca, öğrenciler grup çalışmasında strateji eğitimi aldığı takdirde grup çalışmasının bütün dil kurlarında daha etkili ve problemsiz uygulanabileceğini ileri sürmüştür.

Anahtar kelimeler: Etkileşim tipleri, grup çalışması, sınıfça çalışma, algı, dil kuru

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı for providing invaluable feedback for my study, and being supportive and encouring through good and trying times. She guided me in my research during the meticulous thesis writing process, and gave support all the time. Her friendly and understanding attitude, witty jokes, mimes and gestures added spice to our program.

I would also like to thank to Dr. JoDee Walters, who contributed to my thesis with her precious feedback, inspired me with her endless energy, and showed me how hardworking a teacher can be. I have always had a strong emotional tie with her, the reason of which is obscure even to me.

I am grateful to Assist. Prof. Handan Kopkallı Yavuz, the director and Dr. Aysel Bahçe, vice director of Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages for allowing me to attend the MA TEFL Program. I owe special thanks to the participant teachers of my study for willingly agreeing to be a part of my thesis.

Many special thanks to the MA TEFL 2007 class for the new and creative ideas they gave during discussions, their nice presentations, collaboration, and sincere friendship.They were always kind, understanding and friendly to me.

I am very grateful to the members of our "nuclear group". Without them, this program would not be so unforgettable and enjoyable for me: Thank you, Gulin Sezgin, my dear lovely philanthropic roommate for being always near me with your support, advise, frienship and good intention. I want to continue this priceless friendship forever. Thank you Figen Tezdiker, my eternal "level-responsible" for

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

It has been often noted that interaction has a significant place in enhancing students' language learning, and the advantages of activities carried out through interaction have been listed by many researchers (Brown, 2001; Lynch, 1996; Rivers, 1987; Hedge, 2000). Therefore, one of the concerns of English language teachers is to provide students with rich interaction opportunities in the classroom. They use interaction types in their classes in order to reach the goals they have set for the lesson. Problems may arise, however, if students do not regard these interaction types as effective learning tools, or do not have positive feelings towards the interaction types used in classes. It is necessary therefore to know how students evaluate the interaction types, what they feel about them and how different or similar the students' and their teachers' opinions are. By taking these factors into consideration, teachers may find alternative ways to the typical practice of interaction types and make changes in their practices to mitigate the negative feelings of the students. Hence, this study aims to investigate perceptions of students at various proficiency levels and their teachers toward interaction types used in language classes, exploring students' and teachers' affective reactions to interaction types, along with their impressions of their effectiveness as learning tools.

Background of the Study

With the advent of cooperative learning approaches, there has been a shift from teacher-fronted learning to student-centered learning and concepts such as communication, collaboration and interaction have been increasingly emphasized. Among these concepts, especially the place of interaction in the classroom and the

benefits it provides for learners have been widely addressed in the recent literature (e.g. Brown, 2001; Ellis, 2003; Hedge, 2000; Lynch, 1996).

Interaction means the exchange of information, opinions or feelings collaboratively between two or more people, leading to a positive mutual effect on the participants (Brown, 2001). It involves both the expression of one's own ideas and the comprehension of those of others (Rivers, 1987). During interaction, negotiation of meaning is accomplished through comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation checks and recasts (Ellis, 2003). In other words, speakers amend what they say in order to be comprehensible for the listeners (Hedge, 2000), and this contributes to the acquisition of the information gained through negotiation of meaning. In language classrooms, interaction occurs between teacher and students, students and students, or students and authors of texts. Through interaction, students can raise their knowledge of language as they listen to their teachers and classmates or read the linguistic materials, and they can learn and produce the language by means of negotiating meaning with each other during the tasks or exercises carried out in the classroom.

In today's communicative classroom, the challenge is to find activities and procedures which will create spontaneous interaction for students and which will help the acquisition process (Hedge, 2000). Therefore, it is suggested that situations in which interaction occurs in a natural way and in which students can use what they have been taught in a more formal manner for real communication should be created (Rivers, 1987). In order to improve interaction, free discussions, role plays, dramas, simulations, information gap activities, jigsaw stories as pair work, group work or whole-class can be incorporated into the learning process in the classroom.

Particularly, getting students to perform tasks or exercises in pairs or groups is believed to have many advantages, among which are extended conversational exchanges, opportunities for student initiation, practice in negotiation of meaning, increase in students' motivation, and promoting learners' responsibility and autonomy (Brown, 2001).

As interaction has come to be viewed as an indispensable part of language classrooms, many studies have been conducted in order to investigate different interaction types and patterns (e.g. Dobinson, 2001; Hall & Walls, 2002; Mori, 2002; Sert, 2005; Soler, 2002; Storch, 2002). These studies have examined teacher-student interaction or student-student interaction based on classroom observations, and have attempted to categorize the interaction types and patterns. Wells (1993), for example, proposed that an Initiation-Response-Follow-up (IRF) pattern can be used as an alternative to the standard Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) pattern in teacher-student interaction, and Storch (2002) identified and explored four distinct patterns of student-student interaction, which are collaborative, dominant-dominant, dominant-passive and expert-novice.

In identifying and analyzing interaction, studies generally have focused on the outcomes of activities or tasks performed in the classroom. However, Wu (1998) claims that examining just the observable activities of interpersonal verbal exchanges is not sufficient to draw conclusions about interaction. Rather, considering as well the unobservable activities of intrapersonal mental processes such as perceiving, understanding and inferring is also necessary. In addition, Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) argue that students' favorable or unfavorable attitudes towards a task affect their performance on that task. In order to find out whether students in the classroom

like the tasks used during the classes, or whether they learn what their teachers plan to teach in the lessons, they can be asked how they evaluate the activities done in the classroom. Furthermore, it may be useful for teachers to ask students' opinions about classroom activities in order to raise their awareness about how certain activities can be helpful in achieving the objectives of the course (McDonough, 2004). In order to meet the need for exploring how students perceive the effectiveness of activities carried out in the classroom, researchers such as Garret and Shorthall (2002), Ghaith (2001), Mackey (2002), and Rao (2002) have studied students' perceptions or evaluations of the classroom activities and experiences, and thus contributed to the literature by revealing the perceived effect of classroom practices on students, in other words, by showing how students interpret these practices.

Rao (2002) states that perceptions of teachers and their students do not always match, and Yang and Lau (2003) argue that students and teachers are likely to have different expectations in the classroom. This argument was supported by the findings of Schleppegrell and Simich-Dudgeon (1996), and Mcdonough (2004). If there is a mismatch between the perceptions of teachers and students, what is considered as effective by teachers may not be welcomed by students, and the goals and objectives of the course may not be fully achieved. One solution to this may be that teachers should discuss what they think with students, ask their ideas and find solutions to satisfy the students' needs and expectations. In this way, students may be more willing to participate in the activities and utilize all the opportunities interaction presents to them.

In my opinion, simply collecting students' and teachers' perceptions is not sufficient to decide on the effectiveness of interaction types as it does not take into

consideration other factors that may affect these perceptions. For example, the proficiency level of the class may play an important role in determining students' thoughts and feelings and their teachers' opinions about the interaction types employed in the classroom. In their study "Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities" Garrett and Shortall (2002) found that there were some significant differences among beginner, elementary, and intermediate level students in terms of their perceived value of and affective reactions towards the teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities. In terms of specifically interaction based activities, it can be argued that students at upper proficiency levels may feel comfortable and competent to speak and interact, and their teachers may find the interaction types used in classes effective whereas students at lower proficiency levels may feel hesitant or not competent to produce the language, and their teachers may find the interaction types ineffective.

There is no study in the literature which sheds light on whether there are differences in perceptions both between teachers and students as well as between students of different proficiency levels, and considers how effective these students and teachers find various interaction types as learning tools. This study aims, therefore, to investigate how students and teachers feel about interaction types and how effective they find these interaction types as learning tools.

<div align="center">Statement of the Problem</div>

The role of interaction in learning and the opportunities it provides for language learners have been emphasized in the literature (Brown, 2001; Ellis, 2003; Hedge, 2000; Lynch, 1996), and the effectiveness of different interaction types and interaction patterns has been widely investigated (e.g. Dobinson, 2001; Hall &

Walsh, 2002; Sert, 2005; Soler, 2002; Storch, 2002). Classroom research on interaction has focused on the productions of students in the classroom, yet it has been argued that intrapersonal mental processes such as perceiving should also be considered in order to have a deeper understanding of classroom activities' effectiveness (Wu, 1998), and desired learning can not be accomplished without understanding how students interpret the activities they are involved in (Meskill and Rangelova, 2000, cited in Gabillon, 2005). In the literature, the studies on the perceptions of students and teachers about interaction have not been conducted in a comparative manner to explore whether there is a relationship between the proficiency level of the students and their perceptions. There is need, therefore, for research explaining and comparing the perceptions of teachers and EFL students of various proficiency levels towards the interaction types and activities carried out in the classroom.

Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages follows a skill-based approach to teaching English, and speaking-listening is regarded as a separate course. One of the objectives of the speaking-listening course is to enable students to interact with each other. Therefore, students take part in different activities, which are considered to foster interaction, and promote learning. They carry out various tasks and activities as a whole-class, in pairs and in groups. In these activities, students are required to speak in English, cooperate with their partners, understand one another, negotiate, and learn from each other. However, the common understanding among teachers is that students are sometimes reluctant to work in groups or pairs because they are not used to this kind of activity in their previous education lives, and they appreciate whole-class teaching more than pair work and group work. Furthermore, it

has been my observation that the activities found effective by teachers are not always perceived the same by their students. Some teachers report being unable to reach their goals when carrying out activities that involve interaction. In order to get students to work interactively and gain the opportunities interaction offers, it is necessary to know what teachers and students of various levels think and feel about the interaction types.

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

This study attempts to find out what students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types are, whether there is a difference on perception across various proficiency levels, and whether students' perceptions and their teachers' perceptions of these interaction types match.

This study will address the following research questions:

1) What are the perceptions of students of the interaction types used in Speaking-Listening classes at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages?

    a- How do they feel about using these interaction types?

    b- How effective do they find these interaction types as learning tools?

2) Are there differences in perceptions among students of different levels?

3) What are the perceptions of teachers of the interaction types used in Speaking-Listening classes?

    a- How do they feel about using these interaction types?

    b- How effective do they find these interaction types as learning tools?

4) Are there differences in perceptions among teachers of different levels?

5) Are there differences between students' and teachers' perceptions?

Significance of the Study

There is a lack of research in the foreign language teaching field on the perceptions of EFL students of various proficiency levels and their teachers towards the interaction types incorporated into classes. The results of this study may contribute to the literature by revealing and comparing the perceptions of the students and teachers of different proficiency levels about various interaction types. Moreover, the study can confirm or contradict earlier studies' findings thus revealing whether predictable patterns can be identified in student preferences, and it can remind teachers of the need to consider learners' preferences when determining curricula/syllabi. In other words, taking students' perceptions into account and making the necessary adaptations or changes parallel to them could help create a classroom environment in which all of the students are more likely to enjoy the opportunities the interaction types offer.

The findings of this study may be helpful for the teachers who have Speaking-Listening classes at Anadolu University because they may gain a deeper understanding of their students' perceptions of the interaction types and can thus select and carry out the activities more effectively. They can also have an idea about students who have favorable or unfavorable attitudes towards the tasks and try to find ways of addressing the unfavorable attitudes to increase students' performance, or they can find out what interaction strategies to teach their students to make more successful implementation of the tasks in the classroom. In addition, this study may lead to further studies in examining the students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types in different courses such as writing, grammar and reading courses at Anadolu University.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the research questions the study will address, and significance of the study have been presented and discussed. The second chapter reviews the literature on interaction, interaction types- whole class teaching, group work and pair work-, interaction patterns, and perception. In the third chapter, the research methodology, which includes setting and participants, instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures of the study, is described. The analysis of the data collected to serve the aim of the study is described in the fourth chapter. Lastly, the fifth chapter summarizes the findings, and attempts to interpret them in addition to presenting the limitations of the study and pedagogical implications.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study examines students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types – whole-class teaching, group work and pair work- at various proficiency levels. A survey study was conducted to investigate whether the proficiency level of students has an impact on the perceptions of both students and their teachers with regard to the effectiveness and enjoyment of various interaction types.

This chapter presents background information on interaction, its advantages and research studies on it. This is followed by exploring different interaction types and patterns in detail. Last, the importance of perception, studies on the perceptions of students and their teachers of various activities, and the possible effect of proficiency level on perceptions is described and explained in order to indicate the need for this study.

Interaction

The Place of Interaction in Communicative Approaches

Current communicative approaches to language teaching have attributed a major role to communication in language classes since the emergence of communicative methodologies in the 1980s (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The emphasis on communication has led to a shift in classrooms to student-centeredness, thus the teacher's role has become less dominant than in traditional teacher-fronted methods, and students are expected to take on more responsibility for their own learning. The focus of instruction has been directed at meaning, rather than form, in communication. The participants of a conversation are supposed to convey their

knowledge, opinions, and feelings to each other, and in turn, understand each other to avoid breakdowns in communication. In today's communicative classrooms, therefore, one of the teacher's main duties is to introduce situations likely to promote communication, in which students interact with one another, find opportunities to work on negotiation of meaning, and increase their communicative competence (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). They are expected to interact in various ways such as in dyads, triads, small groups, or as a whole class.

In fact, interaction is not a new phenomenon, and it has long been addressed, both in first language and second language acquisition, as an important factor in studies of how languages are learned. Theorists who support an interactionist position, from Vygotsky and Piaget to second language experts like Long, have long argued that language acquisition takes place through interaction (Lightbown & Spada, 2003). Michael Long, emphasizing the importance of comprehensible input in his interaction hypothesis, claims that conversational interaction is necessary in order for second language acquisition to take place, and that input is made comprehensible through interaction with other speakers (Long, 1996, cited in Ellis, 1997).

Definition of Interaction

Interaction is the exchange of information, opinions, or feelings collaboratively between two or more people, and it leads to a mutual effect on participants (Brown, 2001). It not only involves expression of one's ideas, but also grasp of those of others (Rivers, 1987). In classrooms, learners are always engaged in the exchange of information, opinions, and feelings among themselves, or with the teacher, and try to understand the intended meaning of the message, so it is logical to say that interaction is an inevitable part of classroom pedagogy. From a semantic

perspective, meaning is mostly a product of give and take as contributors to the conversation endeavor to communicate. This obliges teachers to create opportunities for real interaction in the classroom so that learners may engage in such exchanges (Brown, 2001). Therefore, if no one-to-one interaction had happened in a classroom, teachers would probably be reluctant to accept that a lesson had taken place at all (Allwright, 1984).

Interaction brings negotiation into play between student and teacher, and between student and student in the classroom. Negotiation refers to any efforts to take decisions by agreement rather than by one-sided decision-making (Allwright, 1984). Depending on the focus of interaction, negotiation of meaning or negotiation of form occurs when students try to come to a mutual understanding. If the focus of the interaction is on meaning, students accomplish negotiation of meaning through comprehension checks, clarification requests, confirmation checks and recasts (Ellis, 2003); in other words, they amend what they say in order to be comprehensible to their classmates or teachers (Hedge, 2000). Negotiation of meaning is an important interactive part of every classroom practice in second or foreign language teaching. On the other hand, if the focus of the interaction is on form, negotiation of form can be achieved through clarification requests, repetition, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation (Lyster, 2002). This negotiation also includes corrective feedback and moves that give or educe information about relevant form-function relationship (Lyster, 2002). When teachers want to spark their students' attention to form and improve accuracy, they may make use of negotiation of form when interacting with them. However, there are also occasions that involve both negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form during interaction. For example, if the meaning is obscured

or ambiguous during the negotiation of meaning due to a grammatical mistake, and negotiation of meaning can not be accomplished, students can come up with the correct grammatical form by negotiating with their teacher or each other. In this way, the meaning becomes clearer, and negotiation of meaning is accomplished at the same time with negotiation of form, which takes place naturally as a necessity of the situation.

Advantages of Interaction

Interaction in language classrooms endows learners whose overall aim is to produce and use the target language with many advantages. Through interaction, students can increase their language knowledge as they listen to their teachers and classmates or read the texts. They can have the chance to practice new aspects of language they have learned; giving feedback to each other while interacting. They may also develop social relations among themselves, and they may become more cooperative while performing tasks. In language classrooms, interaction requires management of learning jointly by both teachers and learners therefore, learners are not simply learners anymore; they become the managers of their learning (Allwright, 1984). Brown (2000, p. 166) lists the features of interaction which are beneficial for learners as follows:

- As focus is on meanings and messages, learners are released from using language in a controlled mode and can attain automaticity more smoothly.
- While students are busy with each other in communication, they see their own language competence, and thus become intrinsically motivated.

- The nature of interactive communication involves careful use of several strategies for production and understanding.

- Interaction necessitates taking risks of misunderstanding or being unable to convey the intended meaning, but the outcomes are invaluable and worth the risks.

- Interactive speech enables students to see the connection between culture and language.

- The complexity of interaction upholds the development of interlanguage of learners.

A review of these features of interaction may suggest that a successful interaction in the language classroom is useful for learners in many ways. Interaction does not contribute to the learning process in only one aspect; on the contrary, it supports language learning with its many aspects such as communication, negotiation or strategy use. For this reason, interaction may be accepted as a multifunctional concept, enabling students to enhance more smoothly in their learning route.

Research Studies on Interaction

As interaction is noted for creating opportunities for students in language learning, it has been the subject of many studies in the ELT field. Dobinson (2001) conducted a study to investigate whether students of upper intermediate to advanced level learn from classroom interaction, and found out that students benefit from the interaction in the lesson even if they are not involved overtly in it. Moreover, he concluded that students frequently recalled and retained new vocabulary that they attended to during the interaction in the class. Bitchener (2004) explored the relationship between negotiation of meaning and language learning in a study carried

out with pre-intermediate ESL learners and suggested that even low proficiency learners use negotiation when there are communication problems, and that language learning which takes place in negotiation during interaction is able to be retained over several months. In the light of these two studies, it can be concluded that interaction helps learners retain the information gained during the lessons.

Interaction may play an important role in the acquisition of grammar, as well. Mackey and Philip (1998) examined the effects of negotiated interaction on the production and development of question forms in ESL beginner and lower intermediate learners, with the focus on recasts during interaction. Their study revealed that learners made great gains when they were developmentally ready to learn the items, and that recasts used during interaction may be beneficial for short-term interlanguage development in the acquisition of grammar. The results of a study on whether conversational interaction facilitates second language development in ESL learners from beginner and lower intermediate classes by Mackey (1999) support this claim, as her study confirms that there is a link between interaction and grammatical development.

However, while investigating the effect of interaction in acquiring the grammar of a second language, Kuiken and Vedder (2002) found that interaction led to noticing, but not to acquisition. The finding of this study contradicts the findings of Mackey and Philip (1998) and Mackey (1999) in terms of acquisition, but it still indicates that interaction has a positive impact on learning grammar. What may have affected the results of these studies may be the design of interaction. In the studies by Mackey and Philip (1998) and Mackey (1999), the students interacted with native speakers who were the researchers or people trained for the research in dyads, but in

the study by Kuiken and Vedder (2002), the students interacted with each other in groups. Therefore, it may be claimed that learners benefit more from interaction in terms of grammar if they interact with higher proficiency speakers than their level.

Further, different aspects of interaction have been investigated to get more detailed information about such multifunctional interaction. Mackey and Silver (2005) sought to uncover the connection between interactional tasks and English L2 learning by immigrant children in Singapore, and found out that feedback provided through negotiations during task interaction assisted language development, and those who received interactional feedback during the tasks showed stage development in question forms. Oliver and Mackey (2003) gave a new dimension to this issue by asserting that interactional context is important in assessing the impact of interaction. In their study, they describe four categories of interactional context, which are communication-focused interaction, content-focused interaction, classroom management-focused interaction, and explicit language-focused interaction. The researchers assert that the type and amount of feedback in the classroom differs according to the context of interaction, and the opportunities for students to use the feedback and their use of the feedback are directly affected from this, in turn. For example, learners had the most opportunities to use the feedback they received in explicit language-focused exchanges and the fewest opportunities in management-related exchanges in their study. Questioning another aspect of interaction, namely, pragmatics, Soler (2002) examined the relationship between teacher-led versus learners' interaction and the development of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. Her study revealed that both teacher-students and peer interaction

may help to build pragmatic knowledge, although learners' development of pragmatic knowledge is not immediate.

Depending on the results of various studies on interaction, it is clear that interaction is really useful in students' language learning process, and it can be used extensively in language classrooms. Employing interaction in different ways for specific purposes may promote the effectiveness of the learning environment, and contribute to the use of the target language.

<div align="center">Interaction Types</div>

In language classrooms, teachers who are advocates of communicative methods seek ways to generate and sustain successful interaction. The challenge is to find activities and procedures which will create spontaneous interaction for students and which will ease the acquisition process (Hedge, 2000). Therefore, creating, or stimulating student creation of, "situations in which interaction naturally blossoms and in which students can use for actual communication what they have been learning in a more formal fashion" is suggested (Rivers, 1987, p. 4). To attain an atmosphere which is composed of natural interaction, tasks such as role-plays, dramas, projects, interviews, information gap activities, problem solving and decision making, and opinion exchange can be performed in groups, in pairs or as a whole-class (Brown, 2001).

There is no consensus about a definition or categorization of group, pair work and whole-class teaching. Some authors mention them as a kind of activity (e.g. Davis, 1997), or method (e.g. McDonough & Shaw, 2003) while others avoid using a particular term and discuss them under a chapter like "Grouping Students" (see Harmer, 2004), or "Interactive Language Teaching" (see Brown, 2001). Since

various tasks, practices, or activities can be performed in pairs, in groups or as a whole-class by students, and this can help foster interaction among them, categorizing group work, pair work and whole-class teaching as "interaction types" make sense. The word *type* is used here because it represents the general structure held in common by the tasks, practices, or activities carried out in pairs, groups, or as a whole-class, namely that interaction is required. However, it should be noted that whole-class teaching is a type of interaction between teacher and student, whereas group work and pair work is another type of interaction, which takes place between students.

<p style="text-align:center">*Teacher-Student Interaction: Whole-class Teaching*</p>

Whole-class teaching is a teacher-fronted interaction type which imputes a major role to the teacher in the classroom. Teachers may prefer this interaction type for several reasons. First, students are under the direct authority of the teacher, and both teachers and students may feel more secure when the whole class is working together. Second, it allows teachers to get a general understanding of student progress. Moreover, it is suitable for activities in which the teacher is acting as controller or giving explanations and instructions. In addition, such teaching tends not to be time consuming, and it is easy to conduct in terms of organization and material production (Harmer, 2004).

Despite these advantages, whole-class teaching has many limitations, as well. To begin with, all the students are required to do the same thing at the same time and pace. It brings the risk of public failure; therefore, students may be discouraged to participate in front of the whole class. Moreover, individual students do not have many opportunities to speak, and they may be disinclined to take responsibility for

their own learning. Further, students do not discover things for themselves; on the contrary, the teacher transmits knowledge to students. Lastly, it is not very appropriate for communicative language teaching, which favors more student talk and less teacher talk (Harmer, 2004).

Student-Student Interaction: Group Work and Pair Work

Group work, which involves three or more students who perform a task collaboratively, is entrenched in almost all language classrooms because it offers many advantages for students. Its most significant feature is that it is learner-centered. The teacher acts as a designer of the activity before the class, and as a facilitator during the implementation of the activity (Davis, 1997, p. 268). Students have more opportunities to speak, and therefore to be involved more actively in language use (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). Furthermore, group work increases students' autonomy since they make their own decisions in the group (Brown 2001; Harmer 2004), enabling students to go beyond sentence-level discourse into genuine communication acts (Davis, 1997). "It provides opportunities for student initiation, face-to-face give and take, practice in negotiation of meaning, extended conversational exchanges, and student adoption of roles that would otherwise be impossible" (Brown, 2001, p. 178). Group work can also help diminish anxiety (Harmer, 2004), promoting a positive atmosphere in the classroom, which can contribute to student motivation (Brown, 2001; McDonough & Shaw, 2003).

In group work, students can work either cooperatively or collaboratively. In cooperative work, students work together on every item whereas in collaborative work, they are given different responsibilities of the task. Teachers can arrange

whether cooperative or collaborative learning will take place depending on the nature of the task.

When the number of the participants is limited to two students, the interaction type is called pair work. Sometimes, pair work is not regarded as different from group work because it is learner-centered, too, and like group work it provides students with great interaction opportunities. However, there are some slight differences. For example, pair work is comparatively quick and easy to arrange, noticeably increases students' amount of speaking time, and gives students even more responsibility (Harmer, 2004, p.116).

Activities held as group work and pair work

There are many activities which are generally performed as group work or pair work in language classrooms. Among the most commonly used ones are role-plays, dramas, project work, information gap activities, and discussions/debates. The general characteristics of these activities are as follows:

Role-play: It prepares students for real communication, contextualizes language use, provides conversational routines, fosters retention of language structures, and adds emotion, inventiveness and listener awareness to language teaching (Salies, 1995).

Drama: It allows students to develop creativity, use their imaginations, discover the value of cooperation, enhance their self-esteem, develop autonomy, and have a sense of accomplishment (Elgar, 2002). Students can perform dramas by using pre-existing plays, or by writing and using their own plays.

Project work: It enables students to actively engage in information gathering, processing, and reporting over a period of time. It increases students' content

knowledge, language mastery and motivation. Moreover, it enhances students' autonomy, and contributes to developing positive attitudes toward English (Alan & Stoller, 2005, p. 10).

Information gap activity: This is a controlled activity which is goal-convergent, and which creates learning opportunities for students. In an information gap activity, generally student A has some information and student B asks questions to find that information. During the activity, students negotiate with each other focusing on primarily information transaction, and they try to establish a mutual understanding to accomplish the task (Nakahama, Tyler, & van Lier, 2001).

Discussion/debate: It is a "natural and efficient way of practicing talking freely in English by thinking out some problem or situation together through oral exchange of ideas" (Ur, 1981, p. 2). It enables students to practice fluency while speaking, to learn new information and ideas from their peers, and to develop debating skills.

Teachers can choose whether to employ pair work or group work in the execution of these activities, taking the nature and goal of the activity into consideration. Brown (2001) suggests that pair work goes better with "tasks that are short, linguistically simple and quite controlled in terms of the structure of the task" (p. 182). He maintains that there are some activities appropriate for pair work such as practicing dialogues with a partner, simple question-and answer exercises, quick brainstorming activities, or preparation for merging with a larger group (pp.182-183). As for group work, it may be more appropriate for activities which require collaboration and interdependence such as project work, or many information and opinion exchanges such as debate and discussion. Students can also perform dramas

in groups since dramas generally involve more than two persons. In addition to these, if the teacher wants to follow students' performance closely, getting students to work in groups is more convenient than pair work.

Research Studies on Interaction Types

The strongly emphasized advantages of group work and pair work in theoretical books are taken into consideration by the writers of language learning books, and hence frequently used in the organization of activities or exercises presented. Jacobs and Ball (1996) conducted a study which analyzed the use of group activities in ELT course books published since 1990, and not surprisingly, they found that group activities are extensively employed in current ELT course books. They also noticed that authors used many good ideas and imaginative means in the activities in order to encourage learners to gain the most benefit from cooperation. The fact that teachers generally follow a course book in their lessons and the current course books accommodate many activities or exercises to be performed in pairs or groups reveals that implementation of pair and group work in addition to whole-class teaching is almost unavoidable in language classrooms.

Both the theoretical grounds for group work and pair work, and the practice of them in real classroom settings have inspired researchers to explore the use and effectiveness of these interaction types. Since these interaction types are also practiced frequently in task-based learning, collaborative learning, and cooperative learning, the scope of the research studies on interaction types has broadened, contributing to the availability and diversity of research. Due to the fact that the aim of this study is associated with interaction types, which are believed to promote interaction, and performed in pairs, groups, or as a whole-class, any study focusing

or comparing on interaction in pair work, group work, or whole-class teaching can provide valuable insights.

Whole-class teaching still tends to reign over current teaching practices. However, since the introduction of communicative approaches, whole-class teaching has been challenged by group work and pair work. As a result, research has focused on group work and pair work, and it is not possible to find recent studies solely on whole-class teaching. Nevertheless, the studies on student-student interaction sometimes compare group work and pair work with whole-class teaching in terms of effectiveness and perception, and these studies may also give ideas about whole-class teaching therefore reviewing the studies on student-student interaction may also enable readers to get a general idea about whole-class teaching as well.

Myers (2000) analyzed the interaction which occurred during group work to investigate whether theories of task-based language learning and Vygotsky's sociocultural theory have practical applications in the classroom. She concluded that the theories were compatible with classroom practice, and that students negotiated meaning and form, really communicated, and learned through interaction. The study of McDonough (2004) also suggests that group work is useful for language learning. In her study, students performed information-gap and opinion exchange activities in pairs and groups, focusing on conditional clauses. Students' production of conditional clauses improved during pair work and group work thanks to the negative feedback and modified input which occurred in interaction.

Like group work, pair work- the other interaction type- has been investigated at different levels for various aims. For example, Harris (2005) investigated whether pair work is applicable and effective in beginning EFL classes, and her study

revealed that pair work is possible even in beginning levels, creating interaction which encompasses negotiation of meaning and form. Moreover, Storch (1999) explored the relationship between pair work and grammatical accuracy at levels from intermediate to advanced, and reported that collaboration and the metatalk it generated in pair work led to an improvement in the overall grammatical accuracy of the texts produced by learners. Another study on pair work by Sert (2005) supports the claim about the positive effects of pair work by presenting how pair work contributed to the production of language and led to the improvement of inter-personal relations in students in their first year of ELT department. To sum up, these studies indicate that employing group work and pair work in addition to whole-class teaching in language classrooms may be very advantageous for learners.

Culture, which has been found worth studying in the literature, is one factor which may influence the effectiveness of interaction types in student-student interaction. In an attempt to investigate group work from a cultural perspective, Flowerdew (1998) asserted that teachers should adjust their expectations and teaching style according to the students' cultural backgrounds. For example, he claimed that group work may go well with Chinese students who value Confucian values if the principles of Confucian discipline are incorporated into group work appropriately. Therefore, it can be suggested that teachers should be careful in designing and implementing group work in order to create an effective learning environment instead of resistance among students.

Teacher intervention in pair or group work is another point which has been addressed in the literature. Teachers should be very careful about whether to interfere or when to interfere when they observe a problem or problems arising during pair or

group work, because, as Lynch (1997) points out, "when teachers intervene to avoid a problem, they may also remove the need to negotiate meaning- and so, perhaps, the opportunity for learning" (p.324).

How teachers can increase the effectiveness of interaction types in student-student interaction by teaching their students strategies is another source of investigation in the literature. Bejarono, et al. (1997) explored the effectiveness of strategy training of EFL students in enhancing interaction in group work, and arrived at the finding that strategy training enabled students to produce more comprehensible input and output during group work. This means that teaching students interaction strategies before working in pairs or groups can contribute to negotiation of meaning and form among students, and sustain the interaction which occurs during negotiations. This assumption can be confirmed in the literature with the study of Naughton (2006), who discovered that cooperative strategy training enhanced small group communication in the language classroom.

<div align="center">Interaction Patterns</div>

During teacher-student interaction and student-student interaction, there are certain patterns which affect the quality and quantity of interaction in the classroom. In teacher-student interaction, the way teachers teach the lessons or the opportunities they create for students to speak, and produce the target language shape the interaction pattern. For example, the dialogue between teacher and student can take place in different combinations such as student-teacher, student-teacher-student, teacher-student, teacher-student-teacher, or teacher-student-teacher-another student. This, in turn, may affect the features and amount of students' production of the target language during interaction between teacher and student. On the other hand, in

student-student interaction, generally students' language proficiency level and the amount of participation are influential in determining the pattern of interaction. Especially, factors such as leadership, dominance, proficiency level and willingness to cooperate shape the interaction patterns in student-student interaction.

Research Studies on Interaction Patterns

In the literature, a few studies have examined the patterns of teacher-student and student-student interaction and have given suggestions about them in order to contribute more to the learning process of learners. Wells (1993) examined teacher-student interaction in the classroom, and suggested that when the third part of the standard Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence of the teacher is replaced with Follow-up, a significant difference in students' participation in interaction with the teacher occurs. In other words, instead of evaluating students' answers to the posed questions in terms of whether they are right or wrong, the teacher can follow up on the responses by asking students to expand on their thinking, justify their opinions, or relate the answers to their own experiences. This slight difference supports and promotes teacher-student interaction a great deal.

As for student-student interaction, interaction patterns have been studied with regard to whether and how students interact with each other in group work or pair work. In group work, Myers (2000) identified four patterns of interaction while observing students working in groups: leader and followers, turn-taking, cooperative production, and individual production. In leader and followers, one student initiated the talk, the other students followed him/her; in turn-taking, students answered the questions in turns; in cooperative production, students worked together throughout the task; and in individual production, students worked on their own. It was observed

that the most common interaction pattern was cooperative production, and students constantly were engaged in negotiation of form and meaning in order to accomplish the task during cooperative production. In the light of current communicative approaches, it can be claimed that cooperative production is the most beneficial for students, so they shoud be encouraged and taught to cooperate while working in groups.

In pair work, students show different interaction patterns than in group work. Storch (2002a) examined the nature of dyadic interaction, and from her data analysis four patterns of interaction emerged: collaborative, dominant-dominant, dominant-passive, and expert-novice, suggesting that not all students work cooperatively when assigned to pair work. In another study, Storch (2002b) explored the dominant-dominant and collaborative patterns closely, and found out that the collaborative interaction pattern was more efficient than the dominant-dominant one as it enabled transfer of knowledge from pair talk to subsequent individual performance. Yule and Macdonald (1990) followed another criterion, and identified patterns by taking the language proficiency level of students into consideration. They claimed that low proficient and high proficient students should be paired together, and the more proficient one should be given the less dominant role so as to create more interactive cooperation, and to enable them to negotiate together. Leeser (2004) also investigated the effect of proficiency level of students in pair work and supported the idea that lower proficiency students should be paired with higher proficiency ones to benefit the most from pair work. Thus, from the research it can be seen that researchers have sought to discover how students can make the most effective use of

pair work, and no matter what label is given to the patterns, cooperative work among students has emerged as an implication of their studies.

Perception

The Importance of Perception

The shift towards learner-centered approaches in language learning has highlighted the importance of learner factors, which shape and influence the learning process of the learners to a great extent. Among these factors, perception especially is of great importance. Perception includes learners' views, opinions, or judgments as well as their interpretations and evaluations of the learning, activities, and tasks. It has a close relationship with the decisions learners make about their learning. In other words, it can be alleged that learners' perceptions of language learning, the activities, and the tasks performed in the classroom may affect their behaviors during the learning period, or in the future. Wenden (1995, cited in Gabillon, 2005) asserts that "learners refer to their self-concept beliefs and their perception of the tasks to interpret and act upon the learning activity" (p.242). For example, if they do not perceive the tasks or activities as useful and effective, they may be unwilling to participate in the process; or, on the other hand, if they perceive them as useful and efficient, they may actively participate in the process.

Teachers who want to increase their students' participation in their classes and augment the effectiveness of their teaching can make use of their students' perceptions. In this way, they can understand how the teaching methods and practices employed in the classroom are perceived by their students, and whether they really enjoy and benefit from these. Garret & Shortall (2002) allege that teachers may gain a lot by being attentive to the opinions of their students, learning

how their teaching is received, and taking their perceptions into consideration when planning and implementing their teaching programs, or when preparing activities. They maintain this claim by adding that if teachers apply these principles in their teaching, they are likely to cultivate and keep interest, vitality, and sustained commitment in their classrooms (p.48). As McDonough (2004) indicates, these, in return, may contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the course. In brief, teachers should make use of their students' perceptions to attain these gains.

There are many suggestions in the literature of ways for teachers to become aware of their students' perceptions of their learning experiences. For example, Barkhuizen (1998) suggests that teachers can ask their students to keep journals, to write letters to the teacher, and give suggestions, or they can hold class discussions as a form of feedback on the classroom practices, and administer course evaluations at the end of each unit or semester. If teachers follow these suggestions, they are likely to avoid the risk of having students who do not enjoy themselves, and who believe that they do not learn anything (pp. 103-104).

Research Studies on Perception

To date, the data gathered for studies on interaction have mainly focused on the production of students. The conclusions were drawn and the suggestions were made according to the results of tests or processes students went through. The impact of learner factors on the findings was by and large neglected. However, the increasing prominence of students' perceptions as a result of the learner-centeredness movement has urged researchers to take the perception factor into account in their studies via questionnaires or interviews, and researchers have begun to support their views by using learners' insights in their studies. They have generally focused on

how students perceive learning English (e.g.Yang & Lau, 2003), or a particular method, practice or activity (e.g. Ghait, 2001; Mackey, 2002; Savignon & Wang, 2003).

Students' perceptions of interaction types have been explored to a small extent as well. However, researchers have examined students' perceptions of cooperative or collaborative learning, pair work and group work, or teacher-fronted and learner-centered activities without naming these as interaction types. To illustrate, Ghaith (2001) investigated learners' perceptions of the enjoyableness and effectiveness of a specific cooperative learning experience, and the results of his study indicated that learners were generally positive about their experience and willing to recommend its use. This suggests that students found working in groups useful and effective, and they were enthusiastic to continue group work in their classes. In addition, Savignon and Wang (2003) explored learner attitudes to and perceptions of communicative teaching and arrived at the result that learners had positive attitudes toward communicative teaching. Similarly, Rao (2002) examined the perceptions of Chinese university students majoring in English of communicative and non-communicative activities, and found that almost all of the students liked group work and pair work. Even the results of a study on collaborative software development by Layman (2000) showed that students preferred to work in pairs, and perceived pair work as more practical than individual work.

Including Teachers' Perceptions in the Research Studies

Teachers have their own evaluations of the activities and how they perceive them may directly influence their classroom practices. The perceptions of the teachers are important for several reasons. First, the way teachers perceive teaching

methods and techniques shapes the way they teach therefore, their perceptions may give deeper insights about the real classroom practices, and the type of activities used in the class. To illustrate, teachers dedicating themselves to accuracy may mainly deal with grammatical exercises and activities, or teachers in favor of communicative approaches may use learner-centered activities more frequently than teacher-fronted activities. Second, teachers' perceptions may reveal whether there is congruence between their and their students' perceptions. This fact is very important in the education field since a lack of congruence may negatively affect the effectiveness of learning (Barkhuizen, 1998). Third, once a lack of congruence is diagnosed, teachers and students can be encouraged to seek common understanding. This may lead to making differences in the way that classroom practices are carried out to make both parties contented.

Taking the above-mentioned factors into consideration, researchers have explored how teachers and their students perceive particular activities. Kasap (2005) asked the opinions of a participant teacher and students at the lower intermediate level while investigating the effects of task-based instruction on the improvement of learners' speaking skills, and her study demonstrated that both students' and their teacher's perceptions were positive towards task-based instruction. McDonough (2004) studied learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities at intermediate level. She held interviews with instructors and saw that instructors had concerns about the implementation of pair and group work such as the orientation of students toward communicative goals at the expense of language form during interaction, which may negatively affect students' performance on exams. Moreover, the results of the questionnaire she prepared to elicit learner's opinions suggested

that students did not perceive group work as useful for learning English. In other words, learners' responses to the questionnaire were similar to the concerns of instructors obtained during the interviews. This may be due to the fact that both teachers and students believe explicit grammar activities, not group work or pair work, is necessary in order to prepare students for course exams.

However, perceptions of teachers and their students may not always match. Recent research has yielded several studies which demonstrate this. Schleppegrell and Simich-Dudgeon (1996) interviewed sixty 3rd and 6th grade students and their teachers about what makes a student a successful responder in classroom interaction, and the study revealed that there was a lack of congruence between the concerns of unsuccessful responders and the features their teachers sought in identifying success in expressing academic knowledge via oral interaction. Likewise, Barkhuizen (1998) investigated high school ESL learners' perceptions of the language teaching/learning activities they encountered in their classes and found that teachers were surprised to learn that students valued the mechanical language skills more than the communicative ones. This fact clearly supports the claim that what teachers view as useful may not be welcomed and perceived as effective by students. As for the interaction types, the results of the study on a specific project in Italy by Hawkey (2006) showed that students perceived pair work as less important than the teachers did, and they gave more importance to grammar exercises than their teachers did. This may be due to a common understanding among some students that grammar is the most important thing in learning language, the structure of the exams, or because students are not accustomed to communicative ways of teaching.

The Impact of Proficiency Level on Perception

The proficiency level of students is an important factor which plays a significant role in determining the content of the lessons, and thus curricula/syllabi. Curriculum designers and teachers focus on different language elements at different proficiency levels. In his book, Brown (2001) states that the role of the teachers and students' capacities change as the levels of students increase, and he makes some explanations and suggestions about how to teach at various levels. He divides the proficiency levels into three: beginning, intermediate, and advanced.

According to Brown, the beginning level is seen to be the most challenging of language teaching. Students at this level are extremely dependent on the teacher, so teacher-fronted classrooms are generally appropriate. Short and simple techniques must be used, and group work and pair work are extremely beneficial techniques on condition that they are controlled and very clear in terms of objectives.

In intermediate classes, students start to take initiative to produce and use the language. Learner-centered classroom can be easily developed because students' proficiency levels have progressed. Student-student interaction can be arranged in pair and group work, in which students are now able to maintain interaction. A negative point at this level is that students are sometimes too concerned about grammatical correctness (Brown, 2001).

At advanced levels, the situation dramatically changes. Students have developed a certain amount of fluency and accuracy. They are able to cope with approximately any situation in which the target language is required. Learner-centered teaching fits well into teaching advanced level because students are

competent in many aspects. Group debates, argumentations, and complex role-plays are the techniques recommended (Brown, 2001).

These specific contexts of different proficiency levels may strongly affect how teachers and students perceive the classroom practices. For example, Garrett and Shorthall (2002) conducted a study which investigated the evaluations of learners of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities in terms of their affective reactions and perceived value. The participants were beginner, elementary and intermediate level students in a language school in Brazil. The results of the study revealed that beginner and elementary students perceive teacher-fronted teaching, not student-centered work, as promoting their learning. The results also indicated "a learner pathway towards more interactive student-centered activities as they move up through the language levels" (p.47). These findings are compatible with the framework Brown draws for different proficiency levels.

Conclusion

Although perceptions of students at different proficiency levels have been investigated, the perceptions of instructors teaching at various levels have not been explored at all. This is as important as students' perceptions because teachers' perceptions may directly influence their teaching styles. To exemplify, teachers may hesitate to use group work and pair work at lower levels because they may think students are not competent enough to act on their own. Therefore, they may perceive group and pair work as ineffective and prefer whole-class teaching to group work and pair work in their classes. On the other hand, at upper levels, teachers may think students' linguistic competence is enough to work on their own, and thus allot a lot of time to student-student interaction, minimizing the amount of teacher-student

interaction. For these reasons, there is a real need for examining the perceptions of

teachers at different proficiency levels as well as those of students in order to give a

clear and exact picture of the situation.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types-both teacher-student interaction (whole-class teaching) and student-student interaction (pair work and group work). The study sought to find out how students at different proficiency levels and their teachers perceive the interaction types in terms of their effectiveness, and what their affective reactions are toward these interaction types. It was hoped that this study would also reveal information about whether the perceptions of students and teachers vary at different proficiency levels, and thereby, it would contribute to more fruitful outcomes in the implementation of whole-class teaching, pair work and group work at various proficiency levels.

The study addressed the following research questions:

1) What are the perceptions of students of the interaction types used in Speaking-Listening classes at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages?

      a- How do they feel about using these interaction types?

      b- How effective do they find these interaction types as learning tools?

2) Are there differences in perceptions among students of different levels?

3) What are the perceptions of teachers of the interaction types used in Speaking-Listening classes?

      a- How do they feel about using these interaction types?

      b- How effective do they find these interaction types as learning tools?

4) Are there differences in perceptions among teachers of different levels?

5) Are there differences between students' and teachers' perceptions?

This chapter describes the methodological procedures for the study. First, the background of the methodology for this study is stated. Then, the participants of the study and the setting in which the study was conducted are explained in detail. Last, the data collection instruments and the way the data were collected and analyzed is presented.

Setting and Participants

This study was conducted at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages (AU SFL) in the Spring Semester of 2006-2007 Academic Year. The School of Foreign Languages is an intensive language program that follows a skill-based approach to teaching English. It offers speaking-listening, writing, reading and grammar in context courses, and the hours of these courses change according to the proficiency level of the students. In the first term, there are beginner, elementary, lower-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate levels, and in the second term, each level moves up from elementary through advanced.

The Speaking-Listening course was chosen for this study because interaction naturally takes place while students and their teachers speak during the course. Moreover, the activities, exercises and tasks carried out in Speaking-Listening classes involve both teacher-student interaction and teacher-teacher interaction in many ways. Therefore, students were familiar with the interaction types that this study was investigating.

The participants of this study were the students of two randomly-chosen classes from each proficiency level and their Speaking-listening course teachers. The

number of the classes at each proficiency level in the second term was: 17

elementary classes, 20 lower-intermediate classes, 20 intermediate classes, 9 upper-

intermediate classes and 2 advanced classes. These classes were determined

according to the results of a proficiency test students took in the first term. The

perception questionnaires (Appendix A,B, C, and D) were administered to students

and their teachers on March 8, 2007. The reliability of the questionnaires was found

to be 0.65 for both students and teachers using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of

internal consistency. After the analysis of the questionnaires, one randomly-chosen

Speaking-Listening course teacher from each proficiency level was interviewed to

get deeper insights about their perceptions of the interaction types employed in their

classes (see Appendix E and F for schedule of interview questions).

<div align="center">Instruments</div>

Two questionnaires were used for the study in order to gather the necessary

data from the participants. One of the questionnaires was constructed for students,

the other, for their teachers. Brown (2001) describes questionnaires as "any written

instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which

they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing

answers" (p. 6) . Questionnaires were chosen to be the main instrument of the study

because, as Dörnyei (2003) states, it is "easy to construct, extremely versatile, and

uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is

readily processable" (p. 1). The questionnaires were constructed carefully in order to

obtain data which could be processed in a scientifically sound manner. Since Likert

scales use response options representing the degree of agreement, and they are

simple, versatile and reliable (Dörnyei, 2003), Likert-type items were employed in

the second part of the questionnaire. Likert was thought to be the most effective rating scale in measuring the participants' perceptions of student-student interaction, namely, group work and pair work.

Before constructing the questionnaire, an item pool was generated. In the item pool, some statements were gathered from an established questionnaire by Saglam and Kaya (2006), and the other statements were written by the researcher based on the knowledge she gained while reviewing the literature. Further, the suggestions of the instructors teaching Speaking-Listening classes at Anadolu University were taken into consideration. After that, the items appropriate and directly relevant to the study's research questions were selected for piloting the questionnaire.

The two perception questionnaires had the same items, but the items were worded in a slightly different way because the respondents were teachers and students. The three-part-questionnaires aimed at getting the ideas of teachers and students about interaction types. The effectiveness of the interaction types as learning tools and students' and teachers' emotional reactions were measured separately based on the assumption that some respondents might find interaction types effective but have negative feelings about them, or vice versa.

In the first part of the questionnaire, respondents were provided with eleven statements, and they were expected to fill in the blanks with a) whole-class teaching or b) group work. The purpose was to obtain an overall opinion about whether there was a tendency toward teacher-fronted or student-centered learning in the responses of students at different various proficiency levels and their teachers. Moreover, this part was thought to present information about which interaction type was perceived as the most effective and which interaction type was perceived as the most enjoyable.

The second part of the questionnaire focused on student-student interaction, namely, group work and pair work. There were twenty one items in the students' questionnaire, and nineteen items in the teachers' questionnaire, measuring the extent of agreement for the statements. The items focused mainly on learning, feedback, peer preference, discussions, language competence, assignments in the tasks, role-plays and emotional reactions toward working together. Students and their teachers were supposed to circle the number they agreed with on the Likert scale.

As for the third part, there were only two questions posed for the purpose of revealing the general opinion of the respondents. The first question asked respondents which interaction type they enjoyed the most, and the second question asked which one of them they found the most useful in Speaking-Listening classes. Finally, pair work was also included to see whether the respondents in favor of student-student interaction have a specific preference for pair work over small group work.

In addition to the questionnaires, semi-structured interviews were designed for the study. The researcher decided to conduct semi-structured interviews in order to reinforce the results of the questionnaires. Additionally, semi-structured interviews allowed the participants to state their opinions in a freer way, and explain their reasons for the responses they gave to the questionnaires. The interview questions were prepared by considering the research questions and questionnaires of the study.

Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaires on students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types were translated into Turkish by the researcher in order to avoid any misinterpretations or misunderstandings related to language competence. Then, the

adequacy of the translation was checked by an English instructor. The questionnaires were piloted with two randomly-chosen intermediate level classes and their Speaking-Listening teachers at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages on January 18, 2007 in order to verify that the items in the questionnaire were comprehensible and clear for the students and teachers. Based on their constructive feedback, necessary revisions such as rewording items, adding new ones, deleting irrelevant ones, and amending ambiguous wordings were made. Moreover, grammatical mistakes were corrected, and instructions were simplified and clarified. It can be said that the pilot study proved to be very beneficial, and the questionnaires were ready to be administered to the sample participants.

After the revising process, the questionnaires were distributed to two randomly-chosen Speaking-Listening course teachers from each level in order to administer in their classes in the lesson hour on March 8, 2007. They were instructed to read aloud the instruction part before students started to complete the questionnaires. Moreover, teachers were expected to complete the questionnaires prepared for them at the same time. Two hundred and thirty eight students and ten teachers returned the questionnaires. The number of students at each proficiency level who completed the questionnaires is presented below in Table 1.

Table 1 - The number of participating students at each level

Level	Frequency	Percent
Elementary	44	18.5
Lower intermediate	48	20.2
Intermediate	50	21.0
Upper intermediate	51	21.4
Advanced	45	18.9
Total	238	100.0

After the administration of questionnaires, the data gathered were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program to be analyzed in detail. The semi-structured interview questions were piloted with an intermediate level Speaking-Listening course teacher on March 9, 2007. The interview questions were about: 1- which interaction type the teacher finds effective, 2- which interaction type s/he finds enjoyable, 3- when s/he uses these interaction types, 4- whether the language level of his/her students is appropriate for group work, 5- how s/he designs the groups, 6- what s/he thinks about role-plays in terms of effectiveness and enjoyableness, 7- what kind of situations s/he uses in role-plays. The interviews were held in Turkish as it was believed that participants would express themselves better in their mother tongue. The interviews were recorded and then transcribed by the researcher. The transcriptions and the researcher's own experience gave her the opportunity to make the necessary changes in the questions.

After the piloting phase, the same questions were posed in the actual interviews, but additional follow-up questions were asked to the participants according to their answers. The participants were again randomly-chosen, and included one Speaking-Listening course teacher from each proficiency level. Before holding the one-to-one interviews, all the interviewees were given a consent form to sign. Then, the interviews were carried out in Turkish like that in the piloting. As a last step, the recorded interviews were transcribed and analyzed by the researcher (see an excerpt from a transcription in Appendix E and F).

Data Analysis

In this study, questionnaires were used to gather the quantitative data, and interviews were held to provide the qualitative data. The questionnaires enabled the researcher to obtain information about students' and their teachers' perceptions of interaction types. In other words, the data collected from the questionnaires revealed whether the tendency was to teacher-student interaction (whole-class teaching), or student-student interaction (pair work and group work). Moreover, the questionnaires allowed the researcher to analyze students' and teachers' affective reactions to interaction types, and whether the proficiency level of the students lead to any difference among perceptions. The interviews, on the other hand, were conducted in order to get deeper insights into the perceptions of teachers, exploring the possible reasons behind their opinions.

The perception questionnaires were prepared by the researcher, and administered to the students enrolled in the Preparatory Program of Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages and their Speaking-Listening course teachers in spring semester of 2007. The items of the questionnaires were analyzed using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequencies and percentages were computed for each item. Chi-square tests were calculated in order to find the significance of the distribution of answers for the items. As for the interviews, they were taped and transcribed by the researcher. The researcher thought that the analysis of the interview questions would reveal the striking points in determining the teachers' rationales behind using whole-class teaching and group work in Speaking-Listening classes.

Conclusion

This chapter included general information about the purpose of the study, listing the research questions, the settings and participants, instruments employed in the procedure for data collection and data analysis of the study. In the next chapter, the data analysis carried out using the methods described in this chapter is presented in detail.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The main aim in this study was to investigate what students at various

proficiency levels and their course teachers think and feel about interaction types,

namely whole-class teaching, group work and pair work. Moreover, it explored

whether students' opinions vary according to their proficiency levels, and whether

they shared similar ideas with their course teachers.

This study sought to find answers to the following research questions:

1) What are the perceptions of students of the interaction types used in Speaking-

Listening classes?

   a- How do they feel about using these interaction types?

   b- How effective do they find these interaction types as learning tools?

2) Are there differences in perceptions among students of different levels?

3) What are the perceptions of teachers of the interaction types used in Speaking-

Listening classes?

   a- How do they feel about using these interaction types?

   b- How effective do they find these interaction types as learning tools?

4) Are there differences in perceptions among teachers of different levels?

5) Are there differences between students' and teachers' perceptions?

The research tools employed in the study included perception questionnaires

and interviews. The data obtained from the questionnaires were entered into the

Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) to be analyzed quantitatively. Then,

frequencies and percentages of every question were calculated, and Chi-squares were

taken in order to see whether the distribution of the answers for each question was

significant. In addition to this, cross- tabulations to compare students at each level among themselves and students with their teachers were calculated to answer the 2nd and 4th research questions of the study.

For the interviews, one teacher who completed the perception questionnaires was randomly chosen from each proficiency level. The interview questions were designed to get more information about teachers' perceptions of the interaction types under investigation. The interview sessions were audiotaped and subsequently transcribed by the researcher.

In this chapter, the findings of the questionnaires and interviews will be presented and described. In the data analysis procedures part, the analysis of data will be presented in two sections: 1- Analysis of questionnaires, 2- Analysis of interviews. When displaying the results of the questionnaires, each part of the questionnaires will be analyzed respectively in terms of both students at different levels and their teachers. For the interviews, the teachers' answers to each question will be analyzed one by one.

<div align="center">Results</div>

<div align="center">*Questionnaire Part 1*</div>

The first part of the questionnaire was intended to obtain the general view of students and teachers about group work and whole-class teaching. Pair work was not included specifically as another option to fill in the blanks because this part aimed to gather the participants' overall perceptions of the interaction types, and pair work is accepted in the literature as a kind of group work. There were eleven items in this part. Four of these items were about the effectiveness of interaction types as learning tools, and the rest were about their enjoyableness. In this part, the questions about the

effectiveness as learning tools and enjoyableness will be analyzed separately to make the distinction between the participants' affective reactions and thoughts about the effectiveness of the interaction types.

Effectiveness of interaction types as learning tools

In the first part of the questionnaire, items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9 are related with which interaction type students and their teachers perceive as more effective for various purposes. The results are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2 - Effectiveness of interaction types as learning tools

Items	Group work				Whole-class teaching			
	students % Freq.		teachers % Freq.		Students % Freq.		teachers % Freq.	
I1 ___ is the most effective way of learning	61.3	146	70	7	38.7	92	30	3
I2 I / Students have the most opportunity to speak in ___	62.2	148	80	8	37.8	90	20	2
I4 I / Students find the most chance to practice in ___	60.1	143	90	9	39.9	95	10	1
I6 I / Students speak the most fluently in ___	75.6	180	90	9	24.4	58	10	1
I7 I / Students pay the most attention to my / their speech in ___	17.2	41	10	1	82.8	197	90	9
I8 I / Students try not to make mistakes in ___	15.5	37	0	0	84.5	201	100	10
I9 I / Students speak in English the most in ___	49.6	118	20	2	50.4	120	80	8

Note: %= Percentage, Freq. = Frequency

The first item was a direct one questioning students' and teachers' overall perceptions of interaction types with regard to effectiveness. In general, about 61 % of the students responded favorably for group work, with the exception being intermediate level students, who generally preferred whole-class teaching (52%) to group work (48%). It was surprising that instead of the lower levels, it was intermediate level students who had slightly more inclination towards whole-class

teaching. The majority of Speaking-Listening teachers also stated that group work was the most effective way of learning; just three teachers out of ten - one from elementary level and two from upper-intermediate level - chose whole-class teaching for this question. It is interesting to note that at the elementary level, although the students were two times more likely to view group work as most effective; their teachers' responses were just the opposite.

The second item tried to elicit which interaction type provided students with more opportunity to speak. Nearly two thirds of the students marked group work. According to chi-square results, there was not any significant difference in the perceptions of students among different proficiency levels. The teachers responded similarly in favor of group work with just one teacher from elementary level and one from intermediate level filling in this item with whole-class teaching.

It is well known that finding the chance to practice what they have learned is a very important aspect of language learning. According to 60.1% of the students, group work presents them the most opportunity to put their knowledge into practice. The percentages of students at various levels were more or less similar; however, at upper-intermediate and advanced levels a great percentage of students preferred group work over whole-class teaching for this item. Though an instructor teaching at elementary level chose to answer this item with whole-class teaching (this instructor had chosen whole class teaching for the above item as well), and her perception did not match those of her students, this mismatch was not very distinctive as only 52.3 % of the students stated that they had the most chance to practice what they had learned in group work, and 47.7% of the elementary students stated the opposite. In other words, there was not a significant preference of group work over whole-class

teaching in elementary level students' responses. The perception of the rest of the teachers was congruent with their students' perceptions.

In terms of speaking fluently, 75.6 % of the students answered that group work was more effective as a learning tool, and there was no significant difference among the proficiency levels. Again, one elementary level teacher opted for whole-class teaching, in contrast with the students at this level, 79.5% of whom said they spoke most fluently in group work.

Nearly 83 % of the students at all levels declared that they paid more attention to their speech in whole-class teaching. Interestingly, a teacher instructing at the advanced level thought her students were more careful at speaking in group work, sharing the same idea with only 22.2 % of the students who completed the questionnaires at this level.

A great majority of the students (84.5%) and all the teachers reported that students tried not to make mistakes in whole-class teaching. This can probably be explained by the fact that in whole-class teaching the teacher monitors students, therefore students are more attentive to their speech, and students can feel the pressure of speaking accurately in front of their classmates in order not to be humiliated. If we examine the answers to this item at each proficiency level, it is seen that at all levels more than ¾ of the students have given whole-class teaching as their answer.

One of the concerns teachers have when students perform group work activities is that they will speak in their first language and ignore talking in English. One upper-intermediate and one advanced level teachers said students used English more in group work, and this answer may have something to do with the high

competence level of their students in using language. The other eight teachers,
however, stated that their students used English more in whole-class teaching. The
students' answers to this item were not very distinct, as approximately the same
percentage of answers was obtained for group work and whole-class teaching (49.6
% and 50.4 % respectively). In the analysis of the item with regard to proficiency
level, again the answers were close to each other, though lower-intermediate and
advanced level students displayed a somewhat greater fondness towards group work,
reporting that they spoke in English more in group work.

Affective reactions to interaction types

Items 3, 5, 10, and 11 in the first part of the questionnaire were about the
participants' affective reactions to interaction types. These items tried to explore how
students and teachers feel about the interaction types.

Table 3 - Affective reactions to interaction types

| | Group work | | | | Whole-class teaching | | | |
| | students | | teachers | | Students | | teachers | |
Items	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**
I3 I / Students feel the most comfortable in ___	66	157	90	9	34	81	10	1
I5 I / Students get the most nervous when I / they talk in ___	12.2	29	0	0	87.8	209	100	10
I10 I / Students are the most eager to speak in ___	65.1	155	80	8	34.9	83	20	2
I11 I / Students enjoy myself / themselves the most in ___	61.8	147	100	10	38.2	91	0	0

Note: %= Percentage, Freq. = Frequency

When asked when they feel the most comfortable, 66 % of the students stated
that group work provided them with a more relaxed learning environment. This result
was similar at all levels. The teachers' answers to the item for the most part matched
their students' answers, but an instructor teaching at intermediate level thought the
opposite. If we have a closer look at the answers of all the intermediate-level students

in particular, it is observed that only 37.3 % of the students at this level shared the same idea with this teacher.

While 12.2 % of the students reported getting most nervous when talking in group work, an overwhelming 87.8 % of the students on average feel most nervous in whole-class work. In all proficiency levels, more than 80 %of the students marked this item as whole-class teaching, and ten out of ten teachers saw eye to eye with their students.

The students' affective reactions to interaction types were also measured by asking in which context they were more eager to speak. Sixty five percent of the students chose group work while approximately 35 % of the students preferred whole-class teaching. One lower-intermediate and one upper-intermediate level teacher responded to this item as whole-class teaching, except for this, students' and teachers' perceptions were parallel to each other across the various levels.

The final item exploring the affective reactions was about students' enjoying themselves. About 62 % of the students reported enjoying themselves more in group work. According to the results of cross tabulations across levels, the percentages more or less resembled each other, but at upper-intermediate and advanced levels, the preference for group work over whole-class teaching was a bit higher than other levels. Furthermore, all the teachers had the same idea about this item, which showed that they perceive their students as enjoying themselves more when performing group work.

Questionnaire Part 2

After collecting data on the overall perceptions of students and teachers of interaction types in the first part, the second part of the questionnaire focused

specifically on group work, which is an interaction type among students. Although there were 21 items in the students' questionnaire, only 19 items were covered in the teachers', as two items were not relevant to be asked to teachers. The items in this part were designed on a five-point Likert-scale and given values from 1 to 5. Respondents indicated to what extent they agreed with the statements in each item. The responses to items were scored as follows: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree.

The items in this part explored different aspects of group work with regard to students' language competence, group mates, organization of groups, discussions, and role-plays. These items were intended to obtain data about group work in terms of what students and teachers at various levels think and feel about group work. In other words, getting information on the effectiveness of this interaction type and affective reactions of the respondents were the objective of this part. Only discussions and role-plays were included as activities performed in groups in this part because they are the only activities that are employed in all language proficiency levels of the Speaking-Listening classes.

Effectiveness of group work as a learning tool

The items about the effectiveness of group work were linked with:

 1. Peers: learning, feedback and choosing group mates (items 1, 2, 10, 11 in the students' questionnaire; 1, 2, 10 in the teachers' questionnaire)

 2. Organization of groups: having the same or different responsibilities, number of students in a group (items 17, 19, 20 in the students' questionnaire; 15, 17, 18 in the teachers' questionnaire)

3. Language competence: English level of students working in a group (items 4, 5, 8, 16 in the students' questionnaire; 4, 5, 8 in the teachers' questionnaire)

4. Discussions: (items 7, 14 in the students' questionnaire; 7, 13 in the teachers' questionnaire)

5. Role-plays: creativity, and learning (items 9, 18 in the students' questionnaire; 9, 16 in the teachers' questionnaire)

Students' general perceptions of group work in terms of effectiveness, their responses according to their proficiency levels, teachers' perceptions of group work in terms of effectiveness, and average answers to each item at various levels by teachers are presented in the related sections.

Peers

Group work can be regarded as a sort of team work, which means that the people involved in the group designate the success of the process and the outcome. Therefore, whom students work with in the classroom and how they perceive the feedback that they get from their group mates and that they themselves provide to their group mates, may have a profound effect on their learning. Below, students' and teachers' responses to the items related with peers, and their average answers for each item are presented in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Table 4 - Students' responses to the items related with peers

Items	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	16.0	31.9	39.1	8.8	4.2	3.46	1.00
2	7.1	34.9	37.4	16.4	4.2	3.24	.95
9	21.8	22.7	26.9	15.1	13.4	3.24	1.31
10	45.8	26.9	17.6	5.9	3.8	4.05	1.10
11*	7.1	24.8	39.1	21.8	7.1	3.02	1.02

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation, Number of Students= 238
     1: I learn new things from my peers in group work.
     2: I trust the feedback my peers give in group work.
     10: I work the most efficiently with the peers I choose in group work.
     11: My peers learn new things from me in group work. * (This item is unique to students)

Table 5 - Means of students' responses according to their proficiency levels

Item numbers	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
1	3.59	1.01	3.50	1.03	3.26	1.06	3.43	.90	3.58	.98
2	3.39	.89	3.19	.91	3.10	.88	3.35	1.07	3.20	.99
10	4.25	.81	3.94	1.27	3.90	1.07	4.08	1.14	4.11	1.13
11	3.14	1.15	3.06	.83	3.08	1.10	2.96	.97	2.91	1.04

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Table 6 - Teachers' responses to the items related with peers

Items	SA Freq.	%	A Freq.	%	N Freq.	%	D Freq.	%	SD Freq.	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
1	0	0	8	80	2	20	0	0	0	0	3.80	.42
2	0	0	1	10	5	50	4	40	0	0	2.70	.67
10	5	50	3	30	1	10	1	10	0	0	4.20	1.03

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, Freq. = Frequency, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. =Standard Deviation
     1: Students learn new things from their peers in group work.
     2: Students trust the feedback their peers give in group work.
     10: Students work the most efficiently with the peers they choose in group work.

Table 7 - Means of teachers' responses according to proficiency level of students

Item numbers	Elementary Mean	SD	Low-int. Mean	SD	Intermediate Mean	SD	Upper-int. Mean	SD	Advanced Mean	SD
1	4	.00	4	.00	3.5	.70	3.5	.70	4	.00
2	2.5	.70	2.5	.00	2.5	.70	2.5	.70	3.5	.70
10	4.5	.70	4.5	.00	3.5	2.12	4.5	.70	4	1.41

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

If we question whether students learn new things from their peers in group work, it is seen that nearly half (47. 9 %) of the students showed a degree of agreement, though a substantial 39 % of the students were undecided about it (see Table 4). The mean responses of the students at various levels (see Table 5) range between 3.25 and 3.60, suggesting that students' proficiency level is not a significant determinant in their responses to this item. Moreover, eight teachers agreed and two teachers stayed neutral on this item, which means that students' and teaches' perceptions do not clash, although the teachers seem a bit more positive than their students. The other side of this item was questioned by the statement "My peers learn new things from me in group work". In general, 31.9 % of the students agreed and a plurality of 39.1 % of the students marked the "neutral" option. Surprisingly, there was a decrease in students' means score as their proficiency level increased. Maybe, students at higher levels think that there are not many things that their peers can learn from them as their proficiency level is already high.

Feedback, an inevitable aspect of working together, was analyzed with regard to whether students trust the feedback they receive from their peers. Contrary to the expectation that the higher the proficiency level of students, the more they would report relying on their peers' feedback, it was instead the elementary level students who had the highest mean score in this item (3.39) while 3.20 was the mean score from the advanced level students. There was no difference across the student levels, yet four teachers out of ten disagreed with this item, five teachers were undecided and only one teacher marked the "I agree" option. Even though the teachers were meant to be reporting on whether they felt their students relied on their peers' feedback, it is also possible that their responses are reflecting their own greater

concerns about the usefulness or appropriateness of peer feedback than their students.

Salas (2005) states that teachers should use different grouping techniques when putting students into groups; however, students generally favor working with their soul-mates. In order to investigate whether the findings of this study would support or contradict Salas' suggestions about grouping, item 10 was posed to students and teachers. A substantial majority of the students (72.7 %) agreed that they work most efficiently with the peers they choose in group work, with a mean response above 3.90 at all proficiency levels. As for the teachers, most agreed with the students, but one teacher from intermediate level disagreed and one teacher from advanced level was undecided on this item. Maybe, these teachers felt that their students were competent in using the language, and therefore assumed they would be less concerned with whom they become partners with in group work.

Organization of Groups

Under the title of organization of groups, features such as how many students should work in a group, whether students should be assigned different responsibilities or should work together on every item were investigated. The last two features are especially important as they might help determine whether students think working cooperatively or collaboratively is a more effective way of learning in group work. The responses of students and teachers at various levels with regard to organization of groups are presented in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 in order to give an idea to readers on this issue.

Table 8 - Students' responses to the items related with organizations of groups

Items	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std. Dev.
17	26.9	34.9	27.3	6.3	4.6	3.73	1.06
19	22.7	26.5	26.1	16.8	8.0	3.39	1.23
20	28.2	34.9	26.9	6.7	3.4	3.77	1.03

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. =Standard Deviation, Number of Students= 238

17: Working together on every item in group work is efficient.

19: The smaller the number of students in a group, the better my performance is.

20: Assigning students different responsibilities in group work is efficient.

Table 9 - Means of students' responses according to their proficiency levels

Items	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
17	3.93	1.14	3.92	1.04	3.36	.96	3.78	1.00	3.69	1.12
19	3.27	1.18	3.90	1.27	3.34	1.22	3.14	1.26	3.31	1.08
20	3.80	1.19	3.81	1.16	3.72	.92	3.75	.99	3.82	.93

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Table 10 - Teachers' responses to the items related with organization of groups

Items	SA Freq.	%	A Freq.	%	N F	%	D Freq.	%	SD Freq.	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
15(1)*	3	30	2	20	4	40	1	10	0	0	3.60	1.26
17(19)*	4	40	3	30	2	20	1	10	0	0	4.00	1.05
18(20)*	6	60	3	30	0	0	1	10	0	0	4.40	.96

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, Freq. = Frequency, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation (* refers to the equivalence of the item in students' questionnaire)

15: Having students work together on every item in group work is efficient.

17: The smaller the number of students in a group, the better their performances is.

18: Assigning students different responsibilities in group work is efficient.

Table 11 - Means of teachers' responses according to proficiency level of student

Item Numbers	Elementary Mean	SD	Low-int. Mean	SD	Intermediate Mean	SD	Upper-int. Mean	SD	Advanced Mean	SD
15(17)	4	1.41	3.5	.70	4	1.41	2.5	2.12	5	1.41
17(19)	5	.00	4	.00	4	1.41	3.5	2.12	3.5	.70
18(20)	4.5	.70	4.5	.70	3.5	2.12	4.5	.70	5	.00

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

When asked whether the number of students working in a group affects their

performance, approximately half (49.2 %) of the students agreed that the smaller the

number of students in a group, the better their performance is. A fairly large

percentage (26.19) was neutral on this question. There was not a significant difference in the responses among various levels. However, one teacher from upper intermediate level disagreed – contrary to her students who had a mean score of 3.14 for this item, and one teacher from intermediate and one from advanced level were neutral, again mismatching with their students, who had average scores of 3.34 and 3.31, respectively.

Another issue contributing to the accomplishment of group work is whether students find working together or having different roles in a group more effective. Nearly 62 % of the students said that working together is the most efficient way of organization in group work, and generally the elementary, lower intermediate and intermediate level teachers shared the same opinion with their students. The gap between advanced level students' ideas (M= 3.69) and their teacher' ideas (M= 5.0) was notable. Also, although instructors teaching at the upper-intermediate level stayed neutral for this item, their students had a mean score of 3.78 which is very close to the "I agree" option on the scale. The contrasting item for this one asked whether assigning students different responsibilities in group work is efficient, to which 63.1 % of the students agreed. What is remarkable here is that the mean scores of students for these two contradicting items are parallel to each other, which leads the researcher to think that: 1) students do not know the distinction between working cooperatively and collaboratively; 2) they see no difference between these two items in terms of effectiveness; or 3) they responded to these questions without reflecting much on them. Again, a detailed examination of the answers of the teachers suggest that this misunderstanding or confusion may be the same case with most of the teachers as well, except for the upper-intermediate level teachers, whose mean scores

were 2.5 for question 15 and 4.5 for question 18, suggesting a clear preference for

collaborative work.

Language Competence

"Language competence" is an umbrella term in this part covering a range of

subjects such as whether working with higher achieving or lower achieving group

mates is useful, and whether students think their own English and their peers'

English is appropriate for group work. Below, the analysis of the items are explained

separately in order to shed light on this vital issue, and Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15 are

presented for a detailed picture of the responses.

Table 12 - Students' responses to the items related with language competence

Items	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std. Dev.
4	47.1	29.4	15.1	4.2	4.2	4.10	1.07
5	21.8	37.8	29.4	8.0	2.9	3.67	.99
8	13.4	9.7	16.8	21.0	39.1	2.37	1.42
16*	26.5	39.1	26.5	6.3	1.7	3.82	.95

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation, Number of Students= 238.
    4: It is useful to work with higher proficiency peers in group work.
    5: My English is good enough to participate in group work.
    8: In group work my learning is not affected by the proficiency level of my peers.
    16: My peers' English is good enough to participate in group work.* (this item is unique to students)

Table 13 - Means of students' responses according to their proficiency levels

Item Numbers	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
4	4.30	1.11	4.15	1.11	3.98	1.02	4.16	.90	3.98	1.25
5	3.32	1.02	3.52	.92	3.82	.85	3.76	.90	3.93	1.19
8	1.73	1.22	2.19	1.39	2.64	1.36	2.55	1.40	2.71	1.53
16	3.34	.93	3.90	.80	3.74	1.00	4.00	.91	4.11	.93

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Table 14 - Teachers' responses to the items related with language competence

Items	SA Freq.	%	A Freq.	%	N Freq.	%	D F	%	SD F	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4	2	20	8	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.20	.42
5	5	50	3	30	2	20	0	0	0	0	4.30	.82
8	2	20	1	10	4	40	3	30	0	0	3.20	1.13

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly   Disagree,
Freq. = Frequency, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation
  4: It is useful for students to work with higher proficiency peers in group work.
  5: English of students at this level is good enough to participate in group work.
  8: In group work students' learning is not affected by the proficiency level of their peers.

Table 15 - Means of teachers' responses according to proficiency level of students

Item Numbers	Elementary Mean	SD	Low-int. Mean	SD	Intermediate Mean	SD	Upper-int. Mean	SD	Advanced Mean	SD
4	4	.00	4	.00	4	.00	4.5	.70	4.5	.70
5	3.5	.70	3.5	.70	4.5	.70	5	.00	5	.00
8	4	1.41	2	.00	2.5	.70	4	1.41	3.5	.70

Over three quarters (76.5 %) of the students stated that it is useful to work with higher proficiency level peers in group work, with elementary students showing a slightly higher agreement for this item than the other levels. This may be due to the fact that they feel they will learn more if they work with students who know better than themselves. All the teachers agreed with this item, showing no variation according to the proficiency level they teach.

What about working with the same proficiency level peers? While 24.8 % of the students were undecided, 55.9 % of the students agreed with this item stating that it is useful to work with the same proficiency level peers. The mean scores of students at different levels were close to each other; however there were some differences between students and teachers. Even though elementary level students had an average score of 3.77, their teachers' mean was 2.5. At the upper intermediate and advanced levels, on the other hand, students had an approximate mean of 3.5 for

this item, yet their teachers had a mean of 4.5, indicating that teachers agree with this item more than their students do at these levels.

Two points are worth commenting on in the two items above. First, when the answers of students to the questions are compared, it is clear that students agreed with both working with higher proficiency level and the same proficiency level peers. Yet, they express greater support for working with higher proficiency level peers. This suggests that students would rather work with higher proficiency peers than same proficiency ones in group work, although the second option is also welcomed. Second, there was a big discrepancy in the answers of lower level teachers and higher level teachers to item 12. While elementary level teachers did not agree with grouping the same proficient students together, upper-intermediate and advanced level teachers strongly agreed on this idea. This may be related to the distribution of students across levels being more even in upper levels, so all the students have more or less the same competence. On the other hand, at low levels, there are some students who did not enter the placement test in the second term, and therefore they are false low level students. Teachers at low levels, therefore, may think that grouping students with higher proficiency students may be more effective in group work.

In order to further explore this 'proficiency' issue, students were asked whether the proficiency level of their peers affected their learning in group work. Sixty percent of the students said that the proficiency level of their peers was important. The students' answers were parallel to each other at each level although advanced level students gave somewhat less importance to this issue. There was no consensus among the responses of teachers: three teachers felt that students' learning is not

affected by their peers' proficiency level, three others thought the opposite, and four were undecided. It is also very surprising to note that elementary students disagree with this item with a mean score of 1.73, but their teachers agree with it with a mean score of 4. This is similar at the upper intermediate level (2.50 to 4). What is interesting is both the difference the students display with their teachers and the common results between two very different levels of students. Elementary and upper levels are considered as very far away from each other in terms of general English proficiency level; however, in this unique case they showed similarity in acknowledging that their learning is affected by the proficiency level of their peers. This may be explained by the fact that group work requires interdependency of students on each other no matter whether their proficiency level is elementary or advanced. In this interdependency, students are inevitably affected by each other in terms of learning.

"My English is good enough to participate in group work" and "My peers' English is good enough to participate in group work" were two complementary items in the students' questionnaire, inquiring whether they perceive their language competence sufficient to do group work activities. More than half (59.6 %) of the students agreed that their language level was adequate for group work and the mean score was between 3.30 and 3.95 across all levels. Students also agreed that their peers' English was good enough for group work as well, but this time the mean score of the students showed an increase as the level of the students advanced. This is not surprising that at upper levels, students have more confidence in their peers' level of English.

The wording of these two items was changed in the teacher's questionnaire and integrated into one item, "The English level of students at this level is good enough to participate in group work." This question aimed to find out whether there is difference in the perceptions of teachers at lower levels and upper levels with regard to this item. Unsurprisingly, there was again an escalating inclination towards the right end of the scale which is "I strongly agree" as the proficiency level being taught increased (the minimum mean being 3.5 at elementary level, and the maximum mean being 5 for advanced level teachers).

Discussions in Groups

There were two items related to discussions in groups as a preparation to whole-class discussions in terms of usefulness and giving new ideas. The items in this component of group work were arranged in this way because, generally, in Speaking-listening classes at Anadolu University, teachers use group work discussions to get students ready for whole-class discussions.

Table 16 - Students' responses to the items related with discussions

Items	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std. Dev.
7	37.4	24.8	16.8	11.3	9.7	3.69	1.33
14	30.7	37.0	16.0	11.3	5.0	3.76	1.15

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation, Number of Students= 238.
      7: It is useful to work in small groups before whole-class discussions.
      14: Discussing with my peers before whole-class discussions gives me new ideas.

Table 17 - Means of students' responses according to their proficiency levels

Items	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
7	3.75	1.29	4.10	1.18	3.40	1.38	3.59	1.31	3.62	1.41
14	3.84	1.18	4.04	.94	3.70	1.11	3.69	1.08	3.58	1.40

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Table 18 - Teachers' responses to the items related with discussions

Items	SA Freq. %		A Freq. %		N Freq.	%	D Freq.	%	SD Freq.	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
7	3	30	5	50	2	20	0	0	0	0	4.10	.73
13(14)*	4	40	4	40	2	20	0	0	0	0	4.20	.78

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree,
Freq. = Frequency, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. =Standard Deviation (* refers to the equivalence of the item in students' questionnaire)
   7: It is useful for students to work in small groups before whole-class discussions.
   13: Discussing with their peers before whole-class discussions gives students new ideas.

Table 19 - Means of teachers' responses according to proficiency level of students

Item numbers	Elementary Mean	SD	Low-int. Mean	SD	Intermediate Mean	SD	Upper-int. Mean	SD	Advanced Mean	SD
7	3.5	.70	5	.00	4.5	.70	3.5	.70	4	.00
13(14)	3.5	.70	4.5	.70	5	.00	3.5	.70	4.5	.70

When students and teachers were asked to affirm their opinions about whether it was useful to work in small groups before whole-class discussions, 61.8% of the students gave positive answers. Quite similarly, for the teachers, eight agreed with the statement while two were neutral. There was no striking mismatch between the responses of students and their teachers, yet the difference between students' answers and teachers' answers was quite obvious at the intermediate level, where students had a mean score of 3.40 while their teachers had a mean of 4.50.

The other item related with discussions was whether group discussions give students new ideas before discussing as a whole-class. As anticipated, more than two thirds (67.7 %) of the students responded positively, and the mean score was above 3.50 at all levels, showing widespread agreement with the statement. In addition, most of the teachers had the same opinion with their students; however, at the intermediate and advanced levels, the situation is a little bit different. Although a mean score of 3.70 from intermediate, and 3.59 from advanced level students show agreement with the item, a mean score of 5 from intermediate, and 4.5 from

advanced level teachers indicate that agreement is stronger and more noticeable among these teachers. In fact, only at the elementary and upper intermediate levels did teachers show less degree of agreement on this item than their students. These findings do not however suggest any strong conclusion as to whether there is a particular tendency at various proficiency levels.

Role-plays

An indispensable part of speaking-listening classes, role-plays were also investigated in this part in terms of their effectiveness as a learning tool (see Tables 20, 21, 22, and 23 below). Five other items in this section looked at students' and teachers' affective reactions to role-plays.

Table 20 - Students' responses to the items related with role-plays

Items	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std. Dev.
9	21.8	22.7	26.9	15.1	13.4	3.24	1.31
18	25.2	30.3	23.5	11.8	9.2	3.50	1.24

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation, Number of Students= 238
      9: Role-plays arouse my creativity.
      18: Role-play is an effective way of learning.

Table 21 - Means of students' responses according to their proficiency levels

Items	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
9	3.39	1.20	3.27	1.34	2.96	1.27	3.18	1.35	3.47	1.39
18	3.89	1.18	3.52	1.11	3.54	1.19	3.02	1.37	3.62	1.21

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Table 22 - Teachers' responses to the items related with role-plays

Items	SA Freq.	%	A Freq.	%	N Freq.	%	D Freq.	%	SD Freq.	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
9	6	60	3	30	1	10	0	0	0	0	4.50	.70
16(18)*	5	50	4	40	1	10	0	0	0	0	4.40	.69

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree,
Freq. = Frequency, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. =Standard Deviation (* refers to the equivalence of the item in students' questionnaire)
    9: Role-plays arouse students' creativity.
   16: Role-play is an effective way of learning.

Table 23 - Means of teachers' responses according to proficiency level of student

Items	Elementary Mean	SD	Low-int. Mean	SD	Intermediate Mean	SD	Upper-int. Mean	SD	Advanced Mean	SD
9	4.5	.70	4.5	.70	3.5	.70	5	.00	5	.00
16(18)*	4.5	.70	4	1.41	4	.70	4.5	.70	5	.00

First, the question of whether role-plays arouse students' creativity was

explored. Dissimilar with the researcher's expectation, only 44.5 % agreed, 26.9 %

were undecided, and 28.8 % of the students disagreed in general. On the other hand,

nine of the teachers agreed with the statement with the last teacher remaining neutral.

At all levels, teachers had mean scores of 4.5 or above, excluding the intermediate

level where the mean score was 3.5. As a conclusion, it may be suggested that

teachers are more positive than their students are about the creativity offered by role-

plays.

Whether students and teachers find role-plays effective was asked directly of

the respondents, with a fairly divided response. While 55.5 % of the students agreed

that it was an effective way of learning, the rest were either neutral or negative in

their responses. Although the means scores across levels resembled each other, it

was, unpredictably, the elementary level students who had the highest mean score

(3.89). Perhaps, they are more eager to learn English, and think that they have a

chance to improve their English through role-plays. Again, teachers showed

agreement with the item apart from one neutral answer, revealing their more positive

opinions about the effectiveness of role-plays.

Students' and teachers' affective reactions to group work

The items about affective reactions of students and their teachers to group work

are again linked with role-plays: enthusiasm to participate (#3), preference of real-

life situations (#6), relevance of the amount of guidance in situations with students'

eagerness (#21), enjoyment of practice (#12) and creating their own situations (#15).

Below, students' affective reactions to role-plays, their responses according to their

proficiency levels, teachers' perceptions of role-plays in terms of their affective

reactions, and average answers to each item at various levels by teachers are

presented in Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27 respectively.

Table 24 - Students' responses to the items related with their affective reactions to
role-plays

Items	SA %	A %	N %	D %	SD %	Mean	Std. Dev.
3	14.3	23.9	26.9	19.3	15.5	3.02	1.27
6	42.8	26.9	18.5	7.6	4.2	3.97	1.14
12	19.3	23.5	24.4	19.3	13.4	3.15	1.31
15	33.6	29.8	20.2	13.4	2.9	3.77	1.13
21	37.8	21.4	22.3	12.6	5.9	3.72	1.25

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, %=
Percentage, Std. Dev. =Standard Deviation, Number of Students= 238
    3: I participate in role-plays enthusiastically.
    6: I prefer real-life situations in role-plays.
    12: I enjoy practicing what I have learned through role-plays.
    15: Creating our own situations in role-plays is fun.
    21: Too much guided situations decrease my eagerness to speak in role-plays.

Table 25 - Means of students' responses according to their proficiency levels

Item numbers	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
3	3.25	1.16	3.04	1.27	3.02	1.30	2.61	1.32	3.24	1.24
6	3.91	1.25	3.98	1.00	3.84	1.03	4.08	1.07	4.02	1.35
12	3.50	1.22	3.19	1.29	3.14	1.32	2.71	1.25	3.33	1.36
15	3.89	1.12	3.98	1.13	3.64	1.17	3.69	1.17	3.71	1.07
21	3.48	1.37	3.81	1.16	3.50	1.29	3.84	1.17	4.00	1.26

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation.

Table 26 - Teachers' responses to the items related with their affective reactions to role-plays

Items	SA Freq.	%	A Freq.	%	N Freq.	%	D Freq.	%	SD Freq.	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
3	1	10	2	20	6	60	1	10	0	0	3.30	.82
6	7	70	0	0	2	20	1	10	0	0	4.30	1.16
11(12)*	1	10	3	30	6	60	0	0	0	0	3.50	.70
14(15)*	2	20	6	60	2	20	0	0	0	0	4.00	.66
19(21)*	2	20	4	40	3	30	1	10	0	0	3.70	.94

Note. SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree,
Freq. = Frequency, %= Percentage, Std. Dev. =Standard Deviation (* refers to the equivalence of the item in students' questionnaire)
  3: Students participate in role-plays enthusiastically.
  6: Students prefer real-life situations in role-plays.
 11: Students enjoy practicing what they have learned through role-plays.
 14: Creating their own situations in role-plays is fun for students.
 19: Too much guided situations decrease students' eagerness to speak in role-plays.

Table 27 - Means of teachers' responses according to proficiency levels of students

Item numbers	Elementary M	SD	Low-int. M	SD	Intermediate M	SD	Upper-int. M	SD	Advanced M	SD
3	3.5	.70	3	.00	3	.00	2.5	.70	4.5	.70
6	4	1.41	3.5	2.12	5	.00	4	.00	5	.00
11(12)*	3.5	.70	3	.00	3.5	.70	3	.70	4.5	.70
14(15)*	3.5	.70	4	.00	4.5	.70	4	.70	4	.00
19(21)*	4	1.41	4	1.41	4	.00	3	.00	3.5	.70

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation

Role-plays are group work or pair work activities which provide students with many opportunities to use the language communicatively. The success of role-plays depends largely on the enthusiastic participation of the students. Therefore the first item concerned with affective reactions in this part tried to elicit whether students are eager to participate in role-plays in their Speaking-Listening classes. The students show little agreement with one another on this question, with 38.2 % agreeing that they are keen on participating in role plays, 26.9 % remaining neutral, and 34.8 % disagreeing with the statement. If we look at the mean scores, it is seen that upper-intermediate students disagreed the most (M= 2.61), yet their teachers had approximately the same reaction (M= 2.5), so both teachers and students share the same idea at this level. Only at the advanced level did students have a relatively

higher mean score of 3.24, mismatching with their teachers' even higher mean score of 4.5. In fact, as these scores are both on the positive side of the scale, it may be suggested that this is not a mismatch, rather just a stronger belief on the part of teachers. Overall, teachers perhaps like role plays more than students maybe because they are more aware of the pedagogical benefits of role-plays.

Not all the situations in role-plays resemble real-life occasions. Sometimes, students are given some situations that they will not encounter in their daily lives. In order to examine how they feel about this and whether they prefer real-life situations, item 6 was included in this part of the questionnaire. The results of the item did not differ from the researcher's expectations, as 69.7 % of the students agreed, 18.5 % stayed neutral and only 11.8 % disagreed. The ones who disagreed or stayed neutral may think that both real-life and unreal-life situations are good for their improvement therefore it makes no difference for them. Still, at all levels, both students and teachers were positive about preferring real-life situations - a circumstance also experienced by the researcher in her own Speaking-Listening classes.

Among the opportunities offered by role-plays is also having the chance to practice the items learned during the lesson. Again, a significant part of what matters here is whether the students enjoy this or not. A full 42.8 % of the students agreed that they enjoyed practicing what they had learned through role-plays, however this is not a significant value to claim that they really enjoy it, because nearly a quarter (24.4 %) of the students stayed neutral, and 32.7 % disagreed. A detailed examination of mean scores across levels reveals that students were either a bit indecisive or mixed on this except for upper-intermediate level students who had a particularly low mean score of 2.71. Their teachers also had a rather low mean score

of 3.0 which means that generally both the teachers and upper-intermediate students are undecided about this issue.

At Anadolu University, teachers use separate books for Speaking-Listening courses at each level. These course books are designed for speaking-listening skills, so there are plenty of role-play situations in exercises. However, teachers do not always use the situations as they are presented in the book; rather, they allow students to create their own situations to add some fun to the role-plays. According to the results of the questionnaires, 63.4 % of the students agree that it is fun to create their own situations whereas 24.4 % of them stayed neutral and 16.3 % disagreed. At all levels, the average score was above 3.5, showing that in general students at all levels like creating the situations by themselves. Compared with their teachers, what is noteworthy is that although elementary level students had the highest score (3.89) among levels, their teachers had the lowest mean score (3.5). This fact may be due to teachers' assumptions that elementary level students' language level is not very appropriate for their students but despite this, they have to experience creating role-play situations to improve their speaking ability.

The last item about students' and teachers' affective reactions to role-plays was again about situations. This time, the relationship between the guidance provided to students in situations and their eagerness to speak in these situations was under inquiry. A majority (59.2 %) of the students stated that overly guided situations decrease their eagerness to speak in role-plays while 22.3 % stayed neutral and 18.9 % disagreed. Although there was not a definite increase in agreement as the students' level went up, the highest mean scores were obtained by upper intermediate (3.84) and advanced level students (4.0). Interestingly, contrary to the situation observed in

students' responses, it was the upper-intermediate (3.0) and advanced level teachers (3.33) who had the lowest average score. This means that although upper intermediate and advanced level students' eagerness to speak decreases when the situations are too much guided, their teachers do not think that over-guidance in role-plays diminishes their students' eagerness.

Questionnaire Part 3

In this final part of the questionnaire there were two multiple-choice questions aiming to summarize students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types. It was thought that after completing the specific items stated in the previous parts, students and teachers would have shaped their ideas about interaction types more clearly, and should have a last opportunity to express their ideas. The questions posed here directly try to find answers to the study's research questions: which interaction type do students and teachers find the most effective, and which interaction type do they find the most enjoyable? In addition to whole-class teaching and group work, pair work was also included as an option in order to find out whether students and teachers have a specific preference of group work in their answers. As there are only two questions in this part, one about effectiveness as a learning tool and the other about affective reactions, there is no need to separate this part into two sections as done in the preceding sections.

Table 28 - Students' perceptions of interaction types

	Pair work		Group work		Whole-class teaching	
Items	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
1	74	31.1	84	35.3	80	33.6
2	63	26.5	94	39.5	81	34

Note: Freq. = Frequency, % = Percentage, Std. Dev. = Standard Deviation
    1: Which one do you enjoy the most in your speaking-Listening class?
    2: Which one do you find the most useful in your Speaking-Listening class?

Table 29 - Teachers' perceptions of interaction types

	Pair work		Group work		Whole-class teaching	
Items	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
1	5	50	4	40	1	10
2	1	10	6	60	3	30

Note: F= Frequency, % = Percentage
    1: Which one do you think students enjoy the most in your speaking-Listening class
    2: Which one do you think is the most useful in your Speaking-Listening class?

When asked whether they enjoy pair work, group work or whole-class teaching the most in their Speaking-Listening classes, 31.1% of the students answered pair work, 35.3 % group work, and the rest (33.6%) answered whole-class teaching. These values show that students have a very slight preference for group work over the other options. However, if we consider that pair work is another type of group work, then it means that 66.4 % of students enjoy some form of group work more than whole-class teaching. As for teachers, the answers were: 5 pair work, 4 group work and 1 whole-class teaching, which again indicates the triumph of group work over whole-class teaching in terms of enjoyment. One important thing at this point is that only one teacher (10%) thinks his/her students enjoy whole-class teaching the most, yet the percentage is actually higher in students.

As for the effectiveness as a learning tool, 26.5 % of the students answered pair work, 39.5 % group work, and the rest (34%) whole-class teaching. Interestingly, these percentages are very similar with those in question one. The researcher had thought that students would consider whole-class teaching as the most useful because the studies in the literature generally suggest students perceive whole-class teaching as more effective than group work. If we look at teachers' answers to this question, most of the teachers thought group work was the most useful in classes, as well. Only three teachers thought whole-class teaching was the most

useful. Two of these teachers were at elementary, and one at upper intermediate level. It is perhaps predictable that elementary level teachers would think whole-class teaching is the most useful for their students because of the low proficiency level of the students; yet why the upper intermediate level teacher thought like this is a question that may be responded to in the interviews section.

Interviews

As questionnaires were distributed to only 10 teachers while there were 238 students competing the questionnaires, it was decided to conduct interviews with one teacher from each level in order to gain insights on their answers and find the possible reasons behind their responses. There were eight questions asked during the interviews, which were conducted with randomly selected teachers who had completed the questionnaires. The audiotaped interviews were transcribed by the researcher and analyzed to represent the perceptions of the teachers more clearly.

First, teachers were asked directly whether they find group work or whole-class teaching more effective. All the teachers stated that whole-class teaching was more effective than group work because students cannot do something on their own and it is difficult to control them working in groups. Moreover, in groups, students tend to speak in Turkish and create a chatting atmosphere which interferes with the aim of the group work. However, the teachers instructing at intermediate and advanced levels added that it depended on the activity and there was not a clear distinction in the effectiveness of one interaction type especially:

> Intermediate Level Teacher: Whether group work or whole-class teaching is effective depends on the situation. For example, group work is useful in reinforcing the language functions learned, while whole-class teaching is useful when I start a new unit in order to involve all the students and get their ideas.

Advanced Level Teacher: It depends on the activity type. I use whole-class teaching in the presentation stage as a warm-up, but in the practice stage, I use group work in order to practice the language functions. This way, both presentation and practice stages become more effective.

This interview question was in fact a repetition of the first item in part 1 of the questionnaire and the second question in part two. In both cases, only three teachers had chosen whole-class teaching, and they were elementary and upper intermediate level teachers. Nonetheless, in the interviews, almost all the teachers reported that whole class teaching was the most effective, contradicting in several cases their responses in the questionnaire. This may be because when they were forced to choose whole-class teaching or group work, they just chose one of them without carefully thinking in the questionnaire, while they had time to reflect in the interview and present their preference with explanations.

Then, teachers were asked which one they think their students find the most enjoyable: group work or whole-class teaching. All of them felt that their students find group work the most enjoyable. Among the common reasons they give are that students try to create something, so an entertaining atmosphere occurs, they feel safer and more comfortable in groups, they participate more enthusiastically, and they are more motivated. Although upper intermediate and advanced level teachers also thought students enjoyed group work the most, their reasons for this were different from those of other teachers:

Upper-intermediate Level teacher: Students like group work more because in a group they can escape from the responsibility of doing something, and they can chat.

Advanced Level teacher: Students like group work more only because I arrange the activities in an engaging way. They are very prejudiced toward working with their peers, in fact they already

have negative attitude toward English, and it affects everything
they do.

Again this question was chosen to shed light on the eleventh item in the first part, and the first question in the third part of the questionnaire, both of which were about enjoyableness. All the teachers had responded with group work in the questionnaire, only one elementary teacher had answered as group work in the first part but as whole-class teaching in the third part, showing inconsistency in her answers. It is good to remind the readers that students had agreed that group work was enjoyable in both item 11 in the first part and question 1 in the third part of the questionnaire.

After asking which interaction type they find the most effective and which one the most enjoyable, the teachers were asked in which situations they use group work and whole-class teaching. As this question is unique to the interview, it is better to present all the teachers' answers one by one in order to draw a clear picture of the situation.

> Elementary Level Teacher: I use whole-class teaching in presenting new or important subjects. In order to activate students, I use group work in warm-ups because they can learn from each other. Also, in the production stage I want students to work in groups.

> Lower-Intermediate Level Teacher: It depends on the activity type. Before whole-class discussions, for example, I make students work together in groups as a preparation for whole-class teaching.

> Intermediate Level Teacher: I do both of them. Group work is useful in reinforcing the language functions learned. But when presenting a new unit or if I am to brainstorm, I prefer whole-class teaching.

> Upper-Intermediate Level Teacher: If I have planned a good task in which every student is required to take part, I use group work. In warm-ups or discussions, I prefer whole-class teaching.

Advanced Level: I prefer whole-class teaching in the presentation stage and group work in the production stage.

The above excerpts indicate that teachers generally prefer whole-class teaching at the presentation stage or discussion parts, and group work in the practice part. No matter at what proficiency level their students are, teachers think they should guide students all together in presenting something important or new to them.

The language proficiency of the students may be an important factor in teachers' decisions to have their students work in groups or as a whole-class. According to the results of the questionnaire, although teachers were positive in general, it was found that teachers were more likely to agree with the item "The English of students at this level is good enough to participate in group work" as the proficiency level of their students increased. In the interviews, teachers instructing at lower levels asserted that students have a limited range of vocabulary and grammar; therefore, they cannot accomplish group work appropriately. Even the intermediate level teacher shared the same idea:

Despite their level, there are students who have limited grammar and vocabulary, so their English is not enough to do group work successfully. They cannot express themselves in group work and they tend to speak in Turkish.

At upper levels, teachers thought that their students' level was suitable for carrying out group work activities, but what emerged from the interviews was a concern that their students are demotivated. For example; the advanced level teacher expressed her disappointment with this level by saying that:

I had thought that group work would go more smoothly at the advanced level but I am disappointed. Even though they are the highest level, they are not motivated. To be honest, I carried out group work activities better in a lower-intermediate class last year.

This may mean that in addition to being competent in English, students' affective filters should be down in order to perform effectively in group work.

How many students should take part in a "group" is a question which is not clearly answered with a certain number in the literature. When teachers were asked this question, all of them said that there should not be more than four students, otherwise, they chat or escape from their responsibilities in the group. Also in the questionnaire the great majority of the teachers had agreed that the smaller the number of students in a group the better their performance is, which altogether means that in order for group work to be effective, teachers at all levels prefer forming groups of four or fewer in their classes.

A subject directly related with the above question is the design of the groups. All the teachers admitted that they sometimes allow students to choose their own group mates, yet there are some other methods they apply when forming groups such as:

> Elementary Level Teacher: Students sometimes decide on their mates in order to have full participation. However, matching high achievers with low achievers is more effective in group work, so I also use this way.

> Low-Intermediate Level Teacher: Sometimes they choose their peers, yet I do not want them to chat with each other so I use different grouping techniques such as grouping them according to their ID numbers.

> Intermediate Level Teacher: Students work with the ones they feel comfortable and secure.

> Upper-Intermediate Level Teacher: It depends on the activity. Sometimes they choose, sometimes I define with whom they are going to work according to their ID numbers or according to the numbers I gave them randomly.

> Advanced Level Teacher: It depends. Sometimes they cannot get on well with the ones I choose, so I let them go along with their decisions. Occasionally, I group them randomly.

Here the comment of teacher instructing at elementary level is worth analyzing. It was clear throughout the interview that she had concerns about the language competence of elementary level students, and here she suggests that it is better to match more proficiency students with the less proficiency ones. This suggestion has support from the literature. For example, Yule and Macdonald (1990) also advise matching the higher proficient students with lower proficient ones, further suggesting that the effectiveness of pair work or group work will increase more if the more proficient students are given the less dominant role, and the less proficient ones the more dominant role.

There are many kinds of activities which can be done as group work. One of them which is used frequently in Speaking-Listening classes at Anadolu University is role-play. Teachers were asked whether they think role-play is an effective way of learning. All the teachers without exception declared that role-plays are very important for speaking classes because they provide students with opportunities to practice what they have learned, they create real life experience, and they allow students to gain competence to communicate as they are more authentic than other activities.

After this question, the researcher felt the need to ask what kind of situations the teachers employ in role-plays. It was obvious that the first resource they refer to is the course book used in the Speaking-Listening course; however, they had also different situations as stated in the following excerpts:

> Elementary Level Teacher: If I think the options in the book are not enough, I want students to create their own situations. Sometimes, I

create. I adapt the situations if they are culturally inappropriate. As my level is elementary, I am very careful in giving clear instructions and I provide a lot of guidance in order not to confuse them.

Lower-Intermediate Level Teacher: Generally, I use the situations in the book. I want students to add something from their lives to the situations and to act out according to it.

Intermediate Level Teacher: I follow the book. But sometimes the ones in the book are not real-life ones. Therefore, I adapt them and ask students to add something from their own lives. This way, they become more creative and enthusiastic to speak.

Upper-Intermediate Level Teacher: In the book, situations are too guided and strict. I prefer students to create their own situations or I myself create.

Advanced Level Teacher: I want role-plays to be natural as in real life; therefore, I don't limit students to certain situations. I let them be free to create their own situations to be more natural and real-life.

From these statements, it can be said that at all levels, teachers prefer students to be creative in role-plays, and they think this characteristic makes role-plays more real-life like. Strikingly, the elementary level teacher shows her concern about students' proficiency level in this question as well because she articulates that she tries to be cautious in giving instructions in order not to misguide her students.

Conclusion

This chapter analyzed the data collected through questionnaires and interviews. The basis of the perception questionnaires' analysis was students' and their Speaking-Listening course teachers' perceptions of interaction types in terms of their effectiveness and students' and teachers' affective reactions towards them. Each part of the questionnaires was analyzed and described according to affective reactions and effectiveness of the interaction type separately. As for interviews, the transcriptions of interviews conducted with teachers were analyzed in the order of questions posed during interviews. According to the data analysis, in general students

and teachers find group work more effective and enjoyable than whole-class work regardless of their proficiency level. Students' perceptions of interaction types do not show a striking difference across the proficiency levels. Moreover, there is by and large a match of opinions between students and their teachers. Difference of perception occurs when effectiveness is under question. To exemplify, although teachers think positively about role-plays, students regard it as less effective or useful. Teachers and students generally see eye to eye with each other in terms of affective reactions, but teachers are more positive about role-play than their students are.

The next chapter will discuss and comment on the findings of this study in the light of relevant studies in the literature, and answer the research questions of the study one by one.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study explored students' and teachers' perceptions of interaction types. It sought to find out whether there were differences among students of different proficiency levels, and also whether students' and their course teachers' perceptions matched in terms of both their affective reactions towards interaction types and their opinions about the effectiveness of these interaction types.

This study was conducted with the participation of students from two preparatory classes at each proficiency level and their Speaking-Listening course teachers at Anadolu University. These randomly selected students and teachers were given perception questionnaires about whole-class teaching, group work and pair work to complete. Then, one teacher from each proficiency level who had completed the questionnaire was interviewed in order to give insights about their perceptions of the interaction types. After the data collection procedure, both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed and related to each other in order to find answers to the research questions of the study.

This chapter will answer the research questions posed in Chapter I by examining the findings of the questionnaires and interviews, which will be interpreted in the light of the relevant literature. The similar and different points of the findings of this study and the earlier research will be investigated. First, the general results will be presented by answering the research questions one by one, and the results of the study will be analyzed and compared with relevant literature. In what ways this study supports the findings of previous studies and in what ways they differ from previous findings will be explored. After the discussion of findings, the

pedagogical implications of the study will be presented. Finally, the limitations of the study will be asserted and suggestions will be made for further research.

Findings and Results

This section will answer the research questions of this study and interpret the findings in the light of relevant literature. There are five sub-sections, each representing one research question. The first and third research questions are divided into two to reflect first the affective reactions and then opinions about the effectiveness of interaction types as learning tools.

1) What are the perceptions of students of the interaction types used

in Speaking-Listening classes?

a- How do students feel about using interaction types?

The findings of the study suggest that students enjoy themselves the most in group work, which means that they like working with their peers in groups while doing an exercise or classroom activity. In his study, Rao (2002) also found that almost all the students reported liking group work. It may be suggested that the similar results of the studies indicate that students' affective filters are down and they are more likely to enjoy themselves in group work. Maybe, this is due to students' feeling more comfortable, and not getting nervous in group work. Evidence for the validity of this assumption can be found in two other findings of this study.

More than half of students declared that they feel more comfortable in group work, and a great majority of the students reinforced this assertion by stating that they get the most nervous in whole-class teaching. As Harmer (2004) says, group work may be influential in reducing anxiety when students participate in a task whereas whole-class teaching may impose the risk of failure and humiliation in front

of the teacher and all the classmates. As these students are around the same age in a group, they know that their English level is somehow similar to each other, and everybody is likely to make mistakes, so group work can provide a safe environment for them. Students generally focus on accomplishing a task in group work and individual mistakes are ignored since group success is important therefore they may ignore the language use and focus on the task.

Students also report being more eager to speak in group work. They are keen on being active in group activities. In fact, feeling comfortable and not getting nervous can trigger an eagerness to speak, so it is natural to expect students to be more eager to speak in group work following the previous findings.

As for role-plays in particular, a common activity type performed in pairs or groups, students are not as enthusiastic as their teachers to participate in them, and overall there is not a strong indication that they like practicing what they have learned through role-plays. If role-plays are to be used, they should definitely not be overguided in terms of the topic or structure. Students favor creating their own situations, and prefer real-life occasions as subjects. These results may be because teachers do not arrange role-plays appropriately and students do role-plays just because their teachers want them to do. If teachers show its advantages to their students, and explain how role-plays give them opportunity to practice the language functions and structures like in real-life communication, students' perceptions may change in a positive way.

In conclusion, these results suggest that students are more positive towards group work in terms of their affective reactions. Further, it may be suggested that

students enjoy learner-centered classroom interaction more than teacher-fronted interaction in general.

b- How effective do students find these interaction types as learning tools?

When effectiveness is under question in exploring interaction types, generally factors such as providing opportunities to speak, to improve fluency or accuracy, giving a chance to practice, and using the target language come to mind. In other words, the effectiveness of an interaction type is more or less bound to these factors.

In both the first and third part of the questionnaire, students stated that in general they find group work more useful and effective than whole-class teaching. This supports and provides empirical evidence to the findings of Harris (2005), Sert (2005), Storch (1999), and Mcdonough (2004), who also found out that students believed working in groups or pairs effective. It is possible of course that students to some extent regard group work as an effective way of learning because of their emotional perceptions. When a positive atmosphere is provided through group work, effective learning occurs spontaneously.

If we put having more opportunity to speak, and finding more chance to practice under the same category, it is seen that students believe group work to be better for both over whole-class teaching. In the relevant literature it is also stated that students are provided with many opportunities to speak and practice what they have learned in group work since there is less teacher talk and more student talk (e.g. Harmer, 2004; McDonough and Shaw, 2003).

As students speak and practice more, they also report speaking more fluently in group work than whole-class teaching as a result. However, this may also reflect that students are less anxious while working in groups and this affects their speaking

performance positively. As for the amount of speaking in English that each type of interaction provides, there is not a distinct preference which means that the students feel they speak in English as much in whole-class teaching as in group work.

The only point on which whole-class teaching clearly triumphed over group work was related with accuracy. A great majority of the students responded that they pay more attention to their speech in whole-class teaching, which suggests that accuracy or grammatical correctness is given more importance in whole class teaching, maybe because of the risk of public failure as claimed by Harmer (2004). Paying more attention to their speech implies trying not to make mistakes while speaking, and again a great majority of students stated they were more careful while speaking in whole-class teaching.

When we look in detail at the perceived benefits of group work, which was viewed in general as more effective by students, it is clear that not all the students think that they learn new things from each other, but they do report trusting in each other's feedback during group work. It may be claimed that students are not aware of the positive ways in which their peers' feedback may affect their own learning but they are open to receiving it. In their study, Mackey and Silver (2005) found that interactional feedback helped students' language development. Therefore, students should be trained on feedback benefits, and become more conscious of the potential positive effects of their peers' feedback.

In group work, students report liking to work with the peers they choose, as Salas (2005) also claims, so teachers should take into account their students' preferences while grouping them for activities. Students also think that if the number of students working in a group increases, their performances decrease, but they do

not have a certain preference with regard to cooperative or collaborative working. It is notable that students give importance to the proficiency level of their peers in group work. They generally want to work with higher achieving students, presumably as they think they will benefit more from a higher proficiency peer. In the literature this result finds support as it is suggested that students gain more when they are paired or grouped with higher proficiency peers (Leeser, 2004; Yule and Macdonald, 1990).

Students also stated that discussing in small groups before whole-class discussions is beneficial as it gives them new ideas, yet they are not so determined in their perceptions of role-plays. There is not a clear positive indication with regard to the creativity and effectiveness aspects of role-plays. Suggestions about how to remedy this condition will be made in the pedagogical implications section.

2) Are there differences in perceptions among students of different levels?

In terms of affective reactions toward group work and whole-class teaching, there is no difference in the students' answers. At all proficiency levels, students enjoy themselves more in group work. In fact, affective reactions are closely related with feelings and these are all teenage students sharing more or less the same interests, so they probably like to work together more than sitting in chairs and listening to their teachers. Moreover, whole-class work has a more disciplined setting, so this may lead students to enjoy themselves more in group work.

As for effectiveness, there was also not a significant difference between students' responses. However, at the intermediate level, nearly half of the students said group work was effective and the rest said whole-class teaching was effective. This level is in the middle of the proficiency levels, and interestingly only at this

level, did students not display a clear preference. Maybe, they find both of the interaction types effective and the effectiveness of an interaction type depends on the activity, task or exercise. As expected, at the advanced level, students asserted they speak in English more in group work, and this may be related with their relatively higher proficiency of English. At all proficiency levels, students can speak in English with the guidance of their teachers, but only at upper levels are students more confident and competent in using English in group work. Another expected result is that it is upper-intermediate and advanced level students who reported having more chance to practice in group work. It is arguable that again the high proficiency of students at these levels makes teachers think their students are competent enough to work on their own, so they employ more group work activities in their classes.

In group work, the number of students thinking that their peers learn new things from them increased as the proficiency level moved up. Moreover, as the proficiency level increased, more students stated that their peers' English is good enough for group work. Advanced level students gave less importance to whether they work with high achieving or low achieving students. These responses are all related again with language competence. Yet, it was elementary students who trusted their peers' feedback more, wanted to work with higher proficient peers, and perceived role-play as an effective way of learning more than students from other levels. As elementary level is the lowest proficiency level in the second term, they are probably aware that they have to work harder than students at other levels to pass the exit exam, and they may think that they have to learn a lot of things. That may be why they want to work with higher proficiency peers, and value role-plays.

3) What are the perceptions of teachers of the interaction types used

in Speaking-Listening classes?

a- How teachers feel about using interaction types

According to the results of the study, all the teachers stated that they felt students enjoy themselves more in group work than whole-class teaching. The data obtained from interviews support this finding. The reason that all the teachers consider group work more enjoyable is their experiences and observations in their Speaking-Listening classes. In the interviews, they reported that as humor, challenge, or more intimacy are added to activities in group work, students enjoy themselves more. Students feel more comfortable with their peers, so group work seems more entertaining for them.

A great percentage of teachers feel that students are more comfortable in group work and students get the most nervous when they talk in whole-class teaching. Teachers are aware that group work provides a more relaxed learning environment for their students. In terms of eagerness to speak, again a great majority of teachers stated that it is group work in which students are more eager to speak. In fact, almost all teachers are aware that students are sometimes reluctant to speak in front of the whole-class but when they are in groups, they speak much more.

b- How effective teachers find these interaction types as learning tools

In general, teachers reported on the questionnaire that they think that group work is the most effective way of learning, and this finding is in parallel with the relevant research studies on the effectiveness of group work (e.g. Harris, 2005; Sert, 2005; Storch, 1999). Such perception of the teachers may be because of theoretical knowledge they have gained from literature, or because they have observed so in

their classes. However, when we look at the responses of teachers in the interviews to find the real reason, it is seen that most of the teachers said whole-class teaching was more effective, contradicting with their answers in the questionnaire. They asserted that students cannot do something on their own effectively, and it is easier to control students in whole-class work. This shows the risk of survey research. When the teachers were made to complete the questionnaires at a particular time, they may have given quick answers, but in the interviews they may have found the opportunity to reflect on the question, so revealed their opinions with the reasons behind them.

A great majority of teachers prefer group work to whole-class teaching in terms of the greater opportunities it provides for students to speak, practice what they have learned, and improve their fluency. However, they think that whole-class teaching is more effective with regard to paying attention to speech, trying not to make mistakes, and speaking in English more frequently. In the interviews, some teachers had expressed their concerns about the fact that students tend to switch to Turkish in group work and they abuse group work by creating a chat environment and ignoring the task. These concerns of teachers were also expressed in the study of McDonough (2004) who studied learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities.

In terms of group work, teachers were concerned with the peer feedback issue because they did not feel that students rely on each other's feedback, but they stated their belief that students can learn from each other. Maybe, this concern is due to the classroom experience of teachers. Sometimes even when students get feedback from each other, they want to confirm it by asking their teacher, who is linguistically superior to all the students. All the teachers agreed that students should work with

high proficiency peers; however, they were undecided like their students about whether students should work together on every item or they should be assigned different responsibilities in the groups. Last, teachers are very much in favor of role-plays as they think role-plays enable students to practice what they have learned, and they feel that it is effective to make students discuss in groups before whole-class discussions. It may be suggested that they consider group discussion as preparation to whole-class discussion, and role-play as practice for students, therefore they regard these activities useful especially for pre- and post parts of whole-class teaching.

4) Are there differences in perceptions among teachers of different levels?

Generally speaking, teachers at all proficiency levels shared the same ideas stating that students perceive group work as more enjoyable than whole-class teaching. Just one intermediate-level teacher expressed the belief that students feel more comfortable in whole-class teaching, and one low-intermediate and one upper intermediate teacher thought that students are more eager to speak during whole-class activities. However, these teachers may not represent the whole teachers at those levels, as in the interviews generally group work was stated as the most enjoyable interaction type.

As for effectiveness, there was again not a huge discrepancy in the opinions of teachers across the proficiency levels: they think that group work is more effective than whole-class teaching. Interestingly, there appears to be no pattern of relationship between level taught and preference for one or the other type of teaching. For example, both an elementary level teacher and an intermediate level teacher stated that their students find more opportunity to speak in whole-class teaching although

these proficiency levels are different from each other in terms of students' language use and production capacity. This finding contradicts the claim of Garret and Shorthall (2002), whose study results indicated that there was "a learner pathway towards more interactive student-centered activities as they move through the language levels" (p. 47). In other words, in their study, students preferred student-centered activities like group work more as their proficiency level increased, but in this study, there was not such a pattern.

Within group work, there were some differences among teachers of various levels. For example, teachers of advanced level classes agreed more with the idea that students trust each other's feedback, presumably because theirs are the most proficient students at school with the highest language capacity. Teachers at lower levels were undecided about whether their students' English is good enough for group work, again a finding logically related with proficiency level, in other words, the lower language capacity of these students. Lastly, lower-intermediate and intermediate level teachers were more likely to think that the proficiency level of students working in a group affects the degree of learning while the rest of the teachers from different levels did not think so. These levels are nearly in the middle of the proficiency levels, so it is difficult to make a generalization. It seems most likely that this finding is connected with these teachers' own beliefs which overall guide them in their teaching, rather than the proficiency level of their students.

5) Are there differences between students' and teachers' perceptions?

In this study, the perceptions of students generally matched those of their Speaking-Listening teachers in terms of affective reactions, though there were a few exceptions. In choosing between group work and whole-class teaching, there was a

mismatch at the intermediate level with regard to feeling comfortable, and another mismatch at lower intermediate and upper intermediate levels in terms of eagerness to speak. In both cases, teachers thought that their students preferred whole-class teaching, and contradicted the answers of their students. These preference are concerned with affective reactions of students, therefore it is suggested that teachers should ask opinions of their students about the activities carried out in their classes. In this way, they will learn their students' feelings about the activities and can design their lessons according to this.

Within group work, the teachers liked role-plays more than their students. To illustrate, at advanced levels, students were neutral on whether they were willing to participate in role-plays, but their teachers were very positive and believed that their students also were enthusiastic for role-plays. Surprisingly, while students at upper intermediate and advanced levels were the most opposed to too much guidance in role-plays it was their teachers who were the most likely to think their students did not mind overguidance. These students seem to be pointing out that overly-guided or structured situations in role-plays mean controlled role-plays, and this allows them limited opportunity to show their full competence. Brown (2001) acknowledges this when he suggests that more advanced students have developed a certain amount of fluency and accuracy, and they should be provided with complex role-plays which impose less guidance and more production possibilities for students. This may challenge them, and increase their eagerness to participate in role-plays.

There appeared to be more incongruence between teachers and students in terms of their perceptions of the effectiveness of interaction types. For example, a teacher from elementary level stated that the students at that level find more chance

to practice and speak more fluently in whole-class teaching, but the students at this level thought the opposite. At lower levels, some teachers are likely to think that whole-class teaching is the best for their students to learn English as both students and their teachers feel secure in whole-class teaching (Harmer, 2004). Moreover, students are viewed as to be dependent on the teacher, so teacher-fronted classrooms are often preferred. However, this study seems to give evidence to Brown (2001), who argues that even students at this level like group work, and group work and pair work can be used and should be used in lower level language classes as long as they are controlled and the objectives and instructions are very clear. Another distinct mismatch was at the advanced level. While a teacher from this level thought that students pay more attention to their speech in group work, a great majority of the students claimed the opposite. This may suggest that proficiency level does not play a significant role in the perception with regard to paying attention to speech. Generally, all the students report being more careful in speaking in front of the class regardless of their proficiency level as their teachers monitor them and are ready to correct them immediately when they make mistakes. This may explain why students also report paying more attention to their speech in whole-class work.

There is not a significant mismatch between teachers and students with regard to different aspects of group work in terms of effectiveness. However, teachers are somewhat more concerned than their students with the accuracy of peer feedback. At the advanced level, students are neutral about whether working together on every item is efficient whereas their teachers strongly believe that students should work cooperatively. In fact, the readers should be reminded that both teachers and students at all proficiency levels were generally undecided about collaborative versus

cooperative working. Therefore, the mismatch between advanced level teachers and their students may be caused by misinterpretation of the questions. Although elementary, upper intermediate and advanced level teachers agree that their students' learning is not affected by the proficiency level of their peers in group work, students at these levels disagreed, reporting that in fact their learning is affected by the proficiency level of their peers in group work. It is perhaps understandable for upper level teachers to think that other students' proficiency level does not affect a student's learning in a group as the students have relatively good language capacity and competence, but why the elementary level teacher thought so may be explained by claiming that at this level all students have limited knowledge of English, and approximately the same low achievement.

<div align="center">Pedagogical Implications</div>

Although students generally expressed that they enjoyed and found group work effective, they were neutral or undecided on the effectiveness of some aspects of group work such as role-plays, or learning from peers. Teachers can increase the effectiveness of group work by holding class forums. In these forums, students' ideas can be discussed; their prejudices about group work stemming from their previous education can be eradicated as Barkhuizen (1998) suggests. By this way, students who have resistance to doing group work, and think that they can not learn from group work can be positively motivated. Moreover, suggestions can be obtained from students with regard to how to carry out group work, and how to choose the topics or group members, so they may be actively involved both in the design and performance of group work activities. These forums can serve as a means of

negotiation between teachers and students regardless of the proficiency level of students.

Some teachers teaching at low levels thought that the proficiency level of their students is not enough for group work and they had concerns about the quality of student work done in groups. However, the literature has shown that students even at lower proficiency levels can perform group work activities as long as they are carefully planned, students are given explanatory instructions, and the objectives of the group work is clearly stated. Moreover, this study has shown that students of all levels -even lower ones- have positive reactions to group work activities. Teachers at these lower levels should consider incorporating such activities into their lessons. There are group work activities suitable for all proficiency levels. For example, lower proficiency level students can be provided with information gap and jigsaw story activities, which are semi-controlled and appropriate for these students.

Moreover, in order to guarantee the smooth and effective implementation of group work, students can be trained in communicative strategies and taught how to negotiate meaning and form among each other. In the literature, Bejarano, et al. (1997), and Naughton (2006) studied strategy training in group work and concluded that strategy training leads to more comprehensible input and output in group work. Therefore, teachers who have concerns about whether students learn from group work can feel relieved while carrying out group work if they train their students in group work and see with their own eyes, how training makes group work performance more effective.

As the results of the study suggested, students are not overly keen on role-plays. In order to get more enthusiastic participation from students in role-play activities, steps suggested by Salies (1995) can be followed:

- introduce role-play and explain its advantages to your students

- develop ideas and vocabulary briefly

- assign roles

- perform the role-play

- debrief

- evaluate

- address the difficulties in the following lessons.

In this way, students will become aware of the benefits of role-plays, and will know what they are expected to do while acting out the role-play. By having feedback after their performance, they will also see their mistakes and they will perform better next time. Moreover, in the questionnaires students reported that they do not want unreal situations and overguidance, and they feel that creating their own situations is fun in role-plays. Therefore, in addition to Salas' suggestions, students should be allowed to be freer in terms of situations and guidance in role-plays. This is particularly so at the higher proficiency levels, where students reported a particular dislike of over-guided situations

Last, nearly all the teachers interviewed said that they used whole-class teaching in the presentation stage of the lessons while using group work only for the practice part. It is advised that teachers vary the use of whole-class teaching and group work. For example, sometimes they can use group work in order to challenge students to discover the target language structure or function together with their peers

in the presentation stage of the lesson. This in turn will improve learner autonomy, and contribute to being responsible for their learning.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

There are several limitations inherent in the study. First, there were about 250 students and just ten teachers involved in the study. Maybe, including more teachers in the study would have made the questionnaire results more reliable. In addition to completing the perception questionnaires, only the teachers were interviewed. The interviews conducted with teachers provided insights into the findings of the study. If students from different proficiency levels had also been interviewed, some of the reasons for their various answers could have been identified, shedding light on their perceptions.

Second, the questionnaires were appropriate to get students' affective reactions, since the emotions are related with their opinions about interaction types. However, as for the issue of effectiveness, the results of a survey can not truly reveal the real classroom practice and resulting effectiveness. Effectiveness may be interpreted differently by different participants, and is probably best measured by a more quasi-experimental study. Moreover, students may confuse their affective reactions with effectiveness. For example, a student may not like group work and report that it is not an effective way of learning just because he does not like it, even though he may actually be benefiting from it.

Finally, only questionnaires and interviews were employed for this study, and these relied on students' and teachers' perceptions of ten different classrooms, in which practices naturally vary. If clear group work activities and whole-class teaching activities had then been prepared for different proficiency levels, and

students' perceptions of the experiences had been asked through questionnaires, the study would have been more objective.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings and limitations of the study, some suggestions can be made for further research. To begin with, teachers and students can be trained in how to carry out group work in language classes. This training can cover topics such as role assignments, cooperative or collaborative working in a group, using the target language, and focusing on how to do group work in addition to accomplishing the given task. Moreover, teachers can teach their students negotiation of meaning strategies such as comprehension checks, clarification requests, recasts and confirmation checks. After training, students may be given tasks in order to see the effect of training in group work. If in the study a control group is also included, the researcher will have the chance to make comparisons between the experimental and control groups with regard to the effectiveness of strategy training in group work. In addition, through such a quasi-experimental study, a researcher can also see whether affective reactions of students can be changed or group work can be improved due to training.

Conclusion

This study investigated the affective reactions of students and teachers at different proficiency levels to interaction types, as well as their impressions as to the effectiveness of these interaction types as learning tools. Data analysis indicated that students and teachers in general perceived group work as more effective and enjoyable than whole-class teaching without a significant difference across various levels. Teachers' and their students' perceptions were generally similar to each other,

however, teachers had more concerns with regard to peer feedback, and they liked and valued role plays more than their students. To conclude, it must be said that group work activities, an indispensable part of today's language classrooms are indeed enjoyed and found effective by learners of English and their teachers, however, student training is a must in order to have smoother and more effective implementation of this interaction type.

REFERENCES

Alan, B., & Stoller, F. (2005). Maximizing the benefits of project work in foreign language classrooms. *English Teaching Forum, 43*(4), 10-21.

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

Andy, T. (1993). *Negotiation of meaning in second language acquisition*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of advocates for language learning. Kansas City, Missouri.

Barkhuizen, G. P. (1998). Discovering learners' perceptions of ESL classroom teaching/learning activities in a South African context. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(1), 85-107.

Bejarano, Y., Levine, T., Olshtain, E., & Steiner, J. (1997). The skilled use of interaction strategies: Creating a framework for improved small-group communicative interaction in the language classroom. *System, 25*(2), 203-214.

Bishop, P. E. (2000). *Classroom interaction*. Retrieved October 21, 2006. from http://www.faculty.valenciacc.edu/pbishop/lcrb/clssrm-interact.pdf

Bitchener, J. (2004). The relationship between negotiation of meaning and language learning: A longitudinal study. *Language Awareness, 13*(2), 81-95.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman.

Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, R. L. (1997). Group work is not busy work: Maximizing success of group work in the L2 classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 30(2)*, 265-278.

Dobinson, T. (2001). Do learners learn from classroom interaction and does the teacher have a role to play? *Language Teaching Research, 5*(3), 189-211.

Dörnyei, Z. & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research, 4(3),* 275-300.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Elgar, A. G. (2002). Student playwriting for language development. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 22-28.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flowerdew, L. (1998). A cultural perspective on group work. *ELT Journal, 52*(4), 323- 329.

Gabillon, Z. (2005). L2 learners' beliefs: An overview. *Journal of Language and Learning, 3(2),* 233-260.

Garret, P., & Shortall, T. (2002). Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities. *Language Teaching Research, 6(1),* 25-57.

Ghait, G. (2001). Learners' perceptions of their STAD cooperative experience. *System, 29,* 289-301.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22,* 186-203.

Harmer, J. (2004). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Harris, K. (2005). Same activity, different focus. *Focus on Basics, 8*(A), 7-10.

Hawkey, R. (2006). Teacher and learner perceptions of language learning activity. *ELT Journal, 60*(3), 242-252.

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

Jacobs, G. M., & Ball, J. (1996). An investigation of the structure of group activities in ELT coursebooks. *ELT Journal, 50*(2), 99-107.

Kasap, B. (2005). *The effectiveness of task-based instruction in the improvement of learners' speaking skills.* Unpublished master's thesis. Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2002). The effect of interaction in acquiring the grammar of a second language. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 343-358.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Layman, L. (2006). Changing students' perceptions: An analysis of the supplementary benefits of collaborative software development. *Proceedings of the 19th Conference on Software Engineering Education & Training (CSEET'06).* 159-166.

Leeser, J. M. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(1), 55-81.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2003). *How languages are learned* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lynch, T. (1997). Nudge, nudge: teacher interventions in task-based learner talk. *ELT Journal, 51*(4), 317-325.

Lyster, R. (2002). *The importance of differentiating negotiation of form and meaning in classroom interaction.* Retrieved November 25, 2006. from http://www.education.mcgill.caprofslysterLyster2002.pdf

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *SSLA, 21*, 557-587.

Mackey, A. (2002). Beyond production: Learners' perceptions about interactional processes. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 379-394.

Mackey, A., & Philip, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(iii), 338-356.

Mackey, A., & Silver, R. E. (2005). Interactional tasks and English L2 learning by Immigrant children in Singapore. *System, 33,* 239-260.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System, 32,* 207-224.

Myers, L. L. (2000). Task interpretation and task effectiveness: A Vygotskian analysis of a French L2 classroom task. *Proceedings for the Texas Foreign Language Education Conference, 5*, 9-21.

Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & van Lier, L. (2001). Negotiation of meaning in conversational and information gap activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(3), 377-405.

Naughton, D. (2006). Cooperative strategy training and oral interaction: Enhancing small group communication in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(ii), 169-184.

Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(iv), 519-533.

Rao, Z. (2002). Chinese students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classroom. *System, 30,* 85-105.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W. M. (1987). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In Rivers W. M. (Ed.), *Interactive language teaching,* (pp. 3-16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saglam, S., & Kaya, O. (2006). *EFL students' perceptions of classroom practices in speaking-listening classes.* Paper presented at the 2nd International ELT Conference, Famagusta, Cyprus.

Salas, M. R. (2005). Grouping techniques in EFL classrooms. Actualidades Invertigativas en Educacion, 5, 1-14. Retrieved April 1, 2007 from http://revista.inie.ucr.ac.cr/articulos/extra-2005/archivos/techniques.pdf

Salies, T. G. (1995). Teaching language realistically: Role play is the thing. ERIC document number ED424753.

Savignon, J., & Wang, C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL, 41,* 223-249.

Schleppegrell, M. J., & Simich-Dudgeon, C. (1996). What is a good answer? Awareness about behavioral and content features of successful classroom interaction. *Language and Education, 10(4),* 273-286.

Sert, O. (2005). Comparative analysis of pair work and individual assignments in two ELT classes. *Journal of Language and Learning, 3(2),* 219-232.

Soler, E. A. (2002). Relationship between teacher-led versus learners' interaction and the development of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 359-377.

Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. *System, 27,* 363-374.

Storch, N. (2002a). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning, 52(1),* 119-158Storch, N. (2002b). Relationships formed in dyadic interaction and opportunity for learning. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 305-322.

Ur, P. (1981). *Discussions that work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5,* 1-17.

Wu, B. (1998). Towards an understanding of the dynamic process of L2 classroom interaction. *System*, *26,* 525-540.

Yang, A., & Lau, L. (2003). Student attitudes to learning of English at secondary and tertiary levels. *System, 31,* 107-123.

Yule, G., & Macdonald, D. (1990). Resolving referential conflicts in L2 interaction: The effect of proficiency and interactive role. *Language Learning, 40*(4), 539-556.

APPENDIX A: PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Dear Student,
This questionnaire is prepared to explore your perceptions of whole-class teaching and group work carried out in the speaking-listening courses at the Preparatory School. This is not a test so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. I am interested in your personal opinion. Your responses to the questionnaire will be kept confidential, and used only in this study for scientific purposes. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help.

Lecturer Özlem KAYA

At which level are you a student this term? _____

Part-I Choose either (**G**) group work or (**W**) whole-class teaching to complete each sentence.

1. ____ is the most effective way of learning.

2. I have the most opportunity to speak in ____.

3. I feel the most comfortable in ____.

4. I find the most chance to practice what I have learned in ____.

5. I get the most nervous when I talk in ____.

6. I speak the most fluently in ____.

7. I pay the most attention to my speech in ____.

8. I try not to make mistakes in ____.

9. I speak in English the most in ____.

10. I am the most eager to speak in ____.

11. I enjoy myself the most in ____.

Part-II Please circle the number appropriate for your opinion.

1. I learn new things from my peers in group work.

strongly agree				strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2. I trust the feedback my peers give in group work.

strongly agree				strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3. I participate in role-plays enthusiastically.

strongly agree				strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

4. It is useful to work with higher proficiency peers in group work.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

5. My English is good enough to participate in group work.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

6. I prefer real life situations in role-plays.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

7. It is useful to work in small groups before whole-class discussions.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

8. In group work, my learning is not affected by the proficiency level of my peers.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

9. Role-plays arouse my creativity.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

10. I work the most efficiently with the peers I choose in group work.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

11. My peers learn new things from me in group work.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

12. I enjoy practicing what I have learned through role-plays.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

13. It is useful to work with the same proficiency level peers.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

14. Discussing with my peers before whole-class discussions gives me new ideas.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

15. Creating our own situations in role-plays is fun.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

     5   4   3   2   1

16. My peers' English is good enough to participate in group works.
strongly　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**strongly**
　agree　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**disagree**
　　　　5　　　　　4　　　　3　　　　　2　　　　1

17. Working together on every item in group work is efficient.
strongly　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**strongly**
　agree　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**disagree**
　　　　5　　　　　4　　　　3　　　　　2　　　　1

18. Role-play is an effective way of learning
strongly　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**strongly**
　agree　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**disagree**
　　　　5　　　　　4　　　　3　　　　　2　　　　1

19. The smaller the number of students in a group, the better my performance is.
strongly　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**strongly**
　agree　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**disagree**
　　　　5　　　　　4　　　　3　　　　　2　　　　1

20. Assigning students different responsibilities in group work is efficient.
strongly　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**strongly**
　agree　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**disagree**
　　　　5　　　　　4　　　　3　　　　　2　　　　1

21. Too much guided situations decrease my eagerness to speak in role-plays.
strongly　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**strongly**
　agree　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**disagree**
　　　　5　　　　　4　　　　3　　　　　2　　　　1

PART-III Please choose one of the choices below taking the level of the class you are
<u>currently</u> teaching into consideration.

1. Which one do you enjoy the most in your speaking-listening class?

 a) pair work
 b) group work
 c) whole-class teaching

2. Which one do you find the most useful in your speaking-listening class?

 a) pair work
 b) group work
 c) whole-class teaching

APPENDIX B: ÖĞRENCİLER İÇİN ALGI ANKETİ

Sevgili Öğrenci,
Bu anket İngilizce Hazırlık Programında Konuşma-Dinleme derslerinde uygulanan sınıfça çalışma ve grup çalışmasına yönelik tutumlarınızı belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Bu anket sınav değildir, bu yüzden cevaplar "doğru" ya da "yanlış" olarak değerlendirilmeyecektir. Bu çalışma için önemli olan sizin görüşlerinizdir. Ankete vereceğiniz yanıtlar gizli tutulacak ve sadece bu araştırma kapsamında bilimsel amaçla kullanılacaktır. Bu araştırmanın başarısı ankete vereceğiniz cevapların içtenliğine bağlıdır. Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Okutman Özlem KAYA

Şuanda hangi kurda öğrencisiniz? _____

I. Bölüm: Aşağıda belirtilen cümleleri (**G**) grup çalışması veya (**S**) sınıfça çalışma seçeneklerinden birini seçerek tamamlayınız.

1. _____ en etkili öğrenme yoludur.

2. En çok konuşma olanağını _____(n)da buluyorum.

3. En çok _____(n)da kendimi rahat hissediyorum.

4. Öğrendiklerimi en çok _____(n)da uygulama olanağı buluyorum.

5. En çok _____(n)da konuşurken heyecanlanıyorum.

6. En çok _____(n)da akıcı konuşuyorum.

7. En çok _____(n)da konuşmama özen gösteriyorum.

8. _____(n)da hata yapmamaya çalışıyorum.

9. En çok _____(n)da İngilizce konuşuyorum.

10. En çok _____(n)da istekli konuşuyorum.

11. En çok _____(n)dan zevk alıyorum.

II. Bölüm: Grup çalışması hakkındaki düşüncelerinizi uygun gördüğünüz rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1. Grup çalışmalarında arkadaşlarımdan dersle ilgili yeni şeyler öğreniyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

2. Grup çalışmaları sırasında arkadaşlarımdan aldığım dönüte güveniyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

3. Rol-oynama(role-play) çalışmalarına severek katılıyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

4. Grup çalışmalarında benden daha iyi İngilizce bilen sınıf arkadaşlarımla birlikte çalışmanın yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

5. İngilizce seviyemin grup çalışmaları için yeterli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

6. Rol-oynama çalışmalarında gerçek hayatta karşılaşabileceğim olayları tercih ederim.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

7. Sınıfça tartışmadan önce küçük gruplar halinde tartışmanın yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

8. Grup çalışmalarında birlikte çalıştığım sınıf arkadaşlarımın İngilizce seviyeleri benim için önemli değil.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

9. Rol-oynama çalışmaları yaratıcılığımı ortaya çıkarıyor.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

10. Grup çalışmalarında kendi seçtiğim arkadaşlarla daha verimli çalışıyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

11. Grup çalışmalarında, arkadaşlarım benden dersle ilgili yeni şeyler öğrendiğini düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

12. Derste öğrendiklerimi rol-oynama çalışmalarında uygulamaktan zevk alıyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

13. Benimle İngilizcesi aynı seviyede olan sınıf arkadaşlarımla birlikte çalışmanın yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

14. Sınıfça tartışmadan önce küçük gruplar halinde tartışmak bana yeni fikirler kazandırıyor.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				**kesinlikle katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

15. Rol-oynama çalışmalarında durumu kendimizin yaratması eğlencelidir.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

16. Sınıf arkadaşlarımın İngilizce seviyelerinin grup çalışmaları için yeterli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

17. Grup çalışmalarında herkesin aynı anda aynı konu üzerinde çalışmasının daha verimli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

18. Rol-oynama çalışmalarının etkili bir öğrenme yolu olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

19. Gruptaki kişi sayısı azaldıkça performansım artıyor.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

20. Grup çalışmalarında herkese farklı görevlerin verilmesinin daha verimli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

21. Rol oynama çalışmalarında yönergelerin beni çok sınırlandırması konuşma isteğimi azaltıyor.

kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
     5   4   3   2   1

III. Bölüm: Aşağıdaki sorulara yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyerek cevap veriniz.

1. Konuşma-dinleme derslerinde en çok hoşlandığınız aşağıdakilerden hangisidir?

         a) ikili çalışma   b) grup çalışması   c)sınıfça çalışma

2. Konuşma-dinleme derslerinde aşağıdakilerden hangisinin en yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

         a) ikili çalışma   b) grup çalışması   c)sınıfça çalışma

APPENDIX C: PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

Dear Lecturer,
This questionnaire is prepared to explore your perceptions of whole-class teaching and group work carried out in the speaking-listening courses at the Preparatory School. This is not a test so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. I am interested in your personal opinion. Your responses to the questionnaire will be kept confidential, and used only in this study for scientific purposes. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help.

Lecturer Özlem KAYA

At which level are you teaching speaking-listening course this term? _____

Part-I Choose either (**G**) group work or (**W**) whole-class teaching to complete each sentence, taking into consideration the level of the class you are currently teaching.

1. ____ is the most effective way of learning.

2. Students have the most opportunity to speak in ____.

3. Students feel the most comfortable in ____.

4. Students find the most chance to practice what they have learned in ____.

5. Students get the most nervous when they talk in ____.

6. Students speak the most fluently in ____.

7. Students pay the most attention to their speech in ____.

8. Students try not to make mistakes in ____.

9. Students speak in English the most in ____.

10. Students are the most eager to speak in ____.

11. Students enjoy themselves the most in ____.

Part-II Please circle the number appropriate for your opinion, taking into consideration the level of the class you are currently teaching.

1. Students learn new things from their peers in group work.

strongly agree				strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

2. Students trust the feedback their peers give in group work.

strongly agree				strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

3. Students participate in role-plays enthusiastically.

strongly agree				strongly disagree
5	4	3	2	1

4. It is useful for students to work with higher proficiency peers in group work.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

5. The English of students at this level is good enough to participate in group work.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

6. Students prefer real life situations in role-plays.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

7. It is useful for students to work in small groups before whole-class discussions.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

8. In group work, students' learning is not affected by the proficiency level of their peers.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

9. Role-plays arouse students' creativity.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

10. Students work the most efficiently with the peers they choose in group work.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

11. Students enjoy practicing what they have learned through role-plays.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

12. It is useful for students to work with the same proficiency level peers.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

13. Discussing with their peers before whole-class discussions gives students new ideas.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

14. Creating their own situations in role-plays is fun for students.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

15. Having students work together on every item in group work is efficient.
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

16. Role-play is an effective way of learning
strongly
agree   **strongly**
disagree

  5   4   3   2   1

17. The smaller the number of students in a group, the better their performance is.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

    5   4   3   2   1

18.Assigning students different responsibilities in group work is efficient.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

    5   4   3   2   1

19. Too much guided situations decrease students' eagerness to speak in role-plays.

strongly agree   **strongly disagree**

    5   4   3   2   1

PART-III Please choose one of the choices below taking the level of the class you are <u>currently</u> teaching into consideration.

1. Which one do you think students enjoy the most in your speaking-listening class?

a) pair work
b) group work
c) whole-class teaching

2. Which one do you think students find the most useful in your speaking-listening class?

a) pair work
b) group work
c) whole-class teaching

APPENDIX D: ÖĞRETMENLER İÇİN ALGI ANKETİ

Değerli Meslektaşım,
Bu anket İngilizce Hazırlık Programında Konuşma-Dinleme derslerinde uygulanan sınıfça çalışma ve grup çalışmasına yönelik tutumlarınızı belirlemek amacıyla hazırlanmıştır. Bu anket sınav değildir, bu yüzden cevaplar "doğru" ya da "yanlış" olarak değerlendirilmeyecektir. Bu çalışma için önemli olan sizin görüşlerinizdir. Ankete vereceğiniz yanıtlar gizli tutulacak ve sadece bu araştırma kapsamında bilimsel amaçla kullanılacaktır. Bu araştırmanın başarısı ankete vereceğiniz cevapların içtenliğine bağlıdır. Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederim.

Okutman Özlem KAYA

Şuanda hangi kurda Konuşma-Dinleme dersi veriyorsunuz? _____

I. Bölüm: Aşağıda belirtilen cümleleri konuşma-dinleme dersine girdiğiniz sınıfın kurunu göz önünde bulundurarak (**G**) grup çalışması veya (**S**) sınıfça çalışma seçeneklerinden biri ile tamamlayınız.

1. _____ en etkili öğrenme yoludur.

2. Öğrenciler en çok konuşma olanağını _____(n)da buluyorlar.

3. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)da kendilerini rahat hissediyorlar.

4. Öğrenciler öğrendiklerini en çok _____(n)da uygulama olanağı buluyorlar.

5. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)da konuşurken heyecanlanıyorlar.

6. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)da akıcı konuşuyorlar.

7. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)da konuşmalarına özen gösteriyorlar.

8. Öğrenciler _____(n)da hata yapmamaya çalışıyorlar.

9. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)da İngilizce konuşuyorlar.

10. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)da istekli konuşuyorlar.

11. Öğrenciler en çok _____(n)dan zevk alıyorlar.

II. Bölüm: Grup çalışması hakkındaki düşüncelerinizi konuşma-dinleme dersine girdiğiniz sınıfın kurunu göz önünde bulundurup uygun gördüğünüz rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1. Öğrenciler grup çalışmalarında arkadaşlarından dersle ilgili yeni şeyler öğreniyorlar.
   kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
   katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
      5   4   3   2   1

2. Öğrenciler grup çalışmaları sırasında arkadaşlarından aldıkları dönüte güveniyorlar.
   kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
   katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
      5   4   3   2   1

3. Öğrenciler rol-oynama(role-play) çalışmalarına severek katılıyorlar.
   kesinlikle   **kesinlikle**
   katılıyorum   **katılmıyorum**
      5   4   3   2   1

4. Grup çalışmalarında öğrencilerin kendilerinden daha iyi İngilizce bilen sınıf arkadaşlarıyla birlikte çalışmasının yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

5. Bu kurdaki öğrencilerin İngilizce seviyesinin grup çalışmaları için yeterli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

6. Öğrenciler rol-oynama çalışmalarında gerçek hayatta karşılaşabilecekleri olayları tercih ederler.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

7. Sınıfça tartışmadan önce küçük gruplar halinde tartışmanın öğrenciler için yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

8. Grup çalışmalarında öğrencilerin İngilizce seviyeleri önemli değildir.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

9. Rol-oynama çalışmaları öğrencilerin yaratıcılığını ortaya çıkarıyor.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

10. Grup çalışmalarında öğrenciler kendi seçtikleri arkadaşlarıyla daha verimli çalışıyorlar.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

11. Öğrenciler derste öğrendiklerini rol-oynama çalışmalarında uygulamaktan zevk alıyorlar.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

12. Öğrencilerin kendileriyle aynı seviyede İngilizce bilen sınıf arkadaşlarıyla birlikte çalışmasının yararlı olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

13. Sınıfça tartışmadan önce küçük gruplar halinde tartışmak öğrencilere yeni fikirler kazandırıyor.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

14. Rol-oynama çalışmalarında durumu öğrencilerin yaratması eğlencelidir.

kesinlikle katılıyorum				kesinlikle katılmıyorum
5	4	3	2	1

15. Grup çalışmalarında herkesin aynı anda aynı konu üzerinde çalışmasının daha
    verimli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle				**kesinlikle**
katılıyorum				**katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

16. Rol-oynama çalışmalarının etkili bir öğrenme yolu olduğunu
    düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle				**kesinlikle**
katılıyorum				**katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

17. Gruptaki kişi sayısı azaldıkça öğrencilerin performansı artıyor.

kesinlikle				**kesinlikle**
katılıyorum				**katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

18. Grup çalışmalarında öğrencilere farklı görevler verilmesinin daha
    verimli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

kesinlikle				**kesinlikle**
katılıyorum				**katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

19. Rol oynama çalışmalarında yönergelerin öğrencileri çok
    sınırlandırması konuşma isteklerini azaltıyor.

kesinlikle				**kesinlikle**
katılıyorum				**katılmıyorum**
5	4	3	2	1

III. Bölüm: Konuşma-dinleme dersine girdiğiniz sınıfın kurunu göz
önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız.

1. Konuşma-dinleme derslerinde öğrenciler en çok aşağıdakilerden hangisinden
   hoşlanıyorlar?

   a) ikili çalışma
   b) grup çalışması
   c) sınıfça çalışma

2. Konuşma-dinleme derslerinde aşağıdakilerden hangisi öğrenciler için en yararlıdır?

   a) ikili çalışma
   b) grup çalışması
   c) sınıfça çalışma

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE TEACHER ORAL INTERVIEW (ELEMENTARY

LEVEL)

Which one do you think is more effective: group work or whole-class teaching?
I think whole-class teaching is more effective for elementary level because students do not have enough English, so they cannot contribute to each other's knowledge, and they begin begin to chat in Turkish. They can have limited production in group work. However, I guide them in whole-class teaching, therefore they can learn more effectively due to my guidance. Moreover, students do not rely on each other's knowledge.

Which one do you think is more effective: group work or whole-class teaching?
Group work. When there is, especially, role-play, students create an enjoyable atmosphere full of fun. They enjoy themselves when presenting their group works. As a competitive atmosphere occurs in game activities in group work, students become more motivated.

In which situations do you prefer group work, in which situations do you prefer whole-class teaching?
Even in warm-ups, I sometimes do group work. Students have something to learn each other in terms of activating their schemata. They make a start for the subject. I present important subjects as whole-class teaching. Production stage of the lesson is more frequently in group work.

Do you think the proficiency level of elementary students is appropriate for group work?
No, their proficiency level is not appropriate. They cannot speak, and do not know the word order in a sentence. They have limited grammar and vocabulary knowledge.

Can we teach group work to elementary level students?
Yes. Students can get accustomed to group work with semi-guided activities. They have to see the structures they will use in group work explicitly presented.

How many students should there be in a group work?
No more than 3 or 4. It is important not to exceed this number in order to have students undertake equal responsibilities.

How do you design group work?
Normally, I let them be groups in order to get full participation of students. However, I would prefer to match high proficient students with low proficient ones.
Sometimes, in desperate situations, I intervene in group design.

Do you think role-play is important?
It is important as students find chance to use certain functions and contexual situations in role-plays. Role play is important for Speaking-Listening course because there is more real-life communication, there is focus on meaning in role-plays. If the situations in the course book are not enough, I ask students to create their own situations. Sometimes, I give situations to them. In culture-related situations, I make adaptations. I am too guided in terms of instructions in elementary level as their level requires so.

APPENDIX F: ÖĞRETMENLERLE YAPILAN MÜLAKAT ÖRNEĞİ

(ELEMENTARY KURU)

Sizce grup çalışması mı sınıfça çalışma mı daha etkili?
Elementary kuru için sınıf çalısmasının daha etkili olduğunu düşünüyorum. Çünkü çocuklar yeterli İngilizce bilgisine sahip olmadıkları için birbirlerine katabilecekleri bişey olmuyor grup workta ve işler Türkçe sohbete dönüyor. Grup çalışmasında çok kısıtlı üretebiliyorlar. Ama sınıf çalışmasında ben onları guide ediyorum. Benim yönlendirmelerimle daha etkili ögrenebiliyorlar. Öğrenciler birbirlerinin bilgisine de güvenmiyorlar.

Sizce grup çalışması mı sınıfça çalışma mı daha zevkli?
Grup çalışması. İş role-playe falan girdiği zaman birşeyler yaratmaya çalışırken espirili ve eğlenceli bir atmosfer oluşuyor. Grup çalışmalarını sunarken de eğleniyorlar. Grup çalışmasında öğrenciler rekaabetçi bir ortam yaratıldığı için game lerde daha motive oluyorlar.

Hangi durumlarda grup çalışması, hangi durumlarda sınıfça çalışma uyguluyorsunuz?
Warm-uplarda bile bazen grup çalışması yaptırıyorum. Aktive etme açısından birbirlerinden ögrenebilecekleri şeyler oluyor. Konuya daha ısınıyorlar. Önemli konuların sunumunu daha çok sınıf çalışması yapıyorum. Production kısmı daha çok grupça.

Sizce öğrencilerinizin dil seviyesi grup çalışması için uygun mu?
Dil seviyeleri grup çalışması için uygun değil. Bırak speaking i syntax bile yok. Vocabulary ve gramer kısıtlı.

Elementary kurundaki öğrencilere grup çalışması öğretilebilir mi?
Ögretilir. Semi-guided birşeyler verilerek öğrenciler grup çalışmasına alıştırılabilir. Grup çalışmalarında kullanacakları yapıları karşılarında görmeliler.

Bir grupta kaç öğrenci olmalı sizce?
3-4 ü geçmemeli. Çünkü herkesin eşit sorumluluğu üstlenmesi açısından bu sayı artmamalı.

Grup çalışmasında grupları nelere göre oluşturuyorsunuz?
Normalde kendilerine bırakıyorum tam katılım sağlamak için. Ama bana kalsa high proficient-low proficient eşlemesi daha etkili. Bazen çok vahim durumlarda müdahale ediyorum grup oluşumuna.

Sizce role play önemli mi?
Evet. Çünkü belirli fonksiyonları ve contexual situationları kullanma fırsatı buluyorlar. Konuşma dersi oldugu için role-play önemli. Çünkü daha çok real-life communication oluyor. Focus on meaning oluyor. Kitaptaki opsiyonların yetmediği durumlarda isterseniz kendiniz yaratın diyorum. Ben kendim de verebiliyorum. Culture-related durumlarda adaptasyon yapıyorum. Elem seviyesinde instruction konusunda oldukça guided oluyorum çünkü kurları bunu gerektiriyor.