

1994

Adult migrant learner perceptions of dyadic interaction in the learning of English as a second language in Australia

Philip G. Nichols
Edith Cowan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses_hons



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nichols, P. G. (1994). *Adult migrant learner perceptions of dyadic interaction in the learning of English as a second language in Australia*. Edith Cowan University. https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses_hons/641

This Thesis is posted at Research Online.
https://ro.ecu.edu.au/theses_hons/641

Edith Cowan University

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study.

The University does not authorize you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following:

- Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright.
- A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. Where the reproduction of such material is done without attribution of authorship, with false attribution of authorship or the authorship is treated in a derogatory manner, this may be a breach of the author's moral rights contained in Part IX of the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth).
- Courts have the power to impose a wide range of civil and criminal sanctions for infringement of copyright, infringement of moral rights and other offences under the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth). Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**ADULT MIGRANT LEARNER
PERCEPTIONS OF
DYADIC INTERACTION
IN THE LEARNING OF
ENGLISH AS A SECOND
LANGUAGE
IN AUSTRALIA**

Philip G. Nichols

B.Ed. (Hons)

1994

USE OF THESIS

The Use of Thesis statement is not included in this version of the thesis.

ADULT MIGRANT LEARNER
PERCEPTIONS OF
DYADIC INTERACTION
IN THE LEARNING OF
ENGLISH AS A SECOND
LANGUAGE
IN AUSTRALIA

by

Philip G. Nichols, BAEd, Dip RSA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the award of
Bachelor of Education with Honours
at the Faculty of Education,
Edith Cowan University, Perth.

Date of submission: 31 August 1994

1 ABSTRACT

Student to student dyadic interaction (pairwork) is a recommended activity in the second language learning classroom but if learners do not find it useful or enjoyable, then its effectiveness is reduced and the learners' motivation diminished. In this study a survey questionnaire with both open and closed questions was used to ask 207 intermediate and advanced adult migrant learners of English of diverse ethnicity about their perceptions of pairwork. Twenty-four learners from the sample were interviewed. The results revealed that most students found pairwork useful and enjoyable, but that perceptions differed according to region of origin and to previous language learning experience. Learners with no formal other language learning experience, South East Asians, Central Asians and Africans were the most, and Eastern Europeans the least, positive. Factors that affected pairwork success were mainly dependent on the partner's personality, proficiency level or pronunciation.

DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

Philip G. Nichols

31 August 1994

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge the help of the following, without whom this thesis would never have been completed, Bernard Hird for his direction as my research supervisor, Dr Tony Fetherstonhaugh for his advice on statistics, Jackie Birch for transcribing the interviews, the students and teachers of the Adult Migrant Education Service and the Advanced English Language Program and finally my wife, Barbara, and my son, Barnaby, for allowing me to absent myself from familial responsibilities during the research.

LANGUAGE NOTE

At times it was difficult to implement non-sexist language policies regarding third person personal pronouns and adjectives. The use of "they" and "their" is sometimes inappropriate when it is necessary to differentiate between several learners and a single teacher. The use of different gender pronouns alternately can be confusing and adopting invented generic pronouns, such as Burgess's "heesh" and "mer" (1978, p.160), would be pretentious and inappropriate in an academic work. Although I find it stylistically clumsy, I have adopted the convention of using "he or she" and "his or her" where paraphrasing was found to be inappropriate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1 ABSTRACT.....	2
2 INTRODUCTION	
2.1 Background.....	8
2.2 Research questions.....	12
2.3 Definition of terms.....	13
3 LITERATURE REVIEW	
3.1 Advantages of dyadic interaction.....	14
3.2 Perceptions of classroom activities in English as a second or foreign language.....	18
3.3 Research into pairwork variables.....	20
3.4 Methodology.....	22
4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
4.1 Second language acquisition.....	26
4.2 Motivation and learner attitudes.....	28
4.3 Adult learning and pairwork.....	32
5 PILOT STUDY	
5.1 Procedure.....	37
5.2 Analysis.....	38
5.3 Implications for research design.....	39

6 MAIN STUDY

6.1	Sample.....	41
6.2	Instrument.....	43
6.3	Procedure.....	44
6.4	Data Analysis.....	45
6.5	Validity and reliability.....	47
6.6	Limitations.....	50
6.7	Ethical considerations.....	51

7 RESULTS

7.1	Fixed response data.....	53
7.2	Free response data.....	77
7.3	Interview data.....	83

8 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....89

9 REFERENCES.....97

10 APPENDICES

I	Subjects.....	110
II	Questionnaire.....	115
III	Interview subjects.....	119
IV	Interview check-list.....	122
V	Questionnaire response frequencies..	124
VI	Questionnaire free responses.....	138
VII	Sample interview extract.....	151

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background

It is suggested that methods of fostering students' positive attitudes ... be encouraged, otherwise there is a very real possibility that many students will drop out. (Naiman, cited in Pattison, 1987, pp.9-10.)

In the nineteenth century, language was primarily taught, not as a means to communication, but as a means to non-linguistic development. Learning Latin or Greek was regarded as either an intellectual pursuit to develop the budding cognitive processes or as a vehicle to understand the politics, philosophy, history and attitudes of the Ancient World first hand. As such, language was taught with emphasis on the written word, on word-for-word translation skills - (usually at sentence level) - and the rote learning of vocabulary, rules and paradigms. Grammar was regarded as prescriptive, was taught deductively and was practised through form-manipulation exercises. Because of the importance of the correctness of form, errors were unacceptable and heavily penalised. There was no point in teaching students to speak in a language that was no longer used for communication.

This approach for teaching classical languages was transferred to the teaching of modern foreign languages and ultimately to English as a Second Language (ESL).

9

The realisation that, as a consequence, students learning a foreign or second language were unable to use it effectively when confronted by native target language users has resulted in the adoption of a more communicative approach towards language learning. Modern second language learning theories, together with a more student-centred approach, emphasise the significance of the students' language needs and the importance of the meaning of the message over structural, phonemic and lexical correctness. Today it is widely recognised that the language classroom should include both the reception and production of the spoken word in real situations so that students are better equipped to use the second language. Emphasis should not only be on accuracy but on fluency. The teacher should not be a demagogue but a facilitator of learning. As learners learn "best through the process of struggling to communicate" (Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.67), activities should have as their objective the transfer of information. Dyadic interaction is one technique that allows learners to learn to communicate by interacting and negotiating meanings through "message-oriented" tasks (Dodson and Thomas, 1988, p.481). Especially at beginner level, it also allows learners to practise structural, phonological or functional form through "medium-oriented" tasks (Dodson and Thomas, 1988, p.481) such as drills and grammar exercises.

However, in spite of the theoretical advantages of

pairwork, many experienced teachers report that, from their own experience of other language learning, they find pairwork tedious and of dubious benefit. One anecdotal reason for this is that if paired with a slower learner, the faster learner becomes annoyed at the other's lack of concept comprehension and slowness in articulation. If paired with a faster learner, the slower learner becomes inhibited by the other's profusion and by the knowledge that the faster learner may be irritated by his or her (the slower learner's) pace. The situation of being paired with an equally paced learner is statistically unlikely within the confines of the language classroom, given the usual number of from fifteen to twenty students. These teachers-as-learners' views are supported by their teaching experience. When asked to practise in pairs, some learners express their disapproval through facial expression or *sotto voce* comment (N. Crawford, S. Lacey, M. Rhodes, N. La Vertu, personal communications, October 10-13 1993). Christison and Krahnke (1986, p.75) also report that [United States university] ESL teachers find it difficult to encourage students to participate in interactive classroom activities with enthusiasm.

Both Horwitz (1989, p.61) and Yorio (1989, p.33) point out that students bring their own pre-conceived ideas of 'good' teaching into the classroom and they perceive classroom activities differently from the teacher. "As teachers, we must not forget that a

technique that we take for granted, is not necessarily taken for granted by the students." (Yorio, 1989, p.42). Learner perceptions of a task can affect motivation, achievement and general perceptions of teaching. Stern comments: "the affective component contributes as least as much and often more to language learning than the cognitive skills" (1983, p.386) and if a task is not enjoyed, student motivation is reduced, the effectiveness of the learning activity is diminished and attitudes towards the teacher, the language and the teaching process can be threatened. There is a wealth of research on pairwork, but little on learner perceptions of it. This descriptive research project represents a step towards ascertaining the degree of learner approval of pairwork, which could add another perspective to its validity as a language learning technique as well as provide a guide for practising teachers.

Main question

1. What perceptions do adult migrant learners of English as a Second Language in Australia have of pairwork and what reasons do they give for these perceptions?

Subsidiary questions

2. Do perceptions of pairwork vary for learners: (a) from different countries or regions of birth; (b) of different ages; (c) of different genders; (d) with different years of education; (e) with different language learning experience or (f) at different proficiency levels?

3. Do perceptions of pairwork vary according to the: (a) type of partner or (b) task-type?

4. Do learners prefer pairs to other groupings?

5. Do learners differentiate between affective and cognitive perceptions of pairwork?

2.3 Operational Definitions of Terms for this Study

perception: a positive or negative, emotive or cognitive impression of a concept

dyadic interaction: any learning activity where two learners interact verbally

motivation: an inner force that encourages a learner to commence, continue and conclude a task

proficiency: the degree to which the language of a non-native speaker approximates the language of a native-speaker.

second language acquisition: the unconscious or subconscious process of "absorbing" linguistic concepts

second language learning: the active, conscious process of studying and memorising structural, phonological or other rules of a language.

task, medium-based: any learning activity that has as its main objective the practice of linguistic form.

task, message-based: any learning activity that focuses on the transmission and reception of meaning rather than form

3 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Advantages of dyadic interaction

The language classroom ... needs, like any other classroom a program of education and interaction, which together support motivation. The interaction element requires language activities which involve the learner in co-operation with each other, conversation in pairs ... and active participation. (Abbs, 1983, p.53)

In the teacher-fronted classroom, the domination of the teacher produces an artificial social relationship which inhibits second language comprehension and acquisition (Pica, 1987, p.4). Educationally, pairwork provides an increase in both the quantity and quality of language practice (Long and Porter, 1985). If a lesson is divided into Teacher Talking Time (*TTT*) and Student Talking Time (*STT*), assuming all students talk an equal amount, the maximum time an individual student can speak interactively during teacher-fronted activities is (STT / N) per cent, where N is the number of students in the class. However, with pairwork, this figure could hypothetically be increased for each student to ($STT / 2$) per cent. Compared to small group work, every participant has more opportunity to interact in pairs and one individual dominates less in dyads than in groups of three (Gaies, 1983). Learners face each other so interaction is closer to real-life language use

(Byrne, 1987). Communication occurs unblocked by other learners and thus aids the development of and appropriate responding to paralinguistic and non-verbal language aspects. For example, participants may notice confusion in their partners' facial expression and check their comprehension (Doughty and Pica, 1986, p.309).

Pairwork can help to individualise instruction as learners can work independently at their own level and speed. While the class members are involved with each other, the teacher can isolate a group of students for particular attention. Pairwork provokes curiosity by providing variety to a lesson and enables learners to put into practice the language they have just been taught. Daines and Graham (1988, p.3) claim that adults are more likely than younger learners to lack confidence in their ability and need short-term reinforcement to see the relevance of their learning. Pairwork promotes cooperation, and thus allows students to come into social contact with and inspire each other. It therefore fulfils Keller's (1983) "personal motive need" of affiliation, (cited in Crookes and Schmidt, 1991, p.482), as well as offering an opportunity to practise collaborative social skills necessary for operating in the world outside the classroom (Jules, 1992, p.191). As well as promoting linguistic and infralinguistic social aspects of behaviour, pairwork fosters discourse competence. The conversational norm in the lockstep classroom is a series of display questions asked by the

teacher, which merely practise sentence comprehension and production. In pairwork however, interaction is a two-way information exchange where the basic conversational turn-taking pattern of "initiate" and "respond" (Wells, 1981, p. 29) can be practised.

Psycholinguistically, pairwork fosters factors essential to second language acquisition. It overcomes the paradox that although speaking is of prime importance in the communicative classroom, it is also the most stressful (Phillips, 1989). Both she and Young (1990) found that pairwork promotes a positive environment and reduces anxiety. Some students undergo stress if, observed by their peers, they have to respond quickly and succinctly. Pairwork allows students to increase their wait-time without feeling that they are slowing the rest of the class. Students may also be reluctant to indicate to the teacher their lack of comprehension and pairwork can thus lower the "affective filter", a mental block that prevents linguistic processing taking place (Krashen, 1981, 1985). Learners use more communicative language in pairs than in other groupings (Nerenz and Knop, 1982). Pairwork thus provides opportunity for the development of strategic competence (Canale and Swain, 1980. p.30). Studies on "foreigner talk" {the equivalent of "caretaker-speech" in first language acquisition} indicate that the modifications a speaker makes (viz. syntactically less complex utterances, higher frequency lexical items,

avoidance of idiom, slower and clearer articulation) and the negotiation strategies of repair and prompting that a speaker uses to modify or have utterances modified are crucial factors for successful communication (Chaudron, Porter, cited in Long and Porter, 1985, p.213). These "restructuring moves" (Pica, 1987, p.8) include comprehension checks, repetition, confirmation and classification requests and pairwork is considered the best grouping for practising and evolving these strategies. "In the classroom, pair rather than group work ... tasks may ultimately be most conducive to negotiated modification of interaction, and hence to second language acquisition." (Pica and Doughty, 1985, p.132).

Objections that two non-native speakers working together cannot learn from each other are unfounded. Learners in pairs practise as many negotiation strategies as (Porter, 1986, p.219), and talk more with each other than, with a native speaker in the same situation (Long and Porter, 1985, p.215, p.222). Although they cannot necessarily offer one another accurate grammatical or appropriate socio linguistic input, there is no significant difference in grammatical accuracy when speaking with a native or non-native partner, nor in teacher-fronted class activities as opposed to small group or pair work. (Pica and Doughty, cited in Doughty and Pica, 1986, p.322). Indeed, some learners use input from their peers more than from the

teacher (Seliger, 1983, p.247).

3.2 Previous studies on perceptions of classroom activities in English as a Second or Foreign Language.

What goes on in the classroom has a decisive role to play in foreign language learning.

(Julkunen, 1991, p.13)

Although some high school students prefer practising oracy to literacy (Pozzi-Escot, 1987; Pattison, 1990), and some university students prefer participatory to listening activities (Reid, 1987), many adult learners prefer those activities that are least related to communicative competence. Horwitz (1989, p.64) reports that global listening exercises were not favoured by adult students and translation, or at least understanding, of each word was preferred. In Little and Sander's study (1990) ESL university students stated their most favoured activities as memorising vocabulary, listening to explanations of grammar, pronunciation correction, grammar correction, pronunciation practice, grammar practice. These students preferred those activities that emphasise academic deductive learning with its attention to correct reproduction of form. In fact, those communicative aspects of language that were included in the research (inductive analysis of grammar rules, speaking about oneself) were found very low down on the list of eighteen. Similar results were found by Willing (1988) in his research of adult migrant ESL

students in Australia. The most popular classroom activities overall were: pronunciation practice, teacher correction, learning by in-class conversations and teacher explanation (p.116). This indicates that adult learners are concerned that a message be grammatically and phonologically accurate. They favour teacher explanation to hypothesis-forming, which indicates a preference for a deductive rather than an inductive approach, to rule learning. Furthermore, the lower the level of the learners' proficiency, the more they prefer traditional teacher-based activities. Thus beginners - contrary to theoretical suggestions that they should begin to produce language actively from the first lesson - were the most unreceptive to communicative language teaching. (Willing, 1988; Little and Sander 1990; Hurshberger, 1989).

Research specifically on attitudes towards pairwork is inconclusive. Phillips (1989) and Young (1990) found pairwork less stressful than other groupings but Willing (1988) found that, although slightly more popular than unpopular, it was not ranked as highly as other groupings. However, the main aim of Willing's study was to identify learning styles through analysis of a range of activities and there was but one question on pairwork. Fishbein and Ajzen point out that single-item measures are highly unreliable (1975, p.114) and Willing's conclusions therefore require some triangulation.

3.3 Research into pairwork variables

Task

Research has concentrated on negotiation in pairwork. Duff (1986) found "convergent" tasks, e.g., problem solving activities where participants attempt to arrive at a shared goal, more conducive to language acquisition than "divergent" tasks, e.g. debates, where participants endeavour to maintain their own viewpoints. Doughty and Pica (1986) conclude that only two-way tasks, where each participant has information unknown to the other to exchange, are effective in prompting interactional negotiations in both participants. Without interaction, no solution can be reached. By contrast, in one-way information-gap tasks, where the solution of a problem can be reached without participants having to pool information, participants can choose whether to contribute or not and often oral interaction is monopolised by the more proficient or more domineering student.

Participant

Learner characteristics can also influence participation in and effectiveness of pairwork. Some learners merely answer questions while others dominate and take control of the interaction. (Gaies, 1983, p.191). Two "non-active" (as regards discourse style) students paired together fail to complete communicative tasks and "active" students dominate "non-active"

students allowing them little opportunity to communicate (Alvarado, 1992; Spelman, 1992). Males dominate females in mixed pairs but females initiate more negotiations than males (Gass and Varonis, 1986). Chinese Mandarin speakers dominate Japanese speakers (Duff, 1986). Learners receive a higher quantity of comprehensible input from an advanced partner, but more practice in negotiation for meaning with intermediate partners (Porter, 1986). Willing (1988) reports 'concrete' learners prefer pairwork. 'Concrete' learners are those defined by Knowles (1982) as "interested in the here and now, immediate, realistic, curious, spontaneous, risk-takers, performers, want constant change of pace and variety" (cited in Willing, 1988, p.155), but comprise only approximately ten per cent of the student population. Ely (1988) found that university students who rated highly on a "language class sociability" scale, i.e., learners who like "to interact in class by means of the second language" (p.26), demonstrated positive affective reactions towards pairwork.

3.4 Methodology

For beliefs and feelings that the individual can be expected to be aware of and willing to report ... self-ratings are a useful source of information (Kidder, 1981, p.205)

Elicitation techniques, such as questionnaires and interviewing, are appropriate for the assessment of learners' attitudes (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989, p.166, p.172.). However, Lupescu and Day (1990) suggest caution must be taken in accepting the validity of student self-reported data. In their intended study of student attitudes towards a traditional or communicative teaching approach no conclusions could be drawn. In statistical analysis to check concurrent validity and internal reliability, they found that there was no negative correlation between scores for communicative and traditional questions. This implies that the students agreed or disagreed with items regardless of how they felt about the teaching methods. There are several reasons for this. Learner perceptions of particular classroom activities may be biased by how much the learner is satisfied with particular teachers or their methods - the "halo effect" (Gay, 1981, p.128). Learners may believe that making a negative response towards one aspect of classroom behaviour may reflect on that teacher. This is particularly true for some ESL learners. "The very idea of passing judgment on a

teacher may be inconceivable to someone from a culture in which the teacher is revered as an authority figure." (Wennerstrom and Heiser, 1992, p.273). Contamination of data may occur through non-understanding of concepts and the ensuing "generosity error", where respondents tend to give positive ratings if they do not understand a question or do not know the answer (Kidder, 1981, p.206). Learners may be unaware of what is meant conceptually (Fowler, 1988) or, especially true for ESL learners, linguistically (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989, p.172). Participants may also be unable to remember or describe their perceptions accurately (Kidder, 1981, p.147). "Students cannot be expected to have attitudes about ideas they have not ... thought of" (Lupescu and Day, 1990, p.131). The approval motive plays a big role and some students' desire to complete the questionnaire may be stronger than their wish to admit non-understanding. Alternatively, students may give the answer that they think will reflect better on them (Skehan, 1989, p.61-2) or that they think the teacher wants to hear (Christison and Krahne, 1986, p.64). Orne (1962) comments "At some level [the subject] sees it as his task to ... respond in a manner which will support the hypotheses being tested" (cited in Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975, p.119).

Questionnaires have the advantages that they can be administered to a large sample, anonymity can be guaranteed, there is less pressure for immediate

response, and they are standardised; reliability is therefore higher (Kidder, 1981, p.147; Seliger and Shohamy, 1989, p.172). Likert scales are considered superior to other rating scales as they are easier for the respondents to use and are more reliable if competent item analysis is carried out (Likert, 1967; Edwards and Kenney, 1967; Shrigley and Trueblood, 1979; Kidder, 1981). Berg and Rapaport (cited in Foddy, 1993, p.167) say that a scale with too few categories is highly prone to central tendency, the inclination to mark down the centre category. This tendency is reduced as the number of categories is increased, but too many categories make it difficult for the respondent to discriminate (Fowler, 1988, p.96). The optimal number of categories is seven plus or minus two (Foddy, 1993, p.164). McCall and Gardner (1984) conclude that the order of items in a Likert scale can alter results significantly. They feel that researchers often load questions to increase the possibility of their hypothesis being correct. Fixed-alternative questions should be constructed from the learners' point-of-view based on a pilot study of comprehensive free-answer responses (Shuman and Presser cited in Kidder, 1981, p.158), which "will more accurately reflect what the respondent wants to say" (Nunan, 1992, p.143). Fowler (1988, p.64), however, debates the usefulness of data from free-answer questions if no face-to-face interviewing takes place. Interviewing allows correction

of misunderstanding, clarification, probing and elaboration, and should be used both before questionnaire construction as well as a follow-up (Kidder, 1981, p.152, 161). A survey into perceptions should therefore include a questionnaire with both closed and open questions as well as interviews.

This literature review has discussed the cognitive advantages of dyadic interaction, but shown that research in the affective field is scarce and inconclusive. In order to provide more decisive data about pairwork and draw conclusions about its overall effectiveness, further research following the above methodological precepts was warranted.

4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK RELATED TO THE STUDY.

4.1 Aspects of second language acquisition

[It has been] argued that one learns to read by reading, and to write by writing.

Similarly, it can be argued that one learns to speak by speaking (Swain, 1985, p.248).

Although their pronunciation is generally not as precise, given equal and similar natural exposure to the second language, adults are able to acquire language proficiency as effectively as children (Burstall, cited in Littlewood, 1984, p.66). Certain conditions are necessary: language aptitude, time, exposure to comprehensible language, the possibility to use the second language in meaningful contexts, motivation and a conducive environment. Krashen (1981, 1985) advocates the importance of the comprehensibility of input. Unknown structures are understood with the help of the students' previous knowledge of the world and their current linguistic competence, when those structures are contextualised and at one stage above the student's current level of competence. Learners are then able to produce the structure and "speaking is a result of acquisition and not its cause" (Krashen, 1985, p.2). However, Swain (1985) notes that although learners receive enough input to develop sociolinguistic competence, some learners are not able to produce correct utterances and she maintains that there must also be contextualised comprehensible output for a

learner to assimilate grammatical rules. "Although comprehensible input may be essential to the acquisition of a second language, it is not enough to ensure that the outcome will be nativelike performance." (p.236). Nunan comments: "output, particularly when it occurs in conversations where the learner is having to negotiate meaning, provides learners with the opportunity to push to the limit their emerging competence." (1991, p.50). Hatch (1978) maintains that development of syntactical structure follows conversational ability. She applies the cognitive principle of "scaffolding" to second language learning as the process by which structures are incorporated into the learner's interlanguage. Thus there is need for both contextualised input and output - interaction. Learners who maintain high classroom interaction acquire language both faster and more accurately (Seliger, 1983, p.262). Increased interaction enables the learner to form and test hypotheses and is necessary for developing those strategies that aid the communication of meaning by modification of the utterance.

The adult language classroom should therefore provide opportunities for learners to interact and thus develop the range of competences - grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic - that, following Canale and Swain (1980, p.28), comprise communicative competence.

4.2 Motivation, Learner Attitudes and Perceptions

Given motivation, anyone can learn a language

(Corder, cited in Skehan, 1989, p.49)

Motivation is one of the most significant factors for achievement in second or foreign language learning (Julkunen, 1991, p.2). Kidd (1975, p.101) defines motivation in two-ways; firstly the reduction of needs and secondly as a "positive striving" (p.102) for self-fulfilment and the need for human beings to enhance their relationships in society. A student who is motivated is one who has positive attitudes towards the task and who works well without the need for continual encouragement, one who has direction and prefers one activity to another, one who has perseverance and is able to concentrate on that activity and one who is able to continue with the activity without being compelled to (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991, p.481). Adults are considered to be more highly motivated than younger learners as the main motivational forces are internal and driven by issues such as self-esteem and self-actualisation as opposed to the external rewards and punishments of peer- and parent-pressure or the consequences of failure (Knowles, 1974, p.60; Knowles, 1984, p.5). They attend classes because they need the knowledge being taught (Bohlin, 1990, p.4) and believe in the value of education to solve problems (Love cited in Kidd, 1975, p.32). They tend therefore to be highly motivated, yet several factors affect the degree of that

motivation.

Gardner first emphasised the importance of motivation in second language learning (cited in Muchnik and Wolfe, 1982, p.262.). In addition to positive attitudes towards the target language community (integrativeness), attitudes towards the learning situation in general also increase motivation and in predictive studies have been found to correlate with high achievement and proficiency (Lalonde and Gardner, 1985). This correlation has been criticised by researchers such as Savignon, Burstall and Oller (Crookes and Schmidt, 1991, p.474), who maintain reversed causality and that high motivation may in fact be the result of high achievement. However, Gardner's work is relevant for the present research as it draws attention to the interplay between the variables of attitude and achievement. "There is an interactive relationship between linguistic proficiency and attitudinal variables rather than a strictly linear, cause and effect relationship" (Hurshberger, 1989, p.43).

Any discussion of Gardner and motivation should not ignore the concepts of integrative and instrumental orientations for learning a second language. However, the difference is of little relevance here, firstly because it is unwise to overgeneralise from research on, for example, high school French in bilingual Canada or EFL in the Philippines and secondly, orientation can not

necessarily be divided categorically and has to be regarded more as a composite (Burstall, cited in Stern, 1983, p.378). Benson (1991), for example, illustrates the importance of a "personal" orientation towards language learning which includes neither the instrumental nor "affective". Tassicker (1986, p.112) points out that migrants in Australia do not necessarily want to renounce their cultural heritage despite their desire for acceptance by native Australians. Adult students "come to class because they are already motivated - whether integratively or instrumentally does not seem to matter." (Vincent, 1983, p.40).

It is not only general attitudes that impact on achievement. Citing Keller's theory of motivation conditions, Bohlin (1990) emphasises the importance of the immediate learning situation. After 'interest', {curiosity and challenge}, Keller identifies the motivating factor of 'relevance' "which requires the learner to perceive that important personal needs are being met by the learning situation" (cited in Crookes and Schmidt, 1991, p.481). One basic need is the "instrumental" where the content of a lesson matches what the learners believe they want to learn. The teacher cannot affect the conditions directly, but different learning activities influence these conditions and the learners' interest and effort. Student enthusiasm for a task will increase both intrinsic motivation - the desire to complete the task for its own

value - as well as extrinsic motivation - the desire to complete the task for some external reward, be it in the form of teacher approval or as part of the overall process of becoming part of the language community. In the classroom, general motivational orientation combines with "situational specific motivation" - the state at that particular moment in the lesson, which is affected by the learner's mood, competence and the perceived challenge and interest of the task at hand. Boekharts (cited in Julkunen, 1991, p.4) calls this interaction the "Situation-specific Action Tendency" (SiSAT); it influences effort and the success of the task, which then strengthens the learner's existing general attitudes towards the teacher and learning situation. Learners' attitudes towards pairwork may not only affect the performance of the particular task but also influence general attitudes towards the learning situation.

4.3 Adult Learning and Pairwork

For many kinds of learning, adults themselves are the richest resources for one another (Knowles, 1984, p.10).

The theories of three figures in the recent history of education are of particular relevance to the role of interactional learning activities in the classroom. Dewey emphasises the importance of social interaction and personal experience in the education process (1972, p.42). The teacher should not be the directing force and maintainer of order in the classroom but the locus of control should reside in the learning tasks or activities themselves, which each learner should contribute to and feel responsible for (1972, pp.55-56). There should be no distance of status between learners and teacher; all should be equal members in the classroom community (1972, p.58). Through his or her more mature knowledge, the teacher should select activities that encourage learners to organise and build on the knowledge they have already gained through other learning experiences. Learning should be a discovery process, where, when faced with a problem, learners try out various hypotheses in order to reach a solution (cited in Smith, 1992, p.27). In language learning, this is echoed by the "restructuring moves" (Pica, 1987, p.8) a learner makes to negotiate meaning within discourse. During output, hypotheses about linguistic form are tested and, if the output is comprehensible and

successful communication takes place, verified (Swain, 1985, p.251).

Rogers' humanistic approach also stresses the change of role of the teacher from director to facilitator (1983, p.135.). Learners should be given freedom and encouragement to develop relevant skills at their own pace and they should interact in order to help each other (p.136). The environment should be made conducive to learning. In particular, analogous to Krashen's (1981, 1985) "affective filter", threats to self-esteem should be removed and learners should also be stimulated to learn by doing, in the present case, to learn to communicate by communicating.

Although also applicable to adults, Dewey's and Rogers' premises were mainly directed at educating children. Knowles (1974, 1984) succinctly emphasised the differences in the assumptions behind traditional pedagogic teaching techniques and those of teaching adults (Table 4.1). As with Rogers, the teacher is not primarily a demagogic source of knowledge but the facilitator of the acquisition of knowledge. Peers and experience are resources for further learning but for adults experience can also have its disadvantages as it is "an unavoidable potential hindrance" (Knowles, 1984, p.10) in so far as the attitudes and prejudices that learners bring to the classroom can also reject the new or unknown. Learners may be confused if teaching does not progress in a traditional way and they are asked to

be active and participate (Daines

Table 4.1

Assumptions behind Teaching Techniques

About	Pedagogy	Andragogy
Concept of the learner	Dependent personality	Increasingly self-directed organism
Role of learner's experience	To be built on more than used	A rich resource for learning
Readiness to learn	Varies with level of maturation	Develops from life tasks and skills
Orientation to learning	Subject-centred	Task- or problem-centred
Motivation	External rewards and punishments	Internal incentives, curiosity

(adapted from Knowles, 1974, p.60)

and Graham, 1988, p.4). Learning styles will be heterogenous and verbal skill development and communicative practice, in particular pairwork, may be considered non-productive activities.

Based on these assumptions, Knowles indicates the optimal conditions that foster adult learning. Of relevance to the present study are the elements of climate and learning activities (Table 4.2). Regarding climate, he asks

Table 4.2

Selected learning process elements

<hr/>		
Process		
element	Pedagogy	Andragogy
<hr/>		
Climate	Formal, authority oriented, competitive, judgmental	Informal, mutually respectful, consensual, collaborative, supportive
Learning activities	Transmittal techniques, assigned readings	Inquiry projects, independent study, experiential techniques
<hr/>		

(adapted from Knowles, 1974, p.61)

"How can I most quickly get the learners to become acquainted with one another as persons and as mutual resources for learning?" (1974, p.34) and "How can I make myself available to sub-groups and individuals as a consultant and resource?" (p.36). Pairwork at the early stages of a course is one viable answer. Regarding

learning activities Knowles promotes those that help the learners become self-directed (1974, p.39) and generalises that the more effective teachers involve their students in participatory activities (1984, p.3), for example within dyads. DePaula comments, "The assumptions of andragogy are totally valid ... during all phases of teaching ESL [English as a Second Language] to adults" (1984, p.416).

5 PILOT STUDY

5.1 Procedure

Following principles outlined in the literature review, a combined approach to data collection including both semi-structured interview and questionnaire was adopted. A preliminary questionnaire containing open-ended items as well as five-point Likert-type items was designed and piloted. The pilot study was divided into two parts. Firstly five students from an Advanced English Language Program course were invited to participate in face-to-face semi-structured interviews and express their views on pairwork. The students were also asked for comments on the questionnaire format, especially the category headings. Each interview lasted approximately half an hour and was subsequently transcribed. Only the researcher interviewed the students to maximise internal validity, admittedly at the risk of "experimenter bias" (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975, p.118). The questionnaire drawn up for the proposal was then modified according to the information elicited in order to both reflect students' views in their own words as well as their preferences for the format. The category headings "No, no, not at all", "No, not much", "Yes, but only a little" and "Yes, yes, a lot" were more comprehensible for the interviewed ESL learners than the customary "disagree/agree" prompts.

The amended questionnaire was then given to a different Advanced English Language Program class of

eleven students and a discussion with the students held immediately afterwards to assess the comprehensibility and ease of completion of the questionnaire. The data from the quantitative Likert-type closed items were analysed using an SPSS Release 4.0 for Macintosh (1990) computer statistics package. Means and standard deviations for each item were calculated in order to isolate for deletion those items that were prone to central tendency. A coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach α) was calculated to isolate items of low reliability.

5.2 Analysis.

No items recorded a low standard deviation combined with a mean near the central value, which would have indicated that the item did not discriminate between positive and negative perceptions (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980, p.16). The items were divided into two sub-scales and the first sub-scale (Perceptions of Pairwork) recorded a high overall coefficient of internal consistency ($\alpha = .92$). Frequencies of response for the second sub-scale (partner characteristics and task-type) were calculated, but this section was not analysed with inferential statistics as it concerned discrete aspects of pairwork that had no bearing on overall perceptions.

5.3 Implications for research design

Items that did not correlate well with the total were rephrased or deleted to improve the validity of the questionnaire. Frequencies of response to some closed questions showed that participants found it difficult to compare the emotive aspects of classroom activities with the cognitive and a higher proportion than otherwise answered questions concerning enjoyment and usefulness with "Not sure". In the post-questionnaire discussion, one student commented that it was "impossible to answer" these items if a student enjoyed neither groups nor pairwork. It was decided to divorce these items from the Likert-scale section. They were subsequently rewritten as multiple-choice questions in a separate section, where the participants could more clearly compare "usefulness" with "enjoyment". Some students commented that they would prefer a category between "a little" and "a lot" and consequent discussion resulted in the Likert-scale headings being modified to "Not at all", "No", "Yes" and "A lot" scale.

No differentiation between message-based and medium-based tasks was apparent in the section concerning task type. The section was amended to improve the categorisation of message-oriented and medium-oriented activities and to include affective and cognitive perceptions of particular tasks. It was reduced to a three-item Likert-type scale and although this may have decreased response variation it was hoped

that the variety and briefness of format would encourage participants to pay more attention to this concluding section. Free response items were not amended for the main study.

6 MAIN STUDY

6.1 Sample

Classes

All classes at the required level in the Advanced English Language Program (AELP) and the Adult Migrant Education Service (AMES) in Perth were invited to participate in the survey. Some declined and the final sample consisted of 207 adult English as a Second Language learners, 64 from the AELP and 143 from the AMES. AELP students had a proficiency level of at least '2' on the Australian Standard Language Proficiency Rating (ASLPR) scale (Social Proficiency) and the AMES students had a level of at least '1' (Minimum Survival Proficiency) or at least '1+' (Survival Proficiency).

Country of Birth

Participants came from over forty countries, (see Appendix I). To facilitate reference and analysis, students were grouped according to five regions of origin. Both country of birth and first language had been recorded with the intention of separating cultural sub-groups within countries. However, only country of birth was used to group the students due to the low numbers of learners from countries with more than one linguo-cultural group.

Table 6.1
Regions of origin

	Region	n
1	South East Asia	66
2	East Asia	30
3	Central Asia and Africa	44
4	Eastern Europe	52
5	Western nations	14
	Not stated	1

Total = 207

Possibly, there are occasional cultural differences between participants in the same group and somewhat arbitrary geographical or political decisions were made. For example, the five participants from South America were grouped with those from Western Europe, as a group of their own would be too insignificant.

Other participant variables were grouped as in Table 6.2. See Appendix I for details.

Table 6.2

Participant variable grouping

Age	Gender	Education	FL exp. ^a	Class type
18-30	Male	Primary	Some	AMES (1/1+) ^b
31-42	Female	Year 10	None	AMES (1+/2)
43-55		Year 12		AELP (>2)
Over 55		Tertiary		

^aForeign Language experience in country of birth.

^bProficiency rating of class according to ASLPR.

6.2 Instrument

The final questionnaire (Appendix II) consisted of an overall perceptions to pairwork section incorporating fifteen Likert-type and six multiple-choice items, which were totalled to produce the Perceptions to Pairwork Score (PPS). The multiple-choice items also examined cognitive-affective perceptions towards different learning formats (pair, group, class, self). There was also a multiple-choice section on dyad composition as well as a Likert-type section on task. Six free-response questions gave participants the opportunity to elaborate on the closed questions.

6.3 Procedure

The questionnaire was administered to the learners in their classes with the researcher present. The concept of pairwork was explained orally and, in order to contextualise the activity, the participants were asked to recall a time when they had practised pairwork. They were then asked to fill in the free-response section calling for first impressions. The format of the rest of the questionnaire was explained and as much time as was necessary to complete the questionnaire was afforded the students.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 24 participants - (11.6% of the sample). The aims of the interviews were to corroborate both the closed and open responses, to uncover additional perceptions of pairwork, to gain insight into the motives behind these perceptions and to clarify the data on partner, task and affective or cognitive perceptions. In the interviews, students were first asked general questions about themselves and their residence in Australia before more specific points were addressed. Questions were in the main open-ended and interviewees were given considerable leeway for comment. If it was uncertain whether the interviewees had understood or answered correctly, prompting, requests for clarification and elaboration enabled the interviewees to amplify their answers without direct suggestion by the researcher. See Appendix III for demography of the interviewees.

6.4 Data Analysis

Fixed Response Questions

A computer statistics package (SPSS Release 4.0 for Macintosh, 1990) was used to analyse the quantitative data using descriptive and inferential statistics, (Table 6.3).

Table 6.3

Calculations performed

Questions Calculations^a

- 1-21. Questionnaire reliability using Cronbach α
 An overall mean Perception of Pairwork Score
 (PPS) (1)
 PPSs for each participant variable (region,
 age, gender, education, language learning
 experience, class type) (2)
 Comparison of PPSs for each participant
 variable by ANOVA (2)
 Overall mean scores for each question (1)
 Mean scores for each question for each
 participant variable (2)
 Comparison of scores for each question for
 each participant variable by ANOVA and Scheffé
 procedure (2)

Table 6.3 (continued)

Calculations performed

Questions Calculations^a

- 16-26 Frequencies of response for each question
 Comparison of frequencies of response for each
 question using chi square (3a, 4)
 Comparison between participant variables using
 chi square (2)
- 27-34 Scores and frequencies of response for each
 task-type (3b)
 Comparison of usefulness and enjoyment of task
 using 't-test' (5)
 Comparison of message- versus code based tasks
 using 't-test' (3b)

^aNumbers in brackets refer to the research question(s)
addressed

Free Response Questions

Answers to free-response items were transcribed verbatim, placed on a database computer program (dBASE III, 1987), summarised and categorised according to type of comment (viz. partner level, partner personality, partner pronunciation, partner nationality, partner other, classroom groupings, task-type, error correction, role of teacher, other positive reasons and other negative reasons). The data were then sorted according to the various participant variables (region of origin, gender, age, education, other language learning experience and class type). Patterns within groups relating to type and frequency of response were able to be discerned and trends between groups compared and

commented on.

Interviews

Transcriptions and notes of the interviews were examined as a whole for data that reinforced or extended comments made in the free-responses. Data were grouped and compared as for the free-responses.

6.5 Validity and Reliability

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to reduce guessing and random completion. The Likert-type questions all included a screening question ("I don't understand") and any random answers should have been cancelled out by the size of the sample. The central category ("Not sure") was off-set to discourage marking down the centre and some items had reversed polarity to encourage subjects to study the question before responding. Participants were invited to ask questions when they did not understand parts of the questionnaire. Internally the questionnaire contained several formats to maintain attention. The questionnaire was administered in the students' classrooms by the researcher alone in order to standardise presentation and maintain objectivity. In order to reduce student bias, students were informed that the research was unrelated to the Adult Migrant Education Service or the Advanced English Language Program and it would have no effect on their courses.

They were informed their classroom teacher would not know of their responses and they would remain anonymous and unidentifiable. Classroom teachers were asked to leave the room while the questionnaire was being administered. The researcher had not taught any of the participants himself.

Using the computer statistics package, questionnaire reliability was checked by total-item analysis and the Perception of Pairwork Score section (questions 1-21) was found to have a reliability coefficient of .85. Reversal of polarity in question 15 had been taken into account. Question 10 ("I am afraid to ask the teacher questions") correlated negatively with the total and was deleted from calculation of the Perception of Pairwork score, thereby giving a questionnaire reliability coefficient of .86.

As a further validity check, twenty per cent ($n = 41$) of the summaries of the free-response sections were selected at random by the computer and listed by questionnaire number. They were then compared with the relevant fixed-responses to check if they agreed. No contradictory inconsistencies were noted.

Interviews

None of the subjects had had the researcher as teacher. A standardised list of points to be covered (Appendix IV) was used in the interviews to maintain objectivity and to ensure that all points were covered

consistently. Originally it was intended to record and transcribe all the interviews but only nine interviews were transcribed. Reasons for this were unwillingness to be recorded on the part of some learners and unsuitable recording environments where the interviews had to take place. However, comparison of all the transcriptions with notes made during the interviews showed that no relevant points had been missed. The notes of the non-transcribed interviews can be expected to be equally comprehensive.

The listed, summarised data from each interview was also compared with the interviewee's questionnaire responses. No inconsistencies between questionnaire and interview responses of the informants were noted.

To ensure objectivity, the last two checks were also carried out by a member of the University academic staff, who confirmed the researcher's conclusions.

6.6 Limitations

The data obtained are valid for the sample, which is representative of the Perth, Western Australia, population of non-beginner Adult Migrant Education Service and Advanced English Language Program learners in Term 2, 1994. Low-level learners were considered unable to communicate sufficiently in English to understand the questionnaire and as there are over thirty-five first languages within the sample, translation would have been impractical and standardisation between the different versions difficult to control. The study researched non-beginners' - most of whom have had tertiary education- perceptions only. Although the language was simplified, it is unavoidable that some subjects did not understand questions but nevertheless completed fixed-answer responses. Likewise they may have interpreted terms differently from the researcher. Not all sections or questions were completed by all subjects and statistical significance may have suffered. A some subjects with different perceptions chose to omit different questions, some results may seem to contradict the overall patterns. The size of the sample should have compensated for these factors.

Due to ethical considerations, it was only possible to obtain verbal data from those students who volunteered to be interviewed. Thus, although proportional representation of the sample was intended,

learners from the largest region of origin, South East Asia, and from the largest ethnic group, Vietnamese, were not represented in the interviews. It was therefore neither possible to confirm their written data nor explore in detail the opinions of these learners and those others who chose not to participate in oral data collection and who may have different personalities in respect of risk-taking or sociability factors.

It was beyond the scope of the study to take personality variables such as learning style, risk-taking or field dependence into account. Only easily discernible learner variables such as age, gender, country of origin and language learning experience were considered.

6.7 Ethical Considerations

Subjects were informed that they were under no obligation to complete the questionnaire or be interviewed. Interviewees were informed that the interviews would be recorded. However, as some of the subjects were new to Australia and may have been ignorant of Australian custom, they may have felt obliged to participate. It was underlined to all subjects that this obligation does not exist in Australia and they were offered alternative activities to do in place of the questionnaire. Subjects were also informed that the research was not associated with the Adult Migrant Education Service or the Advanced English

Language Program. They were informed that only the researcher and University staff would see their answers. Anonymity was maintained by having no names on the questionnaires and names and places in interview transcriptions were omitted. There were no foreseeable physiological or psychological hazards, risks or discomforts for the participants. Ethical clearance had been given by the University and permission to access the students had been granted by the Adult Migrant Education Service Manager and the Advanced English Language Program Co-ordinator.

7 RESULTS

7.1 Fixed Response Data

Perceptions to Pairwork Score (PPS) Overall

Statistical analysis of all answers in the first section (questions 1-21) indicated an overall preference for pairwork as the mean score of 3.40 (where 3.00 is the central or neutral value) and showed that more students rated pairwork positively than negatively. (Cp. Willing's (1988) score of 2.63 on a four-point scale for the single question "I like to learn English by talking in pairs", which if converted to a five-point scale would equal 3.29.)

In addition to the overall Perception of Pairwork Score, mean scores for each question were calculated (Table 6.4).

Table 6.4

Mean Score and Standard Deviation for Each Question

Question	Mean N = 207	Cf. with PPS ^a	SD
1 I like working in pairs.	3.81	VH	0.85
2 I try hard when I work in pairs.	3.39	M	1.06
3 Pairwork helps me to learn English	3.83	VH	0.86
4 Pairwork helps me to learn other things	3.76	H	0.87
5 Pairwork helps me to remember things	3.51	H	1.01
6 Pairwork is the best activity we do in class	3.11	L	1.22
7 I use what I learn in pairwork outside the class	3.18	L	1.09
8 Students can help each other in pairs	3.84	VH	0.75
9 I can practise my grammar in pairs	3.55	H	0.97
10 I am afraid to ask the teacher things	2.22	VL	0.91
11 I have contact with other students in pairs	3.63	H	0.87
12 Students can exchange ideas and opinions in pairs	3.91	VH	0.65
13 You have to work in pairs; you can't be lazy	3.17	L	1.10
14 I can practise my pronunciation in pairs			
15 I prefer to do other	3.39	M	1.09

Perceptions of Pairwork
55

activities in the class and not pairwork	3.29	L	0.97
16 ^b Pairs are more useful than whole class activities	3.12	L	0.79
17 Pairs are more useful than independent study	3.29	L	0.76
18 Pairs are more useful than groups	2.92	VL	0.80
19 Pairs are more enjoyable than groups	2.93	VL	0.81
20 Pairs are more enjoyable than whole class activities	3.09	L	0.83
21 Pairs are more enjoyable than independent study	3.31	M	0.78

Note. Central value = 3.00, Overall mean PPS = 3.40.

^a Question score compared to the overall mean PPS. VL = much lower (<3.00) than PPS; L = lower (<3.30) than PPS; M = moderate difference from PPS of ± 0.10 ; H = higher (>3.50) than PPS; VH = much higher (>3.80) than PPS. ^b Questions 16 to 21 are paraphrased multiple-choice scored as for the Likert-type questions with 3.00 as the central value.

High scores were recorded on all questions related to learning through pairwork but the highest score concerned the non-linguistic aspects of pairwork (question 12). The low standard deviation for this question indicates that few subjects rated this question with a low score. Low scores were recorded on the

questions about forced effort in pairwork (14) and the anxiety-reducing aspect of pairwork (10). Questions 16-21 are discussed below.

Regions of Origin and Perceptions of Pairwork Score

The Perception of Pairwork scores for participant groups were compared by analysis of variance. There were no overall significant differences between the gender, age, education and class groupings. However, there was a significant difference between regions of origin and Scheffé procedure indicated this difference lay between the means of the students from Eastern Europe and South East Asia (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5

Mean PPS for Regions of Origin

	Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
			1	2	3	4	5
1	South East Asia	3.51				*	
2	Africa and Central Asia	3.51					
3	East Asia	3.33					
4	Eastern Europe	3.25					
5	Western nations	3.25					

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 3.55, p < .01$.

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Previous Language Learning Experience and Perceptions of Pairwork Score

Using a two-tailed *t*-test, a significant difference was also found between those students with language learning experience in their country of birth and those without, (Table 6.6), $t(22.79) = 3.07, p < .001$. Learners without formal foreign language learning experience in their own countries rated pairwork significantly higher.

Table 6.6

Mean Scores by Previous Foreign Language Learning Experience

Sub-group	Mean PPS
With FL experience	3.40
Without FL experience	3.63

Analysis of Individual Questions

In addition to the calculation of the overall score for the individual questions 1 - 21 (table 6 above), the means for each question for each participant variable were also computed. These means were then compared by analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by Scheffé tests and some groups (region of origin and class type) were found to differ significantly in their responses to certain questions (Tables 6.7 - 6.15). Any other variations are due to random distribution and are not

mentioned.

Differences by Regions of Origin

Table 6.7

Scores by Region for Question 1: I like working in pairs.

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		3	1	5	4	2
2 Central Asia / Africa	4.11	*				
4 South East Asia	3.97					
5 Western countries	3.69					
1 Eastern Europe	3.61					
3 East Asia	3.43					

^a ANOVA values: $F(4,199) = 4.53, p < .01$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level .

All scores are above the mean PPS and as for the overall scores, subjects from South East Asia and Central Asia / Africa express more positive perceptions of pairwork while East Asians agree the least.

Table 6.8

Scores by Region for Question 3: Pairwork helps me to learn English

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		1	3	2	5	4
1 South East Asia	4.05					*
3 Central Asia / Africa	4.02					*
2 East Asia	3.83					
5 Western Countries	3.45					
4 Eastern Europe	3.45					

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 4.74, p < .01$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

The first two regions are again much more positive compared to the East Europeans, East Asia's move up to third place (compared to question 1) is possibly explained by interview anecdotal comments by Chinese subjects that although they do not like pairwork, they feel it is of use (see below).

Table 6.9

Scores by Region for Question 4: Pairwork helps me to learn other things

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		5	1	3	2	4
5 Western countries	4.00					
1 South East Asia	3.98					*
3 Central Asia / Africa	3.89					
2 East Asia	3.53					
4 Eastern Europe	3.41					

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 4.34, p < .01$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

East Asia and Eastern Europeans do not consider pairwork as useful in acquiring non-linguistic knowledge. Anecdotal interview data confirmed this perception of the role of class activities, (see below).

Table 6.10

Scores by Region for Question 5. Pairwork helps me to remember things

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		3	1	2	4	5
3 Central Asia / Africa	3.93				*	*
1 South East Asia	3.68					
2 East Asia	3.27					
4 Eastern Europe	3.20					
5 Western countries	2.92					

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 5.51, p < .001$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Again, subjects from Central Asia and South East Asia perceived this aspect of pairwork more favourably.

Table 6.11

Scores by Region for Question 6. Pairwork is the best activity we do in class

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		1	3	2	5	4
1 South East Asia	3.44					
3 Central Asia / Africa	3.25					
2 East Asia	3.20					
5 Western Countries	2.85					
4 Eastern Europe	2.61			*		

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 3.95, p < .01$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

All regions except South East Asia are below the average Perception of Pairwork score.

Table 6.12

Scores by Region for Question 17. Pairwork helps me more than working by myself (paraphrased multiple-choice)

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		1	3	2	5	4
1 South East Asia	3.53					
3 Central Asia / Africa	3.39					
2 East Asia	3.20					
5 Western Countries	3.08					
4 Eastern Europe	3.00			*		

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 4.36, p < .01$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

The South East Asians and Central Asians / Africans prefer pairwork to independent study more than the other three.

Table 6.13

Scores by Region for Question 21. I like pairwork more than working by myself (paraphrased multiple-choice)

Region	Mean PPS ^a	Regions ^b				
		3	1	2	4	5
3 Central Asia / Africa	3.50				*	
1 South East Asia	3.48				*	
2 East Asia	3.40					
4 Eastern Europe	3.08					
5 Western countries	2.85					

^a ANOVA values: $F(4, 199) = 5.20, p < .001$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Eastern Europeans and Western nations prefer pairwork to independent study much less than do the other groups.

Differences by Class Type

Table 6.14

Scores by Class-type for Question 5. Pairwork helps me to remember things

Class type		Mean	Classes ^b		
		PPS ^a	1	2	3
1	AMES (1/1+)	3.76			*
2	AMES (1+/2)	3.37			
3	AELP (>2)	3.33			

^a ANOVA values: $F(2, 204) = 4.26, p < .05$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

Higher level classes put less value in pairwork as an aid for memorisation of concepts.

Table 6.15

Scores by Class-type for Question 12. Students can exchange ideas and opinions in pairs

		Mean	Classes ^b
Class type		PPS ^a	3 2 1
3	AELP (>2)	4.14	*
2	AMES (1+/2)	4.00	*
1	AMES (1/1+)	3.66	

^a ANOVA values: $F(2, 204) = 11.68, p < .001$

^b Scheffé test: asterisks denote pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level.

All are high scores with the more proficient students in a better position to exchange those ideas.

Classroom grouping

In addition to the calculation of scores, frequencies of response for questions 16-21 (group preferences) were recorded and analysed for significance using chi-square. The following significant differences were found.

Table 6.16

Percentages for Question 20. Which activities do you like more?

Alternative	Percentage
Working in pairs	42
Working with the whole class	32
Both the same	26

Significant difference. $\chi^2(2, N = 195) = 6.68, p < .05$

Pairwork is seen as more enjoyable than working with the whole class, although subjects did not find it significantly more useful.

Table 6.17

Question 17. Which activities help you more?

Alternative	Percentage
Working in pairs	49
Working by myself	20
Both the same	31

Significant difference. $\chi^2 (2, N = 195) = 27.35, p < .01$

Table 6.18

Question 21. Which activities do you like more?

Alternative	Percentage
Working in pairs	53
Working by myself	21
Both the same	26

Significant difference. $\chi^2 (2, N = 195) = 36.00, p < .01$

Pairwork is seen as both more useful and more enjoyable than independent study. Tables 6.12 and 6.13 above and further chi-square analysis (table 6.19) indicate that subjects from South East Asia and Central Asia / Africa do not favour independent study.

Table 6.19

Comparative Percentages by Region for Independent Study

Preference for Questions 17 and 21.

Region	Q17 ^a	Q21 ^b
South East Asia	2	7
East Asia	31	20
Central Asia / Africa	14	13
Eastern Europe	32	37
Western Nations	39	46

^a $\chi^2(4, N = 195) = 12.15, p < .001.$

^b $\chi^2(4, N = 195) = 46.40, p < .001.$

As was expected from the Perceptions to Pairwork scores for questions 18 and 19, which were the closest of all to the central value (2.92 and 2.93 respectively, see table 2.4 above), no significant difference was found between preferences for group work, pairwork or the central category "both the same".

Partner Characteristics

Frequencies of response for questions 22-26 (partner characteristics) were recorded and analysed for significance using chi-square. The following significant differences were found.

Table 6.20

Question 22. Proficiency of partner

Alternative	Percentage
-------------	------------

Better at English	69
Not as good at English	1
The same level	19
Level does not matter	11

Significant difference, $\chi^2(3, N = 194) = 213.01, p < .01$

A definite preference for more proficient partners was found.

Table 6.21

Question 23. First language of partner

Alternative	Percentage
Same first language	16
Different first language	52
Does not matter	32

Significant difference, $\chi^2(2, N = 194) = 37.90, p < .001$

A definite preference for a partner with a different first language was found.

Table 6.22

Question 24. Partner change

Alternative	Percentage
Same partner every time	10
Different partner sometimes	52
Different partner every time	20
Does not matter	18

Significant difference, $\chi^2(3, N = 193) = 80.60, p < .001$

A definite preference for occasional partner change.

Table 6.23

Question 25. Partner choice.

Alternative	Percentage
A partner the teacher chooses	16
A partner I choose	29
Does not matter	55

Significant difference, $\chi^2(2, N = 191) = 43.24, p < .001$

Partner choice is not an important variable.

Table 6.24

Question 26. Partner gender

Alternative	Percentage
A partner of the same sex	9
A partner of the other sex	14
Does not matter	77

Significant difference, $\chi^2(2, N = 194) = 169.68, p < .001$

Gender does not seem to be an important variable. However, although the majority of both genders expressed no preference, comparison of the frequencies of response for males and females showed that significantly more males than females preferred a partner of the opposite gender.

Table 6.25

Preference for Partner of Opposite Gender

Gender	Percentage
Male	22
Female	6

$\chi^2(1, N = 191) = 5.14, p < .05$

Task Type

Unfortunately, despite alteration of the questionnaire format to minimise non-completion, this section was not filled in by all subjects. Eighty-seven completed questions 27 - 34 and fifty-five completed questions 35 - 42. Interview data attributed the low response rate in part to non-differentiation of task type.

The questions 27-42 were scored as the Likert-type questions and means concerning task-type were calculated. 3.00 is the central value and 3.82 the overall mean of this section.

Table 6.26

Mean scores for task types.

Task-type	Activity	Enjoyment Mean ^a	Usefulness Mean ^b
Medium-based			
	Pronunciation		
	practice	3.72 (L)	3.78 (M)
	Grammar practice	3.84 (M)	3.76 (M)
	Practising recently		
	taught material	3.76 (M)	3.70 (L)
	Role play	3.54 (L)	3.60 (L)

Table 6.26 (continued)

Task-type	Activity	Enjoyment Mean ^a	Usefulness Mean ^b
Message-based			
	Problem solving	3.84 (M)	3.84 (M)
	Conversation	3.84 (M)	3.88 (M)
	Discussion and exchanging opinions	3.84 (M)	3.86 (M)
	Writing exercises	3.76 (M)	3.68 (L)

Note. Letters in parenthesis indicate the difference of the mean from the task-type overall mean of 3.82, where L is a low score (<3.73) and M is moderately different.

^a Questions 27-34. ^b Questions 35-42.

Except for enjoyment of "grammar practice", scores are lower for medium-based than for message-based tasks.

Two-tailed t-tests were calculated in order to determine any significant differences between the scores:-

Table 6.27

Perceptions of task-enjoyment and task-usefulness.

Questions	Variable	Mean
27-34	Enjoyment	3.90
35-42	Usefulness	3.74

Although only thirty-nine subjects completed both enjoyment and usefulness sections, a significant difference was found in the results, $t(38) = 2.88$, $p < .01$. These subjects reported they find pairwork tasks more enjoyable than useful. However, as so few subjects answered this section, some triangulation was needed and two-tailed t-tests were also calculated to compare the total scores of questions 16, 17, 18 (the usefulness of pairwork compared to other learning groupings) with those of 20, 21, 19 (the enjoyment of pairwork compared to other learning groupings). No significant differences were found.

Table 6.28

Perceptions of enjoyment of medium-based and message-based tasks.

Questions	Task-type	Mean
27-30	Medium-based	3.70
31-34	Message-based	3.81

A significant difference was found indicating that students perceived message-based as more enjoyable than

medium-based tasks. $t(86) = -3.15, p < .001$

Table 6.29

Perceptions of usefulness of medium-based and message-based tasks.

Questions	Task-type	Mean
35-38	Medium-based	3.70
39-42	Message-based	3.76

Fewer participants completed this section than the enjoyment section and no significant difference was found. $t(54) = -1.21$.

Due to the low response rate of this section, no further analysis by participant variable was undertaken.

7.2 Free Response Data

General Comments

Of the 207 learners who returned the questionnaire, 163 completed one or more free response answers, with the first section, "First Thoughts", the most complete with 134 responses. As the participants had opportunity to express their general perceptions in the closed question sections and there was no compulsion to complete the free-response sections, any comments made in these sections can be assumed to represent the learners' main concerns and interests, especially when they echo the closed question responses.

Many of the free-responses confirm the quantitative data obtained from the closed questions that pairwork is regarded more favourably than not, with 102 (63%) overall positive, 22 (13%) negative and 39 (24%) neutral comments.

Apart from expressions of simple liking or disliking, by far the most frequent responses concerned the partner (thirty-seven responses (28%)) as the most important variable for determining the usefulness or enjoyment of pairwork. Three partner variables were identified, personality, proficiency level and pronunciation.

In some cases, a specific aspect of personality was not defined, but if mentioned, the most frequent factor was activeness and mostly East Europeans commented that pairwork was spoilt by inactive partners. Other negative personality variables were how dominant, lazy, boring, unhelpful, or argumentative the interlocutor was. Comments that partners were "arrogant" or "proud" were made exclusively by Asians and Africans. Desirable partners were "nice", "motivated", "well-educated", "friendly", "happy", or had "a sense of humour."

A partner with a higher level of proficiency was another condition for the success of the activity. Chinese subjects mentioned this factor more than personality or other variables, indicating that this factor is more important for them. Other learners commented that they felt themselves slowed or bored by a

lower level learner and there was no point in having such a partner. Some learners (in particular from Former Yugoslav Republics and Japan) indeed believed there was no advantage in having partners even at the same level, as "They haven't the correct answer. Therefore my English doesn't improve." (questionnaire 39). Despite the overwhelming preference for a partner at a higher level, few participants commented on the disadvantages for the better partner and only one learner mentioned that she felt sorry for a more proficient partner (questionnaire 74).

All groups commented that the partner's pronunciation and accent detracted from the success of pairwork and for some participants it was the sole factor that spoilt an otherwise useful activity. However, a minority (from China and Vietnam) saw the positive side and did realise that pairwork provided an opportunity to develop listening skills.

Positive Reasons

Participants reported that, linguistically, pairwork improves speaking, pronunciation and comprehension. Even though the learners are resident in an English-speaking country, it appears that, for many students, in-class activities provide the only opportunities for prolonged conversation. Responses indicate that this may be especially true for those students who are married within the same ethnic group.

Whole class activities do not provide the learners with sufficient input and output because "teacher is only one and about 30 students" (questionnaire 182).

Complementing Phillips' (1989) and Young's (1990) research, some learners found it easier to talk and gain confidence when speaking in a pair. Pairwork allowed learners to work at their own pace, though at times they were rushed by their partner or the teacher. It also offered variety to a lesson.

Some subjects perceived non-linguistic outcomes in pairwork as it also allowed the students to socialise, to become acquainted with and share different experiences, cultures and ideas. Most of those who saw the advantage of pairwork as a means of gaining insight into other cultures came from the Horn of Africa, one or two from East Asia but none from the regional groupings of Eastern Europe or Western nations (see discussion below, p.94). Several subjects summed up the advantages of pairwork in the possibility to apply themselves synergistically to a task "because 2 head is better than a head" (questionnaire 157).

Negative Reasons

Apart from the partner variables mentioned above, pairwork was seen as unsuccessful because no-one would speak unless forced to or too much first language and irrelevant discussion prevented completion of the task. Contrasting with Bruton and Samuda's contention that in

fact learners do not pick up grammatical errors from their partners "as most of the time they were not repeating what their peers said" (1980, p.54), some participants, particularly from Western Europe, China and Japan, believed they learnt incorrect grammar or pronunciation while working in dyads. Some believed they could learn nothing at all. They did not see that accuracy in collaborative activities is not as important as fluency. "When we work together we can make mistakes and we don't know about it" (questionnaire 77).

Task

As in the fixed-answer responses, few learners commented on the type of task performed. Only eighteen responses were recorded in the final section "Did you do any other activities?", most of which did not directly answer the question asked with relevance to pairwork, but rather outlined general activities learners appreciated. It was difficult to discern any patterns amongst individuals and, for example, one subject commented that pairwork was no good for collaborative writing (questionnaire 18) while another commented that pairwork was only useful for writing exercises and not for speaking skills (questionnaire 59). Participants mentioned communicative tasks such as "conversation", "exchanging opinions" or "discussions-" more often than non-communicative medium tasks, "grammar" or "vocabulary practice". This may be because the type of task "which

involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language" (Nunan, 1989, p.10) is practised more in higher level classes. Further quantitative analysis of the responses showed that Eastern Europeans mentioned medium-based more than message-based tasks, which may reinforce other conclusions that indicate that learners from these regions prefer code-oriented, non-communicative language learning.

Other Language Learning Experience

The quantitative data regarding previous other language learning experience was difficult to confirm from the free response sections. However, 82% of the learners with no prior other language learning experience (as opposed to 63% of the total) commented positively upon pairwork.

Other Variables

No other patterns were discerned between the variables of gender, education, age or class type.

7.3 Interview Data

General Comments

The interview data served mainly to complement the questionnaire data, both by confirming and elaborating on the answers as well as verifying the reliability of specific learner questionnaires. In particular the role of partner variables - personality, level and pronunciation - on the success of pairwork was explored. Attitudes in general towards pairwork were positive although, as in the questionnaire statistical data, the students most against pairwork were Chinese and Former Yugoslavs and those most in favour of it, Central Asians.

Partner Variables

Passivity was a major criticism of the partner, but it must be noted that all interviewees were volunteers and as such had active sociable personalities. Some learners (Central Asian females) revealed that partner passivity was not only due to introversion or shyness but they felt some (East European) partners were reluctant to contribute because they felt culturally superior. Passivity was also attributed to learning style and independent learners were seen as undesirable partners. Dominance was seen not only as a function of personality but also of the theme or the task as some learners were more knowledgeable on particular topics. Suggested ways to minimise domination in pairs were to

change partners regularly and for the teacher to intervene more often. However, those who admitted being the dominant partner believed it was the responsibility of the other and not theirs to rectify the situation by speaking up more. Confirming Gaies (1983), some students preferred pairs to groups as they found it easier to counter dominance. However, as in the questionnaire data, some - particularly from the Central Asia / Africa group - expressed a preference for groups because of the greater diversity of opinion or experience available, the less threatening atmosphere for shy individuals and the avoidance of being trapped by an undesirable single partner.

As above, most interviewees thought that the partner should have a higher or at least equal level of proficiency otherwise little could be learnt and pairwork was a waste of time. However, one learner (Central Asian female) did comment that level did not matter at all because although language outcomes were the main aims of classes, the chance to help others was just as important.

Pronunciation was seen as a partner factor that could cause confusion. Difficulties in comprehending each other's speech were seen reciprocally by Europeans and Asians. However, some students (mostly Central Asians) confirmed the data written by Vietnamese subjects and believed that listening to different

accents was good practice as it encouraged concentration and trained the ear to unfamiliar pronunciation.

Reasons given for students to choose partners were to avoid an undesirable partner and to ensure a partner of higher proficiency. Reasons given for the teacher to choose partners were to avoid taking the easy way out and choosing a non-challenging partner and because supposedly the teacher knew better which learners should be matched.

Regarding partner gender variables and supporting data in question 26, a physically attractive partner was desired by many males. On the other hand, one male did not wish to have female partners because of their different sense of humour and gender-cultural background. Although none admitted it themselves, some females believed other women were against pairwork as at times it brought them into too close contact with men.

Reasons for the preference for first language partners (question 23) were also explained. Apart from ethnic gregariousness, some learners claimed they did not slip into L1 out of laziness but utilised the L1 partner as a resource for time-saving translation of concepts.

Positive Reasons

Stated positive aspects of pairwork confirmed the free-responses; for example, variety to the lesson, an aid to improving the quality of output and conversation skills, as the classroom is the only place where extended discourse takes place, were all mentioned. Pairwork increased confidence and retention of vocabulary and one student, confirming Seliger (1983, p.247) believed he learnt 40% of his lexis from other students. It also provided a forum for the exchange of ideas and an opportunity to become informed about other cultures. It also allowed a longer wait-time compared to whole class activities.

The reasons why question 10 of the questionnaire ("I am afraid to ask the teacher things") did not correlate well with the other questions was also investigated in the interviews. Although students were not "afraid" to ask the teacher questions, some did not wish to take up his or her time. Others said they were not afraid but "ashamed" or "embarrassed". Thus, pairwork does provide an opportunity for the learners to ask questions of their peers that they prefer not to ask the teacher.

Negative Reasons

Negative reasons were that students talk about irrelevancies, cease talking after a few utterances or slip into the first language. Less important negative

reasons given were that the classroom became too noisy or the students had to change places. Other variables that affected pairwork were the learner's own mood, the topic and the degree of intervention of the teacher.

Task

Although subjects could readily contextualise situations where they practised pairwork, recalling the class, partner and teacher, despite intensive prompting they still had difficulty differentiating between task types. This is not necessarily surprising as most medium-based tasks involve message transmission and there is also a limited amount of meaning negotiation in the most meaningless drill. Medium-based tasks such as grammar exercises and roleplay were mentioned, although they were felt to be boring because of the artificial situation created. Message-based tasks included discussion and conversation.

Other Factors

In addition, several factors unexpectedly emerged further to the research questions. Firstly, several students commented that pairwork, although unpopular, must be beneficial because the teacher has set it. Secondly some expressed a preference for formal grammatical instruction and deductive teaching, and finally some subjects suggested that learning is divorced from enjoyment.

Many interviewees expressed the view that the ideal

situation would be to have constant contact with the teacher, either individually one-to-one for a short time every lesson or in smaller groups. The teacher is seen as the only person who can impart knowledge and this faith in the teacher extends to the point that even those who were adamantly against pairwork believed that it must be beneficial, otherwise the teacher would not ask the class to do it. One Chinese student even commented that she believed that many other students were bored when working in pairs but did not like to tell the teacher as they respected the teacher's professionalism.

Some students from China and Europe commented spontaneously that they did not appreciate an inductive approach to learning. The present methods of language learning were sometimes seen as "too radical" (Subject 170) and it would be better to reduce collaborative learning in favour of increased teacher explanation.

Traditional attitudes towards teaching were also observed in how some students considered the learning process to be unconnected to enjoyment. They believed that liking a task detracted from the seriousness of the process and inhibited acquisition. On the other hand, different subjects regarded some learners, presumably those with traditional attitudes, as too serious to appreciate pairwork.

8 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study answered the main research question, revealing learners' perceptions of pairwork and the main reasons behind these perceptions. The fear that pairwork is unpopular and therefore has a negative effect on situation-specific motivation and by extension on general attitudes towards language learning was unfounded. Most students are enthusiastic and regard pairwork as an activity that enables them to practise language skills and to socialise with other class members. The reasons given for positive perceptions echoed Long and Porter's (1985) paradigm of the advantages of pairwork (see Literature Review above, p.14). The findings indicate that the discontent displayed by students in the classroom at the mention of pairwork, which originally provided the impetus for the study, is more attributable to trepidation that the partner will be unsuitable than to dissatisfaction with pairwork activities *per se*. One subject summed this up with his comment: "If I can't get a good partner, this situation is like a torture" (questionnaire 17). The partner's proficiency level and pronunciation were expected to play a role, but the free-response and interview data also revealed that personality variables are of at least equal importance for effective interaction in a dyad.

Complementing empirical research on pairwork success (Spelman, 1992; Alvarado, 1992), learners themselves perceive that task completion is dependent on the partner's degree of activeness. Active partners who are able to initiate and sustain speech exchanges and provide input are preferred. However, passivity is at times a result of shyness or lack of confidence and can be aggravated by a dominant or haughty partner. Although the composition of a class can make it difficult or even impossible, teachers are therefore advised to match active with active partners and allow them to complete a task by themselves so that he or she has time to concentrate on and encourage the less active dyads.

As for level, learners prefer to have a partner who is more proficient in English and Eastern Europeans and Asians commented on this factor more than on other partner characteristics. Byrne (1976, p.59) and Porter (1986) suggest placing a weaker student next to a stronger so the latter may help the former. Although this is optimal for the weaker student in a dyad, the stronger usually feels disadvantaged and may think the activity a waste of time. Beyond the realms of Escherian fantasy, it is impossible to match all students with more proficient partners and teachers should therefore try to ensure that partners are similar in level.

The problem of pronunciation in different first language dyads is sometimes seen as inhibiting the effectiveness of pairwork. This is particularly true for

Asian-European dyads and calls into question Porter's (1986) findings that Non-Native Speaker dyads are as effective as Native Speaker-Non-Native Speaker dyads. In her study, participants were all Spanish-speaking and accent was not a problem. In the multilingual classroom, phonological and phonetic differences may retard task completion and increase frustration but teachers should nevertheless try to avoid forming dyads with the same first language. The majority of learners realise that, when working with a partner with the same first language, they are tempted to slip out of English and some feel that speaking in English is artificial when they can communicate more effectively in their own language. Mixed language pairs can also increase cultural awareness and help avoid ethnic misunderstandings, although, regrettably, there are a few learners who resist pairwork precisely because it brings them into undesired contact with other ethnic groups.

Rotation of partners on a regular, for example weekly, basis can avoid conflict as change allows learners to move on from a partner they do not feel is suitable and also provides them with exposure to a variety of accents and opinions. In general, it does not matter whether the teacher or the learners choose the partners.

The study thus answered the first part of research question 3 relating to partner factors and indicated

that the effect of partner characteristics on pairwork was the most important variable for successful interaction. However, as only a minority of students completed the task-type sections of the questionnaire, it is difficult to generalise whether task-type is also an important variable for the enjoyment or usefulness of pairwork (research question 3b). Those subjects who completed the relevant questionnaire sections and some interviewees reported that the most popular tasks were those that involved an unstructured exchange of opinion and experience. The least popular were role-playing activities where the situations practised were considered artificial. However, in low-level classes, more medium-based tasks are performed and hence perceptions of pairwork can be expected to be different. The higher the class level, the more important the role of pairwork for idea exchange becomes and less important its role as an aid for remembering concepts (see tables 6.14 and 6.15 above).

Similarly, the attempt to isolate affective from cognitive perceptions of pairwork (research question 5) was not successful in the questionnaire and students did not differentiate "liking" from "usefulness". However, there are anecdotal interview data that suggest that learners do have conflicting rational and emotive opinions of pairwork. Some do not like pairwork but think it useful, partly because the teacher has recommended it. Others enjoy it for the variety and

socialisation it brings, despite their belief that its linguistic helpfulness is limited.

In answer to research question 4 concerning classroom grouping, more learners enjoy pairwork than do independent study. There was no significant difference between preferences for small group or for pairwork. More learners stated they preferred pairwork to whole-class activities but apparently many students defined "working with the whole class" in the questionnaire as implying student-student activities only and excluding lockstep teacher-fronted explanation and interaction. It transpired from interviews that some students, particularly from China and Europe, favoured this traditional approach over discovering answers and solving problems for themselves. In this respect, Willing's (1988) and Little and Sander's (1990) findings that students preferred deductive grammar teaching are supported. Knowles (1974, 1984) assumes that adult learners need to be self-directed and Rogers (1983, p.135) emphasises the role of the teacher as facilitator of learning, yet these comments indicate that some adult learners expect learning to be an equivalent process to the pedagogical techniques they experienced in secondary school and they rely on the teacher for guidance. They do not realise they can utilise the resources of weaker students and believe that only a teacher, and a native speaker at that, can provide them with the input they need. Kilpatrick (1984, p.248) and Willing (1988, p.170)

suggest grouping classes by learning style and structuring the course methodology appropriately.

However, as Yorio (1989, p.41) points out comprehensive tests would have to be administered and traits such as gender and country of birth are far easier to discern.

In answer to research question 2, no significant differences were found in perceptions to pairwork between learners with different ages or length of education. Although none of the subjects substantiated or refuted Gass and Varonis's (1986) findings regarding mixed gender dyads (see Literature Review above, p.21), some differences were found in so far as more males than females preferred a partner of the opposite gender. However, the reasons given were superficial and possibly flippant.

Significant differences involving participant variables concerned regions of birth and previous other language learning experience. They indicated that there are certain types of students at post-beginner levels who are most likely to appreciate pairwork. As a general guideline for the teacher, these students are from developing countries or have had no previous formal foreign language learning experience. Those African and Central Asian learners whose culture is most removed from Western industrialised society see pairwork as a means not only of improving language skills but also of understanding different opinions, attitudes and cultures. They are also likely to come from countries

where two or more languages are spoken (e.g., learners from Ethiopia) or have learnt a second language while in a country of transit (e.g., Afghani refugees in Pakistan). Acquiring another language through interaction is therefore more familiar to them than learning it through formal instruction.

Those students most unlikely to appreciate pairwork and become unmotivated in their learning were found to be those learners from China and Eastern Europe who have (or had) highly formal product-oriented secondary education structures and bring into the classroom these preconceptions (Knowles, 1984, p.10; Horwitz, 1989, p.62) and cultural expectations (Christison and Krahne, 1986, p.64) of what language learning should entail. Consequently, they have the most difficulty in accepting pairwork and do not see the point of tasks that, for example, practise communicative negotiation strategies. They do not recognise pairwork as a way to share linguistic or non-linguistic knowledge and many prefer working alone to working with their peers.

But language cannot be used if not practised and, as most students have no social contact with Australians and communicate domestically in their first language, the teacher has to explain or demonstrate the importance of pairwork to those learners who do not perceive its significance. These students must learn to complete interactive tasks enthusiastically so that, ultimately, they have a better chance of succeeding in Australian

society once their English courses are over.

9 REFERENCES

- Abbs, B. (1983). Motivation, communication and early learners. in S. Holden (Ed). *Focus on the learner: Bologna Conference 1983*. Modern English Publications.
- Acton, W. (1984, March). *Affect in the "Communicative" Classroom: A Model*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Houston, TX.
- Alvarado, C. (1992). Discourse Styles and Patterns of Participation on ESL Interactive Tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26 (3), 589-592.
- Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Benson, M. (1991). Attitudes and Motivation towards English: A Survey of Japanese Freshmen. *RELJ Journal*, 22 (1), 34-48
- Bohlin, R. (1990). *A Model for the Motivational Instruction of Adults*. Proceedings of Selected Paper Presentations at the Convention of the Association for Educational

Communications and Technology, Iowa.

Bruton, A. and Samuda, V. (1980). Learner and Teacher Roles in the Treatment of Oral Error in Group Work. *RELC Journal*, 11 (2), 49-63

Burgess, A. (1978). 1985. London: Hutchinson and Co.

Byrne, D. (1976). *Teaching Oral English*. London: Longman

Byrne, D. (1987). *Techniques for Classroom Interaction*. Harlow: Longman.

Canale, M. and Swain, M. (1980) Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1), 1-47.

Christison, M. and Krahne, K. (1986). Student Perceptions of Academic Language Study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20 (1), 61-81

Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the Research Agenda. *Language Learning*, 41 (4), 469-512

Daines, J. and Graham, B. (1988). *Adult Learning Adult Teaching*. Nottingham, UK: University of Nottingham

dBASE III PLUS Version 1.1, [computer program]. (1986).

Ashton-Tate.

DePaula, Z. (1984). Teaching English as a Second Language to Immigrant Community College Students. in M. Knowles and Associates. *Andragogy in Action: Applying Modern Principles of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Dewey, J. (1972). *Experience and Education*. New York: Collier

Dodson, C. and Thomas, S. (1988). The effect of total second language immersion education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 9 (6), 467-485

Doughty, C. and Pica, T. (1986). "Information Gap" Tasks: Do they Facilitate Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20 (2), 305-325

Douglas Brown, H. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (2nd ed.). Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Duff, P. (1986). Another Look at Interlanguage Talk: Taking task to task. in R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn*:

Conversation in Second Language Acquisition. (pp.147-181). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House

Edwards, A. and Kenney, K. (1967). A Comparison of Thurstone and Likert Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. in M. Fishbein, (Ed.) *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York: John Wiley and Sons. pp.249-256.

Ely, C. (1988). Personality: Its Impact on Attitudes toward Classroom Activities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21 (1), 25-31

Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley

Foddy, W. (1993). *Constructing questions for interviews and questionnaires : theory and practice in social research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fowler, F. (1988). *Survey Research Methods*. (rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications

Gaies, S. (1983) Learner feedback: an exploratory study of its role in the second language classroom. in H. Seliger

and M. Long, (Eds.). *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp. 190-212). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Gass, S. and Varonis, E. (1986). Sex differences in nonnative speaker-nonnative speaker interactions in R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp. 327-351). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House

Gay, L. (1981). *Educational Research*. (2nd ed). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. in E. Hatch. (Ed.). *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings*. Rowley. Mass: Newbury House.

Horwitz, E. (1989). Facing the Blackboard: Student Perceptions of Language Learning and the Language Classroom. *ADFL Bulletin*, 20 (3), 61-64

Hurshberger, L. (1989, February). *Communication anxiety and its effect on oral proficiency*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Second Language Research Forum, Los Angeles.

Jules, V. (1992). Cooperative Learning: Student Perceptions of the Changing Structure of Learning. *Contemporary Education*, 63 (3), 191-194

Julkunen, K. (1991, April). *General and situation-specific motivation in FL learning*. Paper presented at the RELC Regional Seminar on Language Acquisition and the Second/Foreign Language Classroom, Singapore.

Kidd, J. (1975). *How Adults Learn*. NY: Association Press

Kidder, L. (1981). *Research Methods in Social Relations*. (4th edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson.

Kilpatrick, A. (1984). Social Work Education at the University of Georgia. in M. Knowles and Associates. *Andragogy in Action: Applying Modern Principles of Adult Learning*. (pp.243-264). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Knowles, M. (1974). *Self-directed learning*. New York: Cambridge

Knowles, M. and Associates (1984). *Andragogy in Action: Applying Modern Principles of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Harlow: Longman
- Lalonde, R. and Gardner, R. (1985). On the predictive validity of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6 (5), 403-412
- Likert, R. (1967). The Method of Constructing an Attitude Scale. in M. Fishbein, (Ed.) *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York: John Wiley and Sons. pp.90-95.
- Little, G and Sanders, S. (1990). *Resistance to learning? Student reaction to Communicative Language Teaching*. Research report available from EDRS.
- Littlewood, W.T. (1984). *Foreign and Second Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. and Porter, P. (1985). Group work, Interlanguage, task and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19 (2), 207-228

Lupescu, S. and Day, R. (1990). Examining attitude in teachers and students: the need to validate questionnaire data. *Second Language Research*, (6) 2, 125-134

McCall, C. and Gardner, S. (1984, April). *A Statistical Assessment of Order of Presentation in Multiple Item Likert Scale Responses, or "Who's on First?"*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Muchnik, A. and Wolfe, D. (1982). Attitudes and Motivations of American Students of Spanish. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, (38) 2, 262-281.

Nerenz, A. and Knop, C. (1982, April). *The Effect of Group Size on Students' Opportunity to Learn in the Second Language Classroom*. Paper presented at the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Louisville, Kentucky.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: a textbook for teachers*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall

International.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*.
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Pattison, P. (1987, April). *The Communicative Approach and Classroom Realities*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, Westende, Belgium

Phillips, E. (1989). Anxiety and Speaking in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 1 (3), 191-206

Pica, T. (1987). Second Language Acquisition, Social Interaction and the Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8 (1), 3-21

Pica, T. and Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: a comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. in S. Gass and C. Madden, *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.115-132). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House.

Porter, P. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and Interaction in task-centred discussions. in R. Day

(Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.200-222). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1987). Students' preferences in learning English in Lima, Peru. *System*, 15 (1), 77-80.

Reid, J. (1987). The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (1), 87-111.

Richards. J. and Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill

Seliger, H. and Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Seliger, H. (1983). Learner interaction in the classroom and its effects on language acquisition. in H. Seliger and M. Long, (Eds). *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.246-267). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Shrigley, R and Trueblood, C. (1979). Designing a Likert Type Scale to Assess Attitude toward Metrication. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 16 (1), 73-78

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Smith, A. (1992). *Training and Development in Australia*. Melbourne, Vic.: Butterworths

Spelman, M. (1992, November). *The Importance of Discourse Style in Pairing Students for Interactive Communicative Tasks*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Louisville, Kentucky.

SPSS Release 4.0 for Macintosh, [computer program] (1990). Chicago, IL.: SPSS Inc.

Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence:- some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. in S. Gass and C. Madden, *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.235-253). Cambridge, Mass.:

- Tassicker, M. (1986). *Aspects of Motivation in Second Language Learning: a Study of Adult Migrant Correspondence Students of English as a Second Language*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria.
- Vincent, M. (1983). Motivation and its importance in ELT. in S. Holden (Ed). *Focus on the learner: Bologna Conference 1983*. Modern English Publications.
- Wells, G. (1981). *Learning through interaction: the study of language development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Wennerstrom, A. and Heiser, P. (1992). ESL Student Bias in Instructional Evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, (26) 2, 271-288.
- Willing, K. (1988). *Learning Styles in Adult Migrant Education*. Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre
- Yorio, C. (1989). The Other Side of the Looking Glass. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 8 (1), 32-45

Young, D. (1990). An investigation of students'

perspectives on anxiety and speaking. *Foreign Language*

Annals, 23 (6), 539-553

APPENDIX I

Subjects

Table I.i

Countries of Origin of Subjects

Region	Country	n
South East Asia	Burma	15
	Cambodia	2
	Indonesia	9
	Malaysia	2
	Thailand	6
	Vietnam	32
Central Asia /	Afghanistan	8
Africa	Egypt	6
	Eritrea	6
	Ethiopia	5
	India	2
	Iran	4
	Iraq	2
	Israel	1
	Kenya	1
	Kurdistan	1
	Lebanon	1
	Morocco	1
	Pakistan	2
	Somalia	2

Region	Country	n
	Syria	1
	Turkey	1
East Asia	China	20
	Japan	7
	Korea	3
Eastern Europe	Fmr Yugoslavia	28
	Hungary	4
	Latvia	1
	Poland	15
	Romania	1
	Russia	2
	Ukraine	1
Western nations	Argentina	1
	Chile	1
	Columbia	1
	El Salvador	2
	Finland	1
	Germany	4
	Italy	1
	Portugal	1
	Spain	1
	Switzerland	1
Not stated		1

Table I.ii

Age of subjects

Age group	n
18-30	73
31-42	97
43-55	30
Over 55	2
Not stated	5

Table I.iii

Gender of subjects

Gender	n
Female	109
Male	94
Not stated	4

Table I.iv

Education of subjects

School completed	n
Primary	8
Lower secondary	21
Upper secondary	55
Tertiary	116
Not stated	7

Table I.v

English Language Experience in Country of Birth

Amount	n
Some	138
None	61
Not stated	8

Table I.vii

Other Foreign Language Experience in Country of Birth

Amount	n
Some	97
None	97
Not stated	13

Table I.viii

*Subjects with No Stated Previous Foreign Language
Experience*

<hr/>	
n	
<hr/>	
27	
<hr/>	

Table I.ix

Class type of subjects

Class type	n
<hr/>	
AMES (1/1+)	83
AMES (1+/2)	60
AELP	64
<hr/>	

Questionnaire

U

I would like you to fill in this form to help me find out about what students like in the classroom. It is about "pairwork". Pairwork is when your teacher asks you to work with one other person in the lesson. Maybe it's to practise conversation, fill in a form together, practise grammar or solve a problem.

About you

- 1 Where do you come from? _____
- 2 What is your first language (mother tongue)? _____
- 3 How old are you? _____
- 3 Are you MALE ☐
or FEMALE ☐ ?
- 4 How many years did you go to school? _____
(Total of primary school + high school + college + university)
- 5 Did you learn English in your country? NO ☐
YES ☐ How long? _____
- 6 Did you learn other languages in your country? NO ☐
YES ☐ How long? _____
- 7 What is your level in this class? 1 ☐
1+ ☐
2 ☐
Over 2 ☐
- 8 I understand what pairwork is. ☐
No ☐
- If the answer to this question is "NO", you can stop here. Please put up.
- 9 I have done pairwork in my English lessons. Yes ☐
No ☐

If the answer to this question is "NO", you can stop here. Please put your hand up.

9 I have done pairwork in my English lessons. Yes ☒ No ☐

If answer to this question is "NO", you can stop here. Please put your hand up.

About pairwork

Stop and think about your English classes, now or before. Can you remember a time when you worked together with one other person in class. (2)

What did you do?

What did you think of the activity?

What did you think about your partner?

(If you cannot remember a time, put your hand up.)

A Write down your first thoughts and feelings now.

Now, keeping that example in mind, try and answer the other questions.

There are six boxes

1 "No, no, not at all" 2 "No" 3 "Yes" 4 "Yes, yes, a lot"

The two boxes on the right mean:

5 "I'm not sure" or "I don't know" 6 "I don't understand the question"

Mark one box for each question.

If you don't understand this, put your hand up.

	NOT AT ALL	NO	YES	A LOT	NOT SURE	DON'T UNDERSTAND
1 I like working in pairs.						
2 I try hard when I work in pairs.						
3 Pairwork helps me to learn English						
4 Pairwork helps me to learn other things						
5 Pairwork helps me to remember things						
6 Pairwork is the best activity we do in class						
7 I use what I learn in pairwork outside the class						
8 Students can help each other in pairs						
9 I can practise my grammar in pairs						
10 I am afraid to ask the teacher things						
11 I have contact with other students in pairs						
12 Students can exchange ideas and opinions in pairs						
13 You have to work in pairs; you can't be lazy						
14 I can practise my pronunciation in pairs						
15 I prefer to do other activities in the class and not pairwork						

B Are there any other reasons why you like pairwork?

C Are there any other reasons why you do NOT like pairwork?

3

16 Which activities help you more?

Mark one answer for each question

- Working in pairs ☐
 OR Working with the whole class ☐
 Both the same ☐

17 Which activities help you more?

- Working in pairs ☐
 OR Working by myself ☐
 Both the same ☐

18 Which activities help you more?

- Working in pairs ☐
 OR Working in small groups ☐
 Both the same ☐

19 Which activities do you like more?

- Working in pairs ☐
 OR Working in small groups ☐
 Both the same ☐

20 Which activities do you like more?

- Working in pairs ☐
 CR Working with the whole class ☐
 Both the same ☐

21 Which activities do you like more?

- Working in pairs ☐
 OR Working by myself ☐
 Both the same ☐

D If you do NOT like pairwork, what things would you prefer to do?

What sort of partners do you prefer working with? Mark one answer in each question

22 I like to have a partner who is

- Better at English than me ☐
 Not as good at English as me ☐
 The same level as me ☐
 Level does not matter ☐

23 I like to have a partner with

- the same first language ☐
 a different first language ☐
 First language does not matter ☐

(9)

- 24 I like to have
 the same partner every time ☐
 a different partner sometimes ☐
 a different partner every time ☐
 It does not matter ☐
- 25 I like to have
 a partner the teacher chooses ☐
 a partner I choose ☐
 It does not matter ☐
- 26 I like to have
 a partner of the same sex ☐
 a partner of the other sex ☐
 It does not matter ☐

E Can you say anything else about the type of partner that you work with?

What sort of things did you do in pairs?

Look at the list below.

If you did not do the activity, then mark the first box.

If you have done the activity,
 was it useful or helpful?
 did you like doing it?

Mark the other boxes for each activity.

If you don't understand the activity, mark the last box.

	DIDNT DO IT	USEFUL			LIKE			DONT UNDER- STAND
		NO	YES	NOT SURE	NO	YES	NOT SURE	
27 Pronunciation practice								
28 Grammar practice								
29 Practising what the teacher just taught us								
30 Role play (e.g. on the telephone; asking the way)								
31 Finding an answer to a problem together								
32 Conversation								
33 Discussion and exchanging opinions								
34 Writing exercises together								

E Did you do any other activities? What did you think of them?

Thank you for your help.

APPENDIX III

Interviewees

Table III.i

Countries of Origin of Interviewees

Region	Country	n
South East Asia		0
East Asia	China	3
Central Asia \	Afghanistan	2
Africa	Egypt	2
	Eritrea	1
	Iran	1
	Iraq	1
	Israel	1
	Morocco	1
	Pakistan	1
	Syria	1
Eastern Europe	Fmr Yugoslavia	3
	Poland	2
Western nations	Chile	1
	Germany	2
	Spain	1

Table III.v

Other Foreign Language Experience in Country of Birth

Amount	n
Some	24
None	0

Table III.vi

Class type of interviewees

Class type	n
AMES	10
AELP	14

APPENDIX IV

CHECKLIST OF POINTS COVERED IN SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

Sex

Nationality

First language

Approximate age

Length of residence in Australia

Occupation

ASLPR level

Educational background

Previous language learning experience

What other languages

How many other languages

Where learnt

Methods

Enjoyment

Australian language learning experience

How long

How many courses

Where learnt

Type of students

Methods

Pairwork

Understand concept

Remember instances

Perceptions

Reasons for perceptions

How help

Anxiety

Type of partner

sex

age

ethnicity

education

level

character

chosen or told

Type of task

form

content

Comparison with group / class work

APPENDIX V

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Question 1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	8	3.9	3.9	3.9
	2.00	11	5.3	5.4	9.3
	3.00	15	7.2	7.4	16.7
	4.00	146	70.5	71.6	88.2
	5.00	24	11.6	11.8	100.0
	.	3	1.4	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	204	Missing cases	3		

Question 2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	7	3.4	3.5	3.5
	2.00	53	25.6	26.8	30.3
	3.00	9	4.3	4.5	34.8
	4.00	111	53.6	56.1	90.9
	5.00	18	8.7	9.1	100.0
	.	9	4.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	198	Missing cases	9		

Question 3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	7	3.4	3.4	3.4
	2.00	13	6.3	6.4	9.9
	3.00	12	5.8	5.9	15.8
	4.00	144	69.6	70.9	86.7
	5.00	27	13.0	13.3	100.0
	.	4	1.9	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	203	Missing cases	4		

Question 4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	6	2.9	3.0	3.0
	2.00	20	9.7	9.9	12.9
	3.00	8	3.9	4.0	16.8
	4.00	146	70.5	72.3	89.1
	5.00	22	10.6	10.9	100.0
	.	5	2.4	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	202	Missing cases	5		

Question 5

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	14	6.8	7.0	7.0
	2.00	25	12.1	12.6	19.6
	3.00	14	6.8	7.0	26.6
	4.00	133	64.3	66.8	93.5
	5.00	13	6.3	6.5	100.0
	.	8	3.9	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	199	Missing cases	8		

Question 6

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	28	13.5	13.9	13.9
	2.00	44	21.3	21.8	35.6
	3.00	23	11.1	11.4	47.0
	4.00	92	44.4	45.5	92.6
	5.00	15	7.2	7.4	100.0
	.	5	2.4	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	202	Missing cases	5		

Question 7

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	19	9.2	9.8	9.8
	2.00	41	19.8	21.2	31.1
	3.00	26	12.6	13.5	44.6
	4.00	98	47.3	50.8	95.3
	5.00	9	4.3	4.7	100.0
	.	14	6.8	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	193	Missing cases	14		

Question 8

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	5	2.4	2.6	2.6
	2.00	8	3.9	4.1	6.6
	3.00	13	6.3	6.6	13.3
	4.00	149	72.0	76.0	89.3
	5.00	21	10.1	10.7	100.0
	.	11	5.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	196	Missing cases	11		

Question 9

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	9	4.3	4.6	4.6
	2.00	28	13.5	14.2	18.8
	3.00	17	8.2	8.6	27.4
	4.00	126	60.9	64.0	91.4
	5.00	17	8.2	8.6	100.0
	.	10	4.8	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	197	Missing cases	10		

Question 10

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	34	16.4	17.2	17.2
	2.00	125	60.4	63.1	80.3
	3.00	10	4.8	5.1	85.4
	4.00	27	13.0	13.6	99.0
	5.00	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	.	9	4.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	198	Missing cases	9		

Question 11

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	6	2.9	3.1	3.1
	2.00	24	11.6	12.5	15.6
	3.00	7	3.4	3.6	19.3
	4.00	144	69.6	75.0	94.3
	5.00	11	5.3	5.7	100.0
	.	15	7.2	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	192	Missing cases	15		

Question 12

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2.00	5	2.4	2.6	3.6
	3.00	12	5.8	6.3	9.9
	4.00	149	72.0	77.6	87.5
	5.00	24	11.6	12.5	100.0
	.	15	7.2	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	192	Missing cases	15		

Question 13

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	17	8.2	9.3	9.3
	2.00	46	22.2	25.3	34.6
	3.00	16	7.7	8.8	43.4
	4.00	90	43.5	49.5	92.9
	5.00	13	6.3	7.1	100.0
	.	25	12.1	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	182	Missing cases	25		

Question 14

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	15	7.2	7.5	7.5
	2.00	38	18.4	19.0	26.5
	3.00	13	6.3	6.5	33.0
	4.00	119	57.5	59.5	92.5
	5.00	15	7.2	7.5	100.0
	.	7	3.4	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	200	Missing cases	7		

Question 15

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	8	3.9	4.6	4.6
	2.00	38	18.4	21.7	26.3
	3.00	29	14.0	16.6	42.9
	4.00	86	41.5	49.1	92.0
	5.00	14	6.8	8.0	100.0
	.	32	15.5	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	175	Missing cases	32		

Question 16

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	54	26.1	26.6	26.6
	3.00	70	33.8	34.5	61.1
	4.00	79	38.2	38.9	100.0
	.	4	1.9	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	203	Missing cases	4		

Question 17

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	38	18.4	19.5	19.5
	3.00	60	29.0	30.8	50.3
	4.00	97	46.9	49.7	100.0
	.	12	5.8	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	195	Missing cases	12		

Question 18

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	75	36.2	37.9	37.9
	3.00	65	31.4	32.8	70.7
	4.00	58	28.0	29.3	100.0
	.	9	4.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	198	Missing cases	9		

Question 19

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	76	36.7	39.0	39.0
	3.00	58	28.0	29.7	68.7
	4.00	61	29.5	31.3	100.0
	.	12	5.8	Missing	
	Total	207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	195	Missing cases	12		

Question 20

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	62	30.0	31.8	31.8
	3.00	52	25.1	26.7	58.5
	4.00	81	39.1	41.5	100.0
	.	12	5.8	Missing	
	Total	207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	195	Missing cases	12		

Question 21

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	40	19.3	20.5	20.5
	3.00	51	24.6	26.2	46.7
	4.00	104	50.2	53.3	100.0
	.	12	5.8	Missing	
	Total	207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	195	Missing cases	12		

Question 22

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	134	64.7	69.1	69.1
	2.00	2	1.0	1.0	70.1
	3.00	36	17.4	18.6	88.7
	4.00	22	10.6	11.3	100.0
	.	13	6.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	194	Missing cases	13		

Question 23

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	30	14.5	15.5	15.5
	2.00	100	49.3	51.5	67.0
	3.00	64	30.9	33.0	100.0
	.	13	6.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	194	Missing cases	13		

Question 24

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	20	9.7	10.4	10.4
	2.00	101	48.8	52.3	62.7
	3.00	38	18.4	19.7	82.4
	4.00	34	16.4	17.6	100.0
	.	14	6.7	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	193	Missing cases	14		

Question 25

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	31	15.0	16.2	16.2
	2.00	56	27.1	29.3	45.5
	3.00	104	50.2	54.5	100.0
	.	16	7.7	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	191	Missing cases	16		

Question 26

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	1.00	17	8.2	8.8	8.8
	2.00	27	13.0	13.9	22.7
	3.00	150	72.5	77.3	100.0
	.	13	6.3	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	194	Missing cases	13		

Question 27

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	16	7.7	10.7	10.7
	3.00	9	4.3	6.0	16.7
	4.00	124	59.9	83.2	100.0
	.	58	28.0	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	149	Missing cases	58		

Question 28

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	9	4.3	5.6	5.6
	3.00	8	3.9	5.0	10.6
	4.00	143	69.1	89.4	100.0
	.	47	22.7	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	160	Missing cases	47		

Question 29

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	13	6.3	8.6	8.6
	3.00	10	4.8	6.6	15.2
	4.00	129	62.3	84.9	93.4
	.	55	26.6	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	152	Missing cases	55		

Question 30

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	21	10.1	17.4	18.2
	3.00	11	5.3	9.1	27.3
	4.00	88	42.5	72.7	100.0
	.	87	42.0	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	121	Missing cases	86		

Question 31

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	7	3.4	4.7	4.7
	3.00	10	4.8	6.7	11.4
	4.00	132	63.8	88.6	100.0
	.	58	28.0	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	149	Missing cases	58		

Question 32

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	9	4.3	5.6	5.6
	3.00	6	2.9	3.8	9.4
	4.00	145	70.0	90.6	100.0
	.	47	22.7	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	160	Missing cases	47		

Question 33

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	6	2.9	4.1	4.1
	3.00	11	5.3	7.5	11.6
	4.00	130	62.8	88.4	100.0
	.	60	29.0	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	147	Missing cases	60		

Question 34

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	16	7.7	10.8	10.8
	3.00	5	2.4	3.4	14.2
	4.00	127	61.4	85.8	100.0
	.	59	28.5	Missing	
	Total	207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	148	Missing cases	59		

Question 35

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	5	2.4	6.0	6.0
	3.00	9	4.3	10.8	16.8
	4.00	69	33.3	83.1	100.0
	.	124	59.9	Missing	
	Total	207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	83	Missing cases	124		

Question 36

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	10	4.8	10.4	10.4
	3.00	3	1.4	3.1	13.5
	4.00	83	40.1	86.5	100.0
	.	111	53.6	Missing	
	Total	207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	96	Missing cases	111		

Question 37

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	11	5.3	11.2	11.2
	3.00	10	4.8	10.2	21.4
	4.00	77	37.2	78.6	100.0
	.	109	52.7	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	98	Missing cases	109		

Question 38

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	12	5.8	15.0	15.0
	3.00	10	4.8	12.5	27.5
	4.00	58	28.0	72.5	100.0
	.	127	61.4	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	80	Missing cases	127		

Question 39

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	7	3.4	6.9	6.9
	3.00	4	1.9	4.0	10.9
	4.00	90	43.5	89.1	100.0
	.	106	51.2	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	101	Missing cases	106		

Question 40

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	5	2.4	5.0	5.0
	3.00	2	1.0	2.0	7.0
	4.00	93	44.9	93.0	100.0
	.	107	51.7	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	100	Missing cases	107		

Question 41

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	6	2.9	6.5	6.5
	3.00	4	1.9	4.3	10.8
	4.00	83	40.1	89.2	100.0
	.	114	55.1	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	93	Missing cases	114		

Question 42

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid	Cum
				Percent	Percent
	2.00	15	7.2	15.6	15.6
	3.00	3	1.4	3.1	18.7
	4.00	78	37.7	81.3	100.0
	.	111	53.6	Missing	
Total		207	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	96	Missing cases	111		

APPENDIX VI
FREE RESPONSES

First Thoughts

- 1 It is more useful when I work alone
- 2 If the partner is the same level or a little higher than me I would like pairwork.
- 3 When I work with the other person usually we talk about our ideas and then we choose one answer which is good.
- 4 Last January in Australia I worked with other person. We had to introduce ourselves. The activity was interesting. I practise speaking. Also we laughed a lot. My partner at this time has the same idea as me
- 5 In the morning teacher asked to know each other. My partner was good person and he told me how he came to Australia
- 6 I generally used to work with active and helpful student. However, sometimes I found an arrogant student.
- 7 It is easy to talk with another one who is like me in speaking
- 8 I like to do work with other student in English classes or at home. It is easy to understand English and easy to improve my English.
- 10 Sometimes is good but sometimes is not good to work in pairs
- 11 I think that pairwork is useful because we always help each other improving our knowledge.
- 14 When I was studying English language at AMES my teacher gave me to write an essay. I tried to do but I couldn't then I decided to work with my friend and it was easy to write with her.
- 15 It was 3 years ago I gave answer on question. It was interesting for me. Partner was very busy and worked hard.
- 16 Yes I have done pairwork in my country. I think it is a good idea. Pairwork is important for me and other student because using our English we can share experience and opinions.
- 17 There was some problems, because the pair had different level of knowledge and talent between the two of the pair.
- 18 Pairwork was or may be useful only if my partner was/is on the same or higher than my English level. In my experience did not happen to work with good partner.
- 19 It depends of partners. Sometimes if other persons similar me, pairwork can be successful. For good pairwork I must choose partner, not teacher!!!
- 20 I like pairwork and I am always keen to go for this option. I need to feel respect who I am working with to have good results to do such work.
- 21 I don't enjoy working in pair very much because in some discussion only two people thinking are not enough. In fact I prefer working in a group.

- 22 Can help together. Something I do not. Pairwork can explain to understand or change idea. I think better than to work alone.
- 23 1 Nearly every day. 2 It is 50% helpful. However some people are passive and just copy from the other
- 25 The first English class in Beneficial House it was good and now I am better than before in English speaking but still problems to understand the questions
- 26 Useful
- 27 In my country high school to do exercise in the lab is good activity because it can cooperate to finish the work . Pretty nice
- 28 When both side give different idea. It is good to do the activity.
- 30 My experience so far is not good. Some students constantly denied me when I was sure that I was right
- 31 I thought I could improve my pronunciation. Now I am feeling the same
- 32 A classmate and I have some conversations with the situations in the lesson I studied
- 33 I enjoyed working in a team in my country but here it is hard to me. If the person is from different country it's harder to understand each other. There is more misunderstanding between two persons in here
- 35 Conversation, form filling, pronunciation
- 37 At first I felt worried and then I felt easier to talk with him and I liked this activity at last
- 38 It's very good
- 40 That is a very good teaching method. Also I think that their methods are very excellent
- 44 Discuss with the other student and I understand coming better and best
- 48 We are trying speak English, this is help me to learn English. We can practise the grammar. My partner try to speak English and she is a good partner.
- 51 We did grammar program. I thought it a little hard. But it was great because I knew something I never knew
- 52 When I was in the school we worked together in class. I think it's good but I like when my partner is active
- 53 When I met my partner he was good person and then we made friends for the first time. We practised some sentences and we helped.
- 54 First it was difficult but now I think this is very good activity. I think it's good to change partners for better practice. It's good also when teacher correct me and partner.
- 56 When I was in school we worked together in class. We didn't know English language and I thought I and my partner can't learn English but now I am sure I can.

- 59 Sometimes pairwork helps like in writing spelling and grammar, but not in conversation.
- 60 I had conversation and interview time it was wonderful. We need talking lesson as well so I like it.
- 62 We did an interview
- 64 We talk each other about exercises sometimes other things. Sometimes hard sometimes easy. We help each other.
- 66 I had a conversation with a classmate, we asked many questions to each other according to teacher's outline. My partner's English level is similar to me, so I think our talking was not bad.
- 68 I was younger I felt very bad. Now I like pairwork very much
- 69 Feeling good
- 73 I think it's a good chance to practise my English when I talk to another in my class.
- 74 We did an interview with each other and then wrote down about partner. I enjoyed because I can do it at my pace. But also I feel sorry about my partner. My English is very low level.
- 77 I don't like pairwork because I am a student and other people in my class are also students, we don't know English well and when we work together we can make mistakes and we don't know about it. We can't teach correctly each other.
- 82 I worked together and we were happy. I like attend to school because I learn more here. I would like to learn English language. I can practise my language with other students.
- 85 I like the activity, I need it because I know that I can learn English better with more activities.
- 88 I worked together with my friend in class (usually conversation)
- 92 We read and complete dialogue sentences. It was a good activity. Sometimes I like my partner and sometimes not.
- 93 About pairwork is speaking good for me
- 94 I had to work together with my friend in class. We discussed together about my lesson.
- 99 Some exercise, good activity
- 100 We talked about problems: Typhoons, cause and the effects. I liked the activity very much because I can improve my spoken and written English. My partners are very helpful and it is nice to work with them
- 102 The pairwork is good but the time is not enough. The time is half hour a week approximately on the other hand the different pronunciation from one to another. The words become not easy to understand.
- 103 Reading and discussing about some particular topics, useful, partner had good knowledge

- 104 We exercised pronunciation. We spoke to each other. It depended on partner.
105 At AMES, at MAE work with my partners to fill a paper about grammar. Is good
to work another person, because two ideas. Now I like to work in pairs.
106 Grammar practice, conversation, exchanging opinions, writing exercises
together. The activity was good and interesting
107 Pairwork can be good. Depends on the partner
108 I thought it was very nice but now I think it's boring.
110 In my English classes before, I mean in my country, I never worked in pairs.
Now, I like working in pairs because I can learn something from my partner
and I can develop more thinking and expressing my ideas.
112 Working in pair was helpful for me and for my partner. It helped me to
understand grammar.
114 I like pairwork
115 In the class we worked together, speaking. My partner is good.
116 I try to think, I'm happy.
117 I asked my partner about his country. I liked it. I was happy with my
partner.
118 It is not bad
119 I like pairwork because to speak English is good for us. If we do it more
time, we will speak well.
120 If my partner is a good person, suitable for me, I can study.
121 I liked my partner.
122 I liked to work with my partner.
123 I think it is good because sometimes you do not understand at all; you can
learn with and from your partner.
124 In conversation practice I think it is very interesting.
125 Practice English is very interesting.
126 I worked together with one person in class and I liked it.
129 I think it's good
130 About pairwork I felt very excited, because when I worked with my partner I
got much information from the others
132 Introduction with my partner and thinking in the activity, maybe my partner
have a very good idea or together work well.
133 Pairwork is good sometimes. it depends on the subject of the lesson.
134 I had presentation with other person. It was interesting because I did not
have the chance to speak to other people whose English is the same level as
me. It was a little bit difficult to understand each other, but we had good
fun.
135 It was interesting and useful but not necessary.
136 I've done pairwork in AMES class. Mostly we discussed about the story we
read, practise grammar and conversation. The activities were very useful such

as to break the ice between students. I have time to speak English, at home I speak Thai.

137 I think it is useful

138 Discussion with a partner helps to find out the solution of a task quicker and also helps to think better.

139 It is useful but not every time; for example if teacher give a problem I prefer to think by myself first. After I have the answer That's time is good for discussing in a pair to make sure of the answer.

140 Pairwork can correct the mistakes for each other, can discuss some problems.

141 Useful.

142 First, we discussed what we had to do, then we kept silent until the teacher asked everyone to open his mouth.

143 Pairwork is an interesting activity and can improve your pronunciation and conversation ability.

144 I think that it very useful and interesting. I like to talk to different sorts of people, especially have a discussion about interesting subject.

145 Sometimes it is not interesting. For example when the partner is on a different level of English.

147 It's very good.

150 I like it

151 Last course my partner's English better than me, so I enjoyed working together. But this course my partner's English lower than me so I feel it's hard to work together

153 In class sometimes I discuss some questions in pairs.

154 I like to work in pairs sometimes. I like my partner to give me ideas when we work together, not only copy my work.

155 We did the answers together; I thought it is good and my partner helpful.

156 At the first time working in pairs in class, I wasn't interested much. However, if the two have got enough English equally to discuss something the result will be better.

161 I remember that I worked with a classmate at first term. We usually had conversation. I think my partner who is a good partner. If you meet a good partner you will be lucky.

162 I think working in pairs is better than sit and listen only. Teacher is only one and about 30 students.

163 We had a conversation to discuss a topic which the teacher provided. I think this kind of activity is good for improving my speaking and my partner is very helpful for me to learn English.

164 I worked in pairs with my classmate many times. I was very enjoy to do that, about this problem that can be solved.

165 We tried hard and discussed. This is the best activity and my partner helped

- me with everything.
- 166 Writing together, writing answers to what we watched on TV.
- 169 Even if I worked in pair, usually I worked alone and next we check, because we haven't time to discuss this subject. Usually teacher hurries up and we don't solve each subject.
- 172 Did some exercises with small group. My partner was smarter than me and they were good English speakers.
- 174 On my last course we worked in pairs and I didn't like it very much because my partner braked me and slowed me in my work
- 175 We worked together, it's not so bad. Sometimes I thought I could not agree with my partner, sometimes he/she is bright. I could compare with my partner.
- 176 Mostly we worked together in this class and I don't have a certain partner because our group changes every week. I prefer to work together; this is very good for conversation.
- 177 I think pairwork is good and you have a lot of fun. We did some vocabulary exercises and my partner was good and helpful.
- 179 One partner who was a woman made me crazy for one week. She was asking me questions that I couldn't get time to help myself.
- 181 My partner sometimes helped me so I think working together (or group) is helpful, but not always.
- 182 I discuss with my partner. It's a good way to learn together with the partner having the same level. I hope my partner has the same knowledge in English.
- 183 I think pairwork is good when I have to do a speaking exercise.
- 184 We are talking to each other. I think it is good.
- 185 We talk to each other. It is not bad.
- 186 Very good exercise.
- 187 It is good exercise I think.
- 188 I like pairwork. But if the English level of my partner is lower than me it becomes boring. If it is equal or higher than me, it is useful for me.
- 189 I think my partner is a good companion and we help one another.
- 190 The first time was in here, I can get profit from any person.
- 191 I don't remember when we talked together. It's very helpful. My partner is a wonderful person.
- 192 It was a good idea from my teacher to change the group every week, so I could talk with most of them. Some are good and intelligent and some are bad. I like to work with other persons.
- 194 I have done pairwork many times in this class and I liked it. My partner was helpful.
- 195 I like work with pairwork in the classroom because we can talk to each other. It helps me to learn English and learn other things.
- 197 We did a discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of computers. The

activity was very interesting for me. My partner was a student who spoke English well.

- 199 I thought it is a good idea and I like it. I thought my partner gave me some good ideas so I got a lot of good ideas.
- 200 Some partners are good in speaking and some are not too good. So it is hard to explain to them.
- 201 I like to do the lessons working in pairs, which helps me understand more quickly than doing it myself.
- 202 I'm happy if we can work together because we can help each other. We can be more close, more understand other nationalities, religions.
- 205 I'm very happy if we work together and discuss with pairwork.

Positive Reasons

- 3 At this moment, pairwork is just OK. I do not like it too much but I don't hate either. Because I haven't had a partner who is suitable with me.
- 4 Learning others' cultures
- 6 To build up a friendship and study the behaviour of different people who come from different backgrounds
- 7 I don't like too much. I like to do work in pairs sometimes.
- 8 I would like to work with pairwork with a person who speaks English is better than me, so I'll learn something from he/she.
- 12 In my opinion it is the best way to learn English
- 13 Because it is a better way to learn English for migrant students
- 14 You can improve your knowledge by working with people
- 16 it gives me a great opportunity to share my idea and opinions with other students
- 17 If we have good partner, we would be able to improve our English level and we would make a relationship with the partner.
- 18 It may be useful, when the partner is better than me and he/she is a little active or much more active than me.
- 20 Can give me sort of social knowledge of my partner
- 21 Doing some short exercises I find pairwork has got some advantages because it is more flexible than working in a group.
- 22 Depends if partner very good English I like pairwork because can learn something from pairwork, but if partner not very good I like to work myself
- 27 Because more practice with the partner, if a whole class or group practice less than pair work.
- 28 Good pronunciation
- 29 Pairwork is required just for 3/4 - 1 hr/ day not more
- 32 Make friends with other people
- 42 I like conversation, listen and write

- 51 Because it is a good thing to learn English.
- 52 I like pairwork when I have a good partner
- 53 The reason why I like pairwork because it helped me when I was learning English. It was important when I was learning more practice and grammar.
- 54 I like to work with better students which can help me.
- 55 I like pairwork when I have a good partner.
- 56 I like pairwork when I have a good partner.
- 60 I can contact other nationality's people. I can enjoy. We have the same ambitions therefore we can help each other.
- 69 Can improve conversation
- 72 I can learn new ideas with my partner.
- 78 I like work with my partner because my partner help me when I not understand words
- 81 At home I speak Vietnamese with my family. I want to speak English but my vocabulary is little. I would like to have pairwork to learn together.
- 86 I like pairwork because we help each other.
- 93 I like pairwork because sometimes helps me, it practises my talking
- 94 Because it helps learn more English.
- 103 We can know each other very well- we can easy to have some friends- we can practise to understand other's accent
- 104 It depends on partner. If I work with partner who knows English better than I, I can learn.
- 112 When you work in pairs you get to know the person and his point of view.
- 114 Pairwork good for me, easy to understand.
- 115 Good for conversation.
- 116 Because it's easy for me to study English
- 123 You have better contact to your partner.
- 124 I like it, you can not learn English from one thing.
- 125 It's interesting for talking.
- 126 Because it helps me for my English language activity
- 127 I like pairwork because it affects my ability to help myself to study step by step.
- 130 Pairwork is an activity to improve my English, to get more knowledge from the others, to decrease shyness each other.
- 132 I think that pairwork depends on the other partner and the orientation of the teacher.
- 134 When I did presentation, we could cheer up each other. I can be used to strong accents, new words. I would like to do other activities but it doesn't mean I don't want to do pairwork. :-)
- 137 In this way I have improved my knowledge of English language.
- 139 Pairwork makes me confident

- 141 Easier way to learn and understand. Two opinions are better than one opinion.
157 Working in pairs can help students to speak with each other and help each other because 2 head is better than a head.
162 Because I'm not afraid of my partners about my grammar.
163 Working in a pair or a group, I think it makes it easier to learn.
166 The more we work together, the more we can improve our talking and solving our problems in the classroom and understand each other.
177 Nice to get to know the other person.
178 Pairwork is only good for conversation.
179 I got lots of information.
181 Very helpful
188 If the English level of the all students is same, pairwork is useful.
189 Because it is good for my English.
191 When I'm studying it's very helpful for me.
196 Because he/she is my classmate and we share our classwork. Furthermore, we have different opinions.
198 I like pairwork because pairwork helps me learn other things and helps me to remember things. Sometimes pairwork helps me to learn other things. Students can exchange ideas and opinions in pairs.
200 We know about their country and we have a lot of knowledge.
205 I can gain many ideas and friends.
206 I can improve my pronunciation and speaking to learn many things.

Negative Reasons

- 5 I think pairwork depend on who you are talking to
6 Wrong selection and making of the pairwork teams.
11 Have to move to other seat
17 If I can't get a good partner, this situation is like a torture.
18 I have met usually lazy partner or partner with pronunciation problems. I believe that are good methods of working with and they may be useful.
22 Partner not very good English. Pronunciation is difficult to understand. Partner who are not helpful.
24 I like pairwork, generally
30 Working with the class. Working in groups.
33 Usually low interest from student who you have to talk with
39 They have the same level. They haven't the correct answer. Therefore I think my English doesn't improve.
44 The other reason is accent
59 Because the other student in pair is also migrant and his language isn't proper neither.
62 I have to listen to a wrong pronunciation, grammar

- 99 Sometimes I can't understand partner
- 104 Some tasks I can do myself better than in pair
- 107 Sometimes partner can be boring.
- 112 No, but it depends who your partner is
- 131 I want to be dependent on my own
- 132 Sometimes I don't understand the partner
- 134 Sometimes both of them make same mistakes or misunderstandings. In that case there is no-one who can correct the mistakes about the grammar
- 135 Sometimes I can't understand the person who works with me in pairs, or that person can't understand me. That makes pairwork difficult.
- 136 Grammar or conversation are alright but so much about introducing yourself where you come from, what is your nationality, is boring activities; just once in an orientation class, then NO MORE.
- 139 Sometimes we think in a different way (one of us do not agree) with the answer.
- 142 Waste time, learn wrong grammar from each other; learn incorrect pronunciation.
- 145 Sometimes I do not like the partner with whom I have to work.
- 151 First, I'm used to thinking myself and sometimes if you discuss with the other person so that takes time and we did not finish the work in time.
- 152 I don't like pairwork when I have a partner whose English isn't as good as mine.
- 156 Not interested. Not many ideas to exchange and practise.
- 162 Sometimes people have different pronunciation from China or Russia, I can't learn to speak well.
- 166 Sometimes if both people's level is equal; if both people don't like to talk much it will not be good.
- 177 In pairwork sometimes only one makes the exercises and the other doesn't understand.
- 181 If my partner is often absent I will worry.

Preferred Activities

- 5 I like work with the groups
- 8 I would like to read English dictionary which is my friend can also help me a lot.
- 16 I prefer pairwork
- 18 Work by myself- work with teacher (one student + one teacher)- small but serious group.
- 21 I prefer working in a small group. 3 or 4 people.
- 33 Groups, but almost, the class and teacher, especially with teacher, because

- other students don't know English and they are not helpful.
- 51 Sometimes I liked to do more written English.
- 53 I would prefer to work by myself and look for small groups to work together.
- 57 Working by myself
- 62 Working by myself or with the whole class.
- 77 I prefer to work myself and check it with my teacher
- 105 Conversations, grammar exercises, games
- 108 Working by myself.
- 131 Study by myself
- 132 I work too slow then I like working by myself.
- 135 Working with the whole class.
- 136 Working by myself.
- 140 Work with small groups or work by myself.
- 142 Talk with the teacher individually.
- 145 I prefer working in small groups.
- 151 I'm not sure, some subject I like working in small groups, some times I prefer to do myself.
- 152 I prefer work in a small group or with all the class.
- 154 I like pairwork sometimes but not all the time and sometimes it is very useful.
- 156 Practise in small group.
- 158 I prefer working in small groups.
- 166 I prefer to work in pairwork
- 174 I like to work by myself. Working in small groups is better in my opinion.
- 177 I prefer to work by myself.
- 178 Working by myself with vocabulary words.
- 179 Teacher with one student for half an hour every day in turn.
- 180 Working in group is better than pairwork.
- 181 I prefer 3-4 person group.
- 182 I like pairwork.
- 207 I like to do by myself

Partner Comments

- 6 An active one with great motivations
- 8 I like to have a partner whose English is better than me
- 14 It doesn't matter
- 17 I hope the partner who is gently friendly and not selfish.
- 18 The first language of my partner does not make any difference but I prefer partner with a good pronunciation.
- 22 Polite
- 26 Very well educated

- 32 The person who speaks English clearly
- 33 It's not need that partner has to be from the same country, but I prefer partner who is from the same part, like I am from [Eastern Europe] and I prefer someone from Europe, no from Asia or South America or other parts
- 34 Not too proud of themself
- 43 I may work with partner who willing to work better than before.
- 52 I like work with a nice partner
- 53 The type of partner that I would work with who is better English than me and always happy person.
- 54 I think must be friendly.
- 55 I like work with partner who knows English very well.
- 56 I like work with partner who knows English well.
- 60 Different nationality
- 66 I hope my partner's English level is better than me, but not too high..
- 68 When we work in pairwork I like my partner to work well with me.
- 77 I prefer to work with partner who is better than I
- 81 I like to have a different partner sometimes a partner I choose because sometimes teacher chooses for me a partner not as good at English as me. She didn't help me.
- 85 Have to like speaking, working, talking. Better or same level as me.
- 112 If his knowledge is better than yours, it's good. They should be nice people with sense of humour.
- 120 If partner is good for me.
- 130 The partner that I usually work with is better than me about English. So I could practise English. Besides the partner should have a knowledge that can teach me.
- 134 A partner who is better at English than me can help me a lot. But it doesn't matter for me. I think I can learn something from anybody.
- 140 Friendly, clever, happy person.
- 141 Same similarity in my interest things especially in English and daily life matters.
- 142 I like a partner whose English is a little bit better than me.
- 144 Should be interested in studying and improving English language.
- 152 I don't like a boring partner.
- 153 I like the partner's English is better than me.
- 154 ~~She didn't listen to the teacher sometimes when the teacher gave work she~~
always waited to ask me and copied my answer.
- 162 Must be happy.
- 163 Cheerful, easy going.
- 178 Just that he/she is interested in English and serious to work.
- 184 He is a good person.

- 196 The type of partner is active man/woman, too much talking and full understanding.

Task comments

- 6 Comparing works and ideas with others and I think it is good way if there enough time
- 7 Working with the teacher and sometimes in groups
- 18 Writing of long piece of something (e.g paragraph) is absolutely not useful because everyone has a different ideas and his/her own way of writing.
- 21 Quiz and competition are quite interesting activity I did.
- 24 I can't remember
- 31 As well as I can do they want improving their English
- 33 If there is need to work in a pair, like Role play that's OK but if there is chance to work by ourselves (like grammar exercises) I prefer alone than in a pair
- 85 I like these activities; I think they are useful for me. I feel I can learn in this class because my teacher is very good for me.
- 95 I did some activities but my pronunciation not very good. Sometimes when I speak with somebody outside they didn't understand what I said
- 119 It is good for all.
- 134 While I was learning English in Japan, there is almost no chance to speak, so I love this course.
- 136 Topic presentation is a useful activity.
- 138 I don't remember other activities.
- 141 More conversation about daily life around us could be useful if put in program.
- 142 Sometimes we just gossip, talk about something irrelevant or even use our own language.
- 145 I prepared a talk with a partner. I think it was very interesting.
- 147 The best way to learn English is to mix everything together. Little bit that, little bit another MIX!
- 162 More conversation

APPENDIX VII

SAMPLE INTERVIEW EXTRACT

- A: So, you come from {Country of birth} and you learnt English in school. When you learnt English in {Country of birth}, you learnt in high school?
- B: No, in primary school.
- A: In primary school, you started in primary school?
- B: Yes, I don't know now, but about after third year, we started.
- A: As early as that. Where in {Country of birth} are you from?
- B: {Country of birth}, from {place}.
- A: From {place}, yes okay, I see. I didn't think you'd learn in {place}. You didn't learn English. Now maybe, a little.
- A: Now, do you think the methods of teaching were different there? What is the biggest difference?
- B: It was {Country of birth}-English, not really English-English. You know, you have the {Country of birth} accent and then when you come to an English-speaking country, I mean you understand but really you can't speak it because it's just that little different but what makes you answer isn't really correct now. It isn't correct.
- A: Right. So you felt much happier. What about the actual methods. Not the quality of the language, but the methods?
- B: I can't really remember.
- A: You can't really remember. Okay, so when you started learning here with MAE, what did you like about the teaching with MAE?
- B: I like the working groups.
- A: Groups?. You mean, what?
- B: The groups where you have to talk and you have to ask.
- A: You mean groups of three or four people?
- B: Yes
- A: You prefer groups to two people?. I mean when you're working with one partner, you prefer a group?
- B: Yes I prefer a group.
- A: Why is that?
- B: Because they have more discussion and when you have a dominant partner and he thinks he's right, you always say okay, you're right and leave it, even though you know you are right.
- A: Does this happen often that one person is more dominant?
- B: Yes, it happens often.
- A: Does this destroy, does this ruin the atmosphere in the group?
- B: Yes, because people they keep quiet and when one is more dominant, he gives the answers even when you-the group knows they are incorrect

- A: Yes, and are you a dominant person?
- B: No.
- A: So you don't think you are a dominant person?
- B: No, I'm not.
- A: What sort of things did you do in groups and in pairs?
- B: We talked about typhoons problems.
- A: Yes, I think you mentioned this. Was this recently, was it?
- B: Yes, that was in the last course. And what else did we do.
- A: Not that the typhoon happened last night or the night before.
- B: No, we talked about Singapore and Hong Kong. What happens when Hong Kong goes over to China.
- A: Yes. Do you find you mainly do conversation then or discussion in pairs, or ..?
- B: Yes, conversation, discussion and we write down and we work out what the problems could be, the cause and effect of them.
- A: When you are just doing discussions, do you feel you are wasting your time?.
- B: No, no.
- A: Because some people say that you're here to learn English and learning English means sitting down, writing and just getting input from the teacher.
- B: No, I feel when you have discussions it improves your English, words probably you didn't know so in my opinion it stays more in my head than when I write it down and its forgotten.
- A: What about when you are in groups or in pairs, what about the other person's pronunciation?
- B: Oh, it doesn't disturb me.
- A: It doesn't disturb you at this level because that's one of the main things people say, disturbs them, pronunciation. What about mistakes, does the other person correct you or do you correct ...
- B: Yes, I correct them.
- A: Does that upset you when somebody?
- B: No, I find it helpful when somebody corrects me because I'm not used to my own mistakes so when somebody hears my mistakes I can correct myself.
- A: Right, so you don't mind that it's a student correcting you and not a teacher.
- B: No.
- A: Right, that's another point as I say that people don't like being corrected. And what sort of partner would you like. Do you like them the same level?
- B: It doesn't matter to me.
- A: You are the ideal student, the partner doesn't matter and the level and of course nationality or things like that, they
- B: I mean you can even when the English is not from your partner is not the same

level as yours but he could have ideas you don't have.

A: So, its not just English, its ideas you can learn which is

B: Still you can learn. It doesn't mean he's stupid when his level is not the same as my level.

A: Yes, that's very true. Do you see the difference between liking something and finding it useful as I tried to explain, and working in groups or as I said, in pairs, do you find it useful and enjoyable or do you find it both?. Or does it depend on the situation?

B: It depends on the situation.

A: What alters the situation?

B: First its the group you have. Is it people they work together or people they like to work on their own. It makes it hard people they like on their own and they don't discuss in the group what they think, they only write it down and keep it to themselves so it makes group work harder.

A: Yes, right, yes. Does that happen often, do you think?

B: Oh no, not often.

A: Not often. Which course is this? Is this your first course?

B: No, this is my second MAE and I had a course in {place}, English class.

A: Was that a community course was it or with Adult Migrant Education?

B: Adult Migrant Education.

A: Yes, they do ... I didn't know if they still did courses out in {place} but Right, is there anything you wanted to say about this idea of working with partners, working in pairs, anything else?

B: No, I find it okay.

A: You find it okay. What things do you like the best in class altogether?. What sort of activities?

B: Er, activities

A: Everything is okay is it?

B: Yes. I find grammar is useful, that doesn't mean I like it because I have difficulties with it. I find it nice when we have discussions with the whole class. When the teacher

A: But you don't talk as much when you have it with the whole class?

B: No, you don't talk as much, but you hear different opinions because we come all from a different country so you learn more about the countries where people come from.

A: Yes, right. So that has an advantage that you still are hearing, you still are listening although you may not be speaking so much.