

Participation of Students in Group Discussion in EFL Classroom at Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School: Grade Ten in Focus

Chernet Zerga¹

¹Wolkite University, Wolkite

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: August 2026	The objective of this study was to assess student participation during group discussions in the EFL classroom, specifically focusing on Grade 10 students at Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School. A mixed-methods research approach and a descriptive survey design were employed. Data were collected from 80 participants—77 students and 3 English language teachers—selected through purposive sampling. The primary instruments included classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and questionnaires. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 20, while qualitative data from observations and interviews were analyzed thematically. The findings revealed that several factors hinder student participation in group discussions: high teacher turnover (frequent transfers), students' weak educational backgrounds, limited pedagogical knowledge among teachers, low English language proficiency, and cultural influences. The study recommends that the Woreda Education Office reduce teacher transfers and that teachers enhance their pedagogical skills. Establishing English Language Improvement Clubs (ELIC), reducing class sizes, assigning clear roles within groups, and providing regular feedback are also recommended. Furthermore, teachers and school administrators should foster community awareness to support student engagement in interactive learning.
Keywords:	

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of Study

People develop and acquire knowledge, experiences, beliefs, and perceptions through education. It helps to pave the way for growth and acts as a mechanism for socio-cultural, financial, technological, political, and environmental progress. However, all schools should promote the teaching-learning process using good lanes contact (teacher-student, student-a student or student-student) to achieve these goals or to provide better education, which means that active participation should be observed during all courses of the planning process. Therefore, group discussion is a student-centered method of teaching and learning process that stresses communication, coordination, and collaboration. The key issues in our academic arena, especially in Ethiopian context, revolve around learning process defects. Students are less encouraged to improve logical thought in many ways, especially in the language learning process. The learning process in the classroom forces students to push their brain and resources to memorize information without developing it to their living condition. On the other hand, teachers control classroom operations, and teaching is simply the transfer of experience from the teacher to the students. The students are passive receivers of whatever the teacher teaches them. In this situation, the students are left with no plan for making their own learning experience more relevant. Students that are learned with a plan are more pretty qualified than those who are not and can be led to more successful learning (Nunan, 1999). Beginning in elementary school, English is taught as a foreign language in Ethiopia. Primary and higher education also uses it as a means of instruction. Despite spending a long time learning English, students are unable to achieve the necessary proficiency level when they enter tertiary education. According to Harmer (2001), is a common framework for exchanging thoughts in a real-world environment, and it is suitable for communicating in a language classroom. As a result, to consider learners in the success of group work assignments, application of group work, expectations, and differentiating difficulties of group work in teaching and acquiring English language speaking abilities, there is a significant role for group work. From this, we can say that working with others is crucial in language learning. Learners are given strong responsibilities when doing group work to develop their communicative skills. As a result, students should act out their various positions. Group discussion is also called group work. Many scholars believe that group work is advantageous to second language learners because it provides many and varied opportunities for meaningful interaction with the target language

Divis (1993) suggests that classroom discussion provides students with opportunities to acquire knowledge and insight through the face-to-face exchange of information, ideas, and opinions. Group discussion can be produced on matched experiences as students articulate their ideas and opinion response to their classmates and develop skills in evaluation and sustainment. A lively productive discussion is among the most challenging activities for an instructor. Group Discussion, according to Rance-Roney (2010), is a classroom learning activity in which students collaborate in groups to build information and complete assignments through collective participation. Group work helps students to develop their power of expression or social skills so that they can work more effectively. As result, students could use the target language for communicating effectively (Alfares). Jordon (1997:11) states that shyness, lack

of self-confidence unwillingness, lack of knowledge selecting an unsuitable topic for discussion, over large room and group in the habit seating arrangement of students and tutor, are some of the problems that affect students in group discussion participate.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Foreign language teaching and learning methods advocate the use of group work in language classes. For example, Brumfit (1984) considers group work as an essential feature of this method. The importance of group work is to ensure that all members are fully involved in learning activities. Foreign and Ethiopian researchers have conducted several pieces of research on teaching and learning speaking skills in group discussions.

From Ethiopian researchers: Adem (2007) researched the challenges and opportunities of group work, and he declared academic status differences in participation and domination as major challenges of teachers in using group work. Berhanu (2000) investigated the practice of cooperative learning in grade eleventh students and mentioned that the implications of the findings for increased or more equitable verbal participation among students in group discussion and the need for research into internal and external variables affected students' participation. He also explored that there was a huge difference in participation among students in terms of their verbal participation in group discussions. Getachew (2008) also studied an assessment of factors that affect students' verbal participation in group work activities of EFL class through satellite TV and the role of teachers to maximize the students' participation in group work. He found out that the time given for discussion is insufficient, and students' seating arrangements are the major factors. Gebrewahid (2011) conducted research on perception and roles of EFL students' in-group work activities and he revealed that students did not perform their expected roles in group work activities. Girma (2005) also investigated factors that impede teachers' group work implementation. He then found out students' use of mother tongue, disciplinary problems, motivation, and fear as factors negatively affecting group work.

However, the above research findings focused on students related problems. According to the current researcher, good teachers, and cultural background plays a great role in the participation of students in group discussion. Therefore, the current study focused on what good teachers and cultures contribute to the participation of students in group discussion in the case of grade 10 students' at Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School. The researcher worked as an English language teacher and taught students in this school. From his teaching experience, he informally observed that when EFL teachers give group discussions, students were unwilling to participate

in the discussions. Perhaps, the problem could be worried about making mistakes, cultural influences, or classroom environment, due to their poor proficiency of the language and fear of colleagues could laugh at them, etc. Because of these assumptions, the researcher was inspired to conduct a study on assessments of students' participation in the group discussion at Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School in focus. There is no research conducted in the focused area related to this topic. Thus, the main purpose of this study is to assess the students' participation during group discussions in the EFL classrooms.

1.3 Research questions

The study intended to answer the following basic research questions:

- What is the perception of students about group discussion?
- What are the challenges that hinder students' participation in group discussions?
- Do the teachers have good Attitude of Group Discussion?

1.4 Objectives of the study

1.4.1 General Objective

The general objective of the study was to assess the participation of students during group discussions in the EFL classroom.

1.4.2 The Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Identify the students' perceptions towards group discussion
- Assess the challenges of students to participate in group discussions
- See teachers' Attitude towards group discussion

1.5 Significance of Study

This research is expected to have the following benefits:

Teachers may be able to see if group discussion is effective or ineffectual enough to be utilized as one of the ways to increase students' participation in their learning process in group discussion as a result of this research. The focus of this study is on students' participation in group discussions, it is intended that, students' may reflect on whether or not they participated sufficiently in a group discussion. They may express their thoughts in group discussions and engage in active learning if they participate. Furthermore, the researcher expects that in the future, they may undertake a better method of learning. In addition this research may be used as a reference for those who wants to conduct further researches on this or related to this topic.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study was designed to assess the students' participation in group discussion and the English teachers' at Tebeteban secondary and preparatory school. Due to the current situation (COVID-19), the participants in this study were delimited to students of grade 10 only. Therefore, the findings may be valid only to students who are learning in this school. So that it cannot be generalized to other students in other institutions. Thematically, the study was delimited to the participation of students during group discussion in EFL Classroom.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The research had many limitations, and the first was the pandemic results the group discussions limited groups to talk together freely and at the times when the researcher gathered data, there were difficulties like unable to record groups freely together with when a teacher approached them. Besides, EFL teachers were less likely to interact and discuss tasks/activities with their students based on the communicative language teaching theories allow. Moreover, had all the classrooms were open for discussions, the results could have been generalized for other schools. Furthermore, unable to record all the teacher formed/ created groups at a time was a challenge since a few groups were using their L1 in the discussions.

1.8 Definitions Key Terms

In this research, four words are often used. The four elements are perception, participation, group discussion, and understanding. To avoid ambiguity when reading and discussing this paper, the researcher briefly addressed these four terms as follows:

1.8.1 Perception

Students' thoughts about their involvement or effort during Group Discussion in an EFL classroom are referred to as perception in this review.

1.8.2 Participation

Students' personal motivation in classroom events through the group discussion approach is referred to as participation in this review. As a result, to participate in classroom teaching, students must take some initiative.

1.8.3 Group Discussion

In this research, group discussion is a student-centered method of teaching and learning process in the academic arena, and students are given an informative and exciting strategy to enable them to engage fairly in the classroom exercise.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Overview

This chapter provides a theoretical and empirical synthesis of literature relevant to group discussion and student participation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction. It examines the theoretical foundations of group discussion, functional roles assigned to learners and teachers, structural modes of classroom implementation, and the pedagogical benefits and challenges associated with small-group interaction. Furthermore, it analyzes key socio-affective constructs—including participation and perception—and evaluates relevant empirical studies from international and Ethiopian educational contexts to establish the research gap addressed by this study.

2.2 Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

2.2.1 Conceptualizing Group Discussion

Group discussion is fundamentally anchored in social constructivist learning theory, which posits that language acquisition and cognitive development occur through mediated social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). In educational contexts, group discussion is conceptualized as a structured instructional strategy in which learners communicate face-to-face in small groups to exchange ideas, solve problems, or achieve shared learning objectives (Jones, 1977; Slavin, 1990).

Classroom discussion provides learners with meaningful opportunities to internalize target language structures and gain conceptual insights through reciprocal verbal interaction (Davis, 1993). Baid (1993) frames group discussion as an exercise in reflective thinking and oral communication directed toward cooperative problem-solving. Junkin (1987) further emphasizes that small-group interaction enables students to active-construct meaning rather than passively absorb instructor-led input.

2.2.2 Theoretical Constructs

In examining group-based language instruction, four core constructs guide the analytical framework of this study:

- **Group Discussion:** The interactive, small-group instructional method deployed to facilitate target language practice.
- **Participation:** The observable degree of active engagement, verbal turn-taking, and cognitive contribution demonstrated by learners during group tasks.
- **Perception:** Learners' cognitive interpretations and evaluation of the utility, efficacy, and dynamics of group discussion.
- **Comprehension:** The linguistic and conceptual mastery achieved through collaborative dialogue and peer negotiation of meaning.

2.3 Roles in Group Discussion

2.3.1 Student Functional Roles

To prevent diffusion of responsibility and minimize free-riding during small-group tasks, specific operational roles are frequently assigned to group members:

- **Facilitator:** Maintains task focus, clarifies objectives, manages meeting agendas, and ensures equitable turn-taking among participants.
- **Recorder:** Documents discussion points, decisions, and task outputs in an accurate and objective manner.
- **Arbitrator/Monitor:** Monitors interpersonal dynamics, manages task-related conflicts, and encourages quieter members to contribute.
- **Timekeeper:** Tracks task progression relative to allocated time limits to ensure all agenda items are addressed.
- **Tension Releaser:** Leverages interpersonal sensitivity and constructive humor to alleviate social anxiety and promote a supportive group atmosphere.

- Spokesperson/Reporter: Consolidates final group deliverables and presents findings to the instructor and wider class.
- Summarizer: Periodically reviews discussion progress to verify collective understanding and consensus.
- Reflector: Paraphrases and reformulates peer contributions to ensure communicative accuracy and mutual clarity.

2.3.2 Pedagogical Roles of the Teacher

In communicative language classrooms, the teacher's role shifts from a traditional deliverer of knowledge to a facilitator, organizer, resource provider, and assessor (Harmer, 2001). Effective implementation requires teachers to:

- Set clear, goal-oriented tasks and explain procedures explicitly prior to discussion.
- Formulate balanced groups based on learner needs, proficiency levels, and task objectives.
- Monitor group interactions unobtrusively, providing scaffolding without dominating the discourse.
- Offer constructive linguistic and procedural feedback following task completion.

2.4 Modes of Group Discussion

Teachers utilize varied structural configurations based on lesson objectives, class size, and spatial dynamics (Harmer, 1991):

- Buzz Groups: Short, rapid discussions involving 2–3 participants tasked with generating initial ideas or answering specific prompts within brief timeframes (Brown & Atkins, 2002).
- Small Group Discussions: Structured interactions comprising 4–6 learners engaged in extended problem-solving, debate, or collaborative learning activities.
- Whole-Class Discussions: Instructor-facilitated exchanges that combine direct instruction with guided student inquiry and vocabulary reinforcement.
- Pyramid (Snowball) Discussions: Sequential communicative tasks where learners begin working individually, merge into pairs, aggregate into small groups, and ultimately join a whole-class debate (Wallace, 1991).

2.5 Advantages, Challenges, and Affective Determinants

2.5.1 Pedagogical Advantages

Collaborative group work yields significant cognitive, affective and linguistic benefits:

- Cognitive Development: Fosters higher-order critical thinking, logical reasoning, and analytical problem-solving skills (Littlewood, 1984).
- Affective Gains: Enhances motivation, builds classroom community, and reduces foreign language classroom anxiety (Nunan, 1998; Marcia, 1997).
- Communicative Output: Increases Student Talk Time (STT) and provides authentic contexts for negotiating meaning in the target language (Johnson, 2000).

2.5.2 Operational Challenges

Despite its established efficacy, group discussion faces systemic constraints:

- First Language (L1) Reliance: In monolingual EFL settings, learners frequently revert to their native language when linguistic confidence or domain vocabulary is lacking (Wallace, 1991).
- Unequal Participation: Dominant students may monopolize talk time, sidelining introverted or less proficient peers (Jordan, 1997).
- Classroom Management Constraints: Large class sizes, immovable furniture, noise level control, and inadequate time management often impede smooth execution (Harmer, 2001).

2.6 Empirical Review and Synthesis

2.6.1 International Empirical Context

- Towns et al. (2000) investigated undergraduate perspectives on small-group learning in the United States, demonstrating that interactive group tasks fostered a strong sense of learning community and enhanced academic achievement through peer teaching.
- Li and Campbell (2005) examined Asian international students in New Zealand higher education, finding highly favorable attitudes toward group tasks for enhancing oral English proficiency and cross-cultural understanding.
- Nur Atthiyah (2018) evaluated EFL university students' attitudes in Indonesia, reporting that while group work significantly improved communicative confidence, students expressed concerns regarding unfairness in group-level assessment.

2.6.2 Ethiopian Empirical Context

- Berhanu Yayo (2013) examined primary school teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and practices concerning cooperative learning in Alamata Town. Findings revealed that while teachers held positive attitudes toward cooperative methods, actual classroom execution was severely hindered by insufficient pedagogical training and poor physical seating arrangements.
- Adem Mohammed (2007) investigated challenges in implementing group work in Grade 9 EFL classrooms in Dire Dawa. The study highlighted large class sizes, limited teacher preparation, and low student readiness as major impediments to effective communicative group practice.

2.7 Research Gap and Chapter Summary

While existing international research firmly establishes the theoretical and affective benefits of group discussion, local empirical studies in Ethiopia (e.g., Adem, 2007; Berhanu, 2013) have predominantly focused on macro-level implementation challenges and general teacher attitudes toward cooperative learning. There remains a paucity of empirical investigation into how specific student functional roles, perceptual factors, and classroom interactional patterns directly influence active participation in primary and secondary EFL contexts. This study fills this gap by critically examining the interplay between learner perceptions, structural group roles, and active participation in the EFL classroom.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design and Setting

This study employed a descriptive mixed-methods survey design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches (Creswell, 2003) to assess Grade 10 students' participation in EFL classroom group discussions. The investigation was conducted at Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School in Guraghe Zone during the second semester of the 2013 E.C. (March–June 2021) academic year.

3.2 Target Population and Sampling Techniques

The study utilized a purposive sampling strategy to select Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School based on geographical accessibility, student academic level, and teacher experience (Maxwell, 1996). A comprehensive census sampling approach was applied to include all Grade 10 students ($N = 77$, spread across three sections) and all active Grade 10 EFL teachers ($n = 3$), ensuring total population coverage for robust data collection.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Data were collected from primary sources using three triangulated instruments:

- Questionnaire: Administered to all 77 students, featuring 42 closed-ended Likert-scale items and 7 open-ended items designed to gather quantitative data on student perspectives and engagement.
- Classroom Observation: Conducted across six focus group discussions using a structured checklist to directly evaluate teacher facilitation and learner interaction patterns.
- Semi-Structured Interviews: Conducted face-to-face with all 3 EFL teachers to extract qualitative insights regarding classroom practices and pedagogical challenges.

3.4 Instrument Validity, Reliability, and Pilot Testing

Instrument validation involved expert review by a university advisor and peer EFL educators. A pilot study was conducted with 30 volunteer Grade 10 students and 3 EFL teachers at Jimma Welene Secondary and Preparatory School (a non-sample site). Based on pilot feedback, 3 items were revised and 5 ambiguous items were removed. Internal consistency for the questionnaire was confirmed using SPSS (version 20), yielding a high Cronbach's alpha coefficient of $\alpha = 0.928$.

3.5 Data Analysis

A convergent mixed-methods analysis framework was used:

- Quantitative Data: Questionnaire responses were processed using SPSS (v. 20) and analyzed using descriptive statistics, specifically frequencies and percentages.
- Qualitative Data: Data from observation checklists and transcribed teacher interviews were organized thematic-wise, coded, and analyzed narrative-form to corroborate quantitative findings.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Formal approval and letters of cooperation were secured from Wolkite University (College of Social Sciences and Humanities) and the local Woreda Education Office. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection, ensuring anonymity, voluntary participation, and data confidentiality throughout the study.

4. Analysis of Result and Discussions

This study assesses students' participation in EFL classroom group discussions at Tebeteban Secondary and Preparatory School, guided by three core research questions:

- What is the perception of students regarding group discussion?
- What challenges hinder students' participation in group discussions?
- Do teachers have a good understanding of group discussion?

4.1 Analysis and Discussions of Qualitative Data

Data was collected through open-ended questionnaire items, classroom observations, and semi-structured interviews.

4.1.1 Students' Perception Toward Group Discussion (Open-Ended)

- Perceived Benefits: Students recognized that group discussions strengthen peer relationships, build confidence, reduce anxiety, improve speaking skills, and enable peer learning.
- Observation Contrast: Although students conceptually understood these benefits, observations revealed they rarely engaged effectively during actual classroom tasks.
- Perceived Difficulties: Challenges reported by students included ambiguous topics, dominant or passive group members, potential for student arguments, miscommunication, and poor task comprehension. Students held mixed views on group formation—some preferred choosing familiar peers for comfort, while others favored teacher-assigned mixed-ability groups to foster peer support.

4.1.2 Analysis of Challenges

- Student-Related Challenges: Interruptions due to late arrivals, dominant students, and off-task behaviors.
- Teacher-Related Challenges: Unclear topic explanations, usage of unfamiliar topics, teachers instructing in Amharic while expecting students to speak English, and lack of lesson preparation. A significant structural issue identified was the frequent transfer of experienced teachers from Tebeteban to Gedebrano High School due to a lack of basic infrastructure (electricity, network, transportation) at Tebeteban.

- **School-Related Challenges:** Uncomfortable desks, poor classroom layouts, large class sizes, lack of multimedia resources, absence of English language clubs, insufficient textbook supply, and long commuting distances. Students from outlying kebeles walk up to three hours on foot, leading to fatigue and absenteeism during first-period English classes.
- **Culture-Related Challenges:** Local cultural norms restrict mixed-gender interactions and discourage youth from speaking assertively in front of elders, directly affecting classroom group dynamic dynamics.

4.1.3 Classroom Observation Analysis

The researcher observed six groups across three Grade 10 English classes taught by two teachers (Teacher A and Teacher B):

- **Introduction Stage:** Both teachers arrived on time. Teacher B provided clear instructional objectives and arranged seating in round-table formats. Teacher A gave unclear explanations (resulting in student confusion) and arranged seating by having students turn their heads backward. Neither teacher permitted full English usage. Introduction time consumed 10 minutes (Teacher A) and 7 minutes (Teacher B).
- **Practice Stage:** Neither teacher set time limits for discussions. Most group interactions occurred in Amharic rather than English. Discussions consumed 20 minutes (Teacher A) and 25 minutes (Teacher B).
- **Feedback Stage:** Both teachers concluded the lessons without providing constructive feedback on student performance.

4.2 Quantitative Data Analysis and Discussions

4.2.1 Description of Participants

Table 1: Description of Participants

Sex of students	Frequency	Percent
Male	49	63.6
Female	28	36.4
Total	77	100.0

A total of 77 Grade 10 students participated in the study, comprising 63.6% ($n = 49$) male and 36.4% ($n = 28$) female respondents.

4.2.2 Students' Perception about Group Discussion

Table 2.1: Group Discussion is academically more motivating

No	Items	Scales	F	%
1	Group Discussion is academically more motivating	Strongly Disagree	16	20.8
		Disagree	17	22.1
		Agree	17	22.1
		Strongly Agree	27	35.0
		Total	77	100

A majority of respondents (57.1%, $n = 44$) agreed or strongly agreed that group discussions are academically motivating, whereas 42.9% ($n = 33$) expressed disagreement.

Table 2.2: Group Discussion enhances students' social skills, problem solving and gives equal opportunity

No	Items	Scales	F	%
2	Group Discussion enhances students' social skills	Strongly Disagree	13	16.9
		Disagree	21	27.2
		Agree	23	29.9
		Strongly Agree	20	26.0
		Total	77	100
3	Group Discussion gives equal opportunity to all students	Strongly Disagree	13	16.9

No	Items	Scales	F	%
		Disagree	21	27.3
		Agree	21	27.3
		Strongly Agree	22	28.5
		Total	77	100
4	Group Discussion enhances the problem-solving capacity of students	Strongly Disagree	22	28.5
		Disagree	16	20.9
		Agree	17	22.1
		Strongly Agree	22	28.5
		Total	77	100

4.2.3 Item 2 (Social Skills)

55.9% ($n = 43$) agreed that group work improves social skills, while 44.1% ($n = 34$) disagreed. Item 3 (Equal Opportunity): 55.8% ($n = 43$) felt group work offers equal participation opportunities, compared to 44.2% ($n = 34$) who disagreed. Item 4 (Problem-Solving): Perceptions were evenly split, with 50.6% ($n = 39$) agreeing that it improves problem-solving capabilities and 49.4% ($n = 38$) disagreeing.

Table 2.3: GD increases academic achievement and encourages people to have different roles

No	Items	Scales	F	%
5	Group Discussion increases students' academic achievement	Strongly Disagree	23	29.9
		Disagree	19	24.7
		Agree	9	11.7
		Strongly Agree	26	33.7
		Total	77	100
6	Group Discussion encourages group members to have different roles for effective Learning	Strongly Disagree	17	22.1
		Disagree	19	24.6
		Agree	16	20.8
		Strongly Agree	25	32.5
		Total	77	100

4.2.4 Item 5 (Academic Achievement)

A slight majority (54.6%, $n = 42$) disagreed that group discussion enhances their academic performance, while 45.4% ($n = 35$) agreed. Item 6 (Role Distribution): 53.3% ($n = 41$) agreed that group discussions encourage taking on varied group roles, whereas 46.7% ($n = 36$) disagreed.

Table 2.4: I am confident enough to deliver my opinions during group discussion and do my job/assignments with better quality

RESEARCH ARTICLE

No	Items	Scales	F	%
7	I am confident enough to deliver my opinions during group discussion	Strongly Disagree	14	18.2
		Disagree	24	31.2
		Agree	18	23.4
		Strongly Agree	21	27.2
		Total	77	100
8	I do my job/assignments with better quality when I work in a group	Strongly Disagree	14	18.2
		Disagree	25	32.4
		Agree	17	22.1
		Strongly Agree	21	27.3
		Total	77	100

4.2.5 Item 7 (Confidence)

50.6% ($n = 39$) reported having sufficient confidence to share opinions during group tasks, while 49.4% ($n = 38$) indicated a lack of confidence. Item 8 (Work Quality): 50.6% ($n = 39$) disagreed that group work improves the quality of their assignments, while 49.4% ($n = 38$) felt it produced higher-quality work.

Table 2.5: I am too shy to participate in a group discussion

No	Items	Scales	F	%
9	I am too shy to participate in a group discussion	Strongly Disagree	21	27.3
		Disagree	19	24.7
		Agree	24	31.2
		Strongly Agree	13	16.8
		Total	77	100

52.0% ($n = 40$) of respondents disagreed with being too shy to participate, whereas 48.0% ($n = 37$) acknowledged that shyness hinders their participation.

Table 2.6: Group discussion is ineffective techniques to increase my involvement

No	Items	Scales	F	%
10	Group discussion is ineffective techniques to increase my involvement	Strongly Disagree	34	44.2
		Disagree	12	15.5
		Agree	24	31.2
		Strongly Agree	7	9.1
		Total	77	100

RESEARCH ARTICLE

No	Items	Scales	F	%
11	I worked on all activities by myself because in group discussion my friends could not understand the topic	Strongly Disagree	23	29.9
		Disagree	16	20.7
		Agree	27	35.1
		Strongly Agree	11	14.3
		Total	77	100

4.2.6 Item 10 (Effectiveness)

59.7% ($n = 46$) disagreed with the statement that group discussion is an ineffective technique (meaning they view it as effective), while 40.3% ($n = 31$) deemed it ineffective. Item 11 (Solitary Task Completion): 50.6% ($n = 39$) indicated they do not do all the work alone, whereas 49.4% ($n = 38$) reported completing tasks individually due to peers' lack of topic understanding.

Table 2.7: I feel inferiority and bored with my group members because my friends are knowledgeable than me

No	Items	Scales	F	%
12	I feel inferiority with my group members because my friends are knowledgeable than me	Strongly Disagree	20	26.0
		Disagree	18	23.4
		Agree	22	28.5
		Strongly Agree	17	22.1
		Total	77	100
13	I feel bored participating in group discussion	Strongly Disagree	30	39.0
		Disagree	16	20.8
		Agree	15	19.4
		Strongly Agree	16	20.8
		Total	77	100

4.2.7 Item 12 (Feelings of Inferiority)

50.6% ($n = 39$) agreed that they feel inferior when working with more knowledgeable peers, while 49.4% ($n = 38$) reported no feelings of inferiority. Item 13 (Boredom): 59.8% ($n = 46$) indicated they do not feel bored during group discussions, whereas 40.2% ($n = 31$) expressed feeling bored.

Table 2.8: In Group Discussion, group members should be formed based on students' academic achievement

No	Items	Scales	F	%
14	In Group Discussion, group members should be formed based on students' academic achievement	Strongly Disagree	23	29.9
		Disagree	17	22.1
		Agree	24	31.2

RESEARCH ARTICLE

No	Items	Scales	F	%
		Strongly Agree	13	16.8
		Total	77	100
15	The Discussion takes more time to complete when I work with other students	Strongly Disagree	14	18.2
		Disagree	24	31.2
		Agree	23	29.9
		Strongly Agree	16	20.7
		Total	77	100

4.2.8 Item 14 (Ability-Based Grouping)

52.0% ($n = 40$) disagreed with grouping students by academic achievement, preferring mixed-ability or self-selected groups, while 48.0% ($n = 37$) agreed with achievement-based grouping. Item 15 (Time Consumption): 50.6% ($n = 39$) felt group discussion takes more time to complete tasks, whereas 49.4% ($n = 38$) disagreed.

Table 2.9: Some group members get a good grade even if they do not do much work

No	Items	Scales	F	%
17	Some group members get a good grade even if they do not do much work	Strongly Disagree	21	27.3
		Disagree	21	27.3
		Agree	24	31.2
		Strongly Agree	11	14.2
		Total	77	100
18	I do not think a group grade is fair	Strongly Disagree	24	31.2
		Disagree	16	20.7
		Agree	25	32.5
		Strongly Agree	12	15.6
		Total	77	100

4.2.9 Item 17 (Free-Riding)

54.6% ($n = 42$) disagreed that inactive members receive undeserved high grades, while 45.4% ($n = 35$) agreed that free-riding occurs. Item 18 (Grading Fairness): 51.9% ($n = 40$) viewed shared group grading as unfair, whereas 48.1% ($n = 37$) considered group grading to be fair.

5. Conclusions

- **Student Perception vs. Execution:** While most students held a positive view of group discussions as an effective learning strategy, both teachers and learners struggled to implement them effectively due to a lack of training, experience, and motivation.
- **Instructional Deficiencies:** Teachers frequently dominated class time instead of facilitating group work. They often failed to clarify assignment goals, use varied grouping strategies, monitor discussions, or provide constructive feedback, leaving students in passive roles.
- **Key Impediments:** Group discussion effectiveness was severely limited by large class sizes, physical space constraints, mother tongue interference, lack of student confidence, and cultural norms that inhibit open communication.

- Resource and Logistics Barriers: Uncomfortable classroom furniture, long commuting distances for students, and broader administrative/infrastructure challenges further hindered active participation.

6. Recommendations

- Administrative & Staffing Support: Local education offices should address teacher transfer rates to maintain instructional stability, while regional authorities and the Ministry of Education should provide targeted pre-service and in-service training on group discussion methodologies.
- School Environment & Language Culture: Schools should establish English-rich environments (such as language clubs, drama, and role-play) and strengthen early-grade foundational language skills so students enter high school equipped for communicative activities.
- Effective Pedagogical Practices: Teachers should consistently use flexible, small, mixed-ability groupings rather than fixed seating arrangements to encourage peer interaction, manage discipline, and boost student engagement.
- Community Awareness: School leaders and community stakeholders should work with families to encourage open dialogue at home, helping overcome cultural barriers that discourage younger individuals from speaking assertively.

References

- [1] Adem M. (2007), a study on the challenges and opportunities of using group work in EFL classes with reference to grade 9 : Dire Dawa comprehensive secondary school in focus.
- [2] Ahmed A. (2019), an assessment on the perceptions, practices and challenges of group work in teaching and learning English language speaking skill: Jimma University.
- [3] Altman, S., (1985), organizational behavior: theory and practice: academic press Towns, M. H.
- [4] Alfares, Nurah. "Benefits and Difficulties of Learning in Group Work in EFL Classes in Saudi Arabia." *English Language Teaching*, vol. 10, no. 7, 2017, p. 247.
- [5] Ary, D. (2010), introduction to research in education (8th ed). Belmont, CA/ Wads worth cengage learning
- [6] Baid A (1943), Discussion principles and Types. Me grew kill Book Company.
- [7] Beebe, S. A., & Masterson, J. T. (2003), communicating in small groups. Pearson Education Inc. Boston: Massachusetts.
- [8] Berhanu Gebremichael. (2000). The practice of cooperative learning in grade Eleven (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.
- [9] BerhanuYayo. (2013). Teachers Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Cooperative learning; (MA. Thesis).Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.
- [10] Brown, H. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. (2 Ed). New York: Longman, Inc
- [11] Brumfit, C. J. (1984). Communicative methodology in language teaching. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Celce Murcia. (1979)."Integrating Group work with the Teaching of Grammar" in A Forum Anthology (1979-83 pp-258-260).
- [13] Clarke, Judi. 1994. Shlomo Sharan (Ed.). Cooperative Learning Methods. London: Praeger.
- [14] Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.