

The Impact of Using Classroom Interaction on Teaching English Grammar for First Year Iraqi EFL University Learners

Ass.prof.Dr. Jassim M. Rayhan

Abeer Ali

University of Babylon

CHAPTER ONE

ABSTRACT

To verify the hypotheses , an experiment was designed whereby two groups, the experimental and control, each consisted of (20) students, who had been chosen randomly from the first stage in the Department of English , College of Basic Education, University of Babylon. Both groups were matched in terms of their age and the level of subjects' achievement in syntax in the first course of the academic year (2008–2009).

The experimental and the control groups were subjected to a pre and post tests. The test results indicate that there is a significant between the two groups in favor of the experimental group.

In the light of the results, the researchers have concluded that:

- 1.The use of classroom interaction in teaching English syntax is more effective in improving the achievements of Iraqis learners than the traditional way.
- 2.There is a relationship between teaching through interaction and the use of language in everyday communication , for the reason that classroom interaction activities are based on the integration of the grammatical forms with their notions and functions.
- 3.Teaching through interaction creates the suitable climate, which is similar to the real world, for learning the foreign language.
- 4.The less the number of students in the class, the more the opportunities to interact and negotiate the meaning among students will be.

1.1 Introduction

The prevailing traditional methods of teaching have weakened the four skills of communication; listening, speaking, reading and writing for most of our students, since such approaches to EFL teaching perceive students as passive learners who listen to the teacher and write down their notes without being actively engaged in language learning (Ali,2001;321). Such learning environments are mind–numbing and uninspiring for students' education. The result is that most of Iraqi EFL learners face a problem in learning English grammar. On the one hand, students need to know the rules in order to pass the final examinations. There is also a good need for communication in an EFL with a number of foreign visitors, interacting with native speakers of English via the

internet, to seek job opportunities or further education in foreign countries etc. That is why the need for mastering not only the syntactic rules of language but also rules of how to use the language.

The above-mentioned argument inspired the researchers to phrase the statement of the problem of the study as follows;

Will the use of classroom interaction activities (cooperative group and Pair work, role playing and the interactive CD) in teaching English grammar enhance the achievements of first year Iraqi EFL university learners ?

1.2. Aim of The Study

This study aims at investigating the effect of using classroom interaction activities on achievements of first year Iraqi EFL university learners in University of Babylon / College of Basic Education/ Department of English.

1.3. Hypotheses of The Study

The researchers attempt to test the following hypotheses in order to accomplish the aim of the research.

1. There is no statistical difference between the experimental and control group in learning English grammar at (0.05) level of significance .
2. There is a significant statistical difference between the experimental and the control group in learning English grammar at (0.05) level of significance.

1.4. Scope of The Study

The present study is limited to;

1. The first year Iraqi EFL university learners in University of Babylon/ College of Basic Education /Department of English for the academic year 2008–2009.
2. Concerning the teaching material, the research is limited to items -2- of units 6,7, 8 , 9 and 10 of An Advanced Course in General English which is assigned as the syllabus of the first stage in College of Basic Education for the second semester.
3. Classroom interaction activities; Cooperation through group and pair work, role playing and the interactive CD.

1.5. Value of the Study

There is a growing tendency in the western world to implement new ways of teaching EFL, one of which is by using classroom interaction. Still, we cannot import these ways because the academic cultural Iraqi context differs. Thus we need to develop our own ways Of instruction (Ali, 2001;341).

This study is important in the sense that it can fill a gap in research to date in the Iraqi context to investigate the importance of teacher – student, student – student and student–text interaction during EFL courses . The study represents an empirical contribution to the issue of quantitative data which is narrow, particularly in methods of teaching EFL in the University of Babylon. Additionally, it is a pioneering work in that it stresses the importance of the three types of interaction (role playing, group and pair cooperation as well as interactive multimedia CD) for the educational process which is little heard of in Iraq.

1.6. Definition

1.6.1 Classroom Interaction; Brown and Rodger (2002; 79) use this term to refer to extensive situation where the educational process of EFL takes place.

1.6.2. Role –play; is "a learning activity in which you behave in the way somebody else would behave in a particular situation"(Ibid; 109).

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 Classroom Interaction

Brown and Rodgers (2002;79) use the word classroom to refer to extensive situation where the educational process of EFL take place among learners and teachers.

Mortensen (1972; 12) states that classroom interaction depends on verbal and non–verbal interaction, He argues that verbal and non–verbal are complementary aspect of communicative act. Non –verbal interaction includes all non–linguistics aspects of behavior, while verbal interaction includes words as discrete entities . To sum up, the classroom of language tutoring where EFL instruction takes place is seen as discourse communities and sociolinguistic environments where interaction is considered a key factor to learner's foreign language development. Hall and Verplaetse (2000; 10) assert this saying;

"It is in their interactions with each other that teachers and students

work together to create the intellectual and practical activities that shape both the form and content of the target language as well as the process and outcomes of individual development."

Heringer (1978; 53) maintains that " human action can only be possible as social action and thus only theory of action that is based on interaction is capable of explaining human action" . Thus human interaction depends on the following three constituents;

1.No less than two participants

2.Every participant acts in relation to at least one constituents.

3.The act(s) of the participant who does not start shall be grasped as a reaction to an act of the participant who begins.

2.2 Implications of Classroom Interaction in Grammar Teaching

The researchers have explained what is meant by classroom interaction, so they are going to explain how classroom interaction can be employed to promote language learning. The term 'grammar' is used to refer to the basic units of a language and how these units are brought together to form meaningful sentences , and the knowledge of what, when and to whom these sentences are said (i.e, their functions). In other words, grammar is concerned with rules of construction and use (Richards, et al, 1992 ;161).

Thornbury (1999; 13) agrees with this definition and broadens it by saying that grammar gives additional "meaning" which cannot be attained from "immediate context". These are basically;

- representation; that is, grammar enables us to use language to describe the world in terms of how, when and where things happen.
- interpersonal; that is , grammar facilitates the way we interact with other people when, for example, we need to get things done by using language.

Grammar is a useful tool that improves the learner's performance in both the mother and foreign language because it is able to record actual usage and formulate the rules whereby sentences are general and understood. Grammar is considered by many linguists to be the central area of language around which other areas such as pronunciation and vocabulary revolve. Grammar is sometimes called the ' computational system, that relates sound and meaning, trivial in itself but impossible to manage without.(Cook,2001;19).

To conclude , classroom interaction can be seen as a useful tool to teach grammar. For the reason that classroom interaction activities provide opportunities to combine the form of the grammatical rules

with their function. This conclusion corresponds to what Hatch (1978;409) has pointed out about the usefulness of classroom interaction in promoting the grammar of English language

" One learns how to do

conversation , one learns how to interact verbally and, out of this interaction, syntactic structures are developed."

2.3The Experimental Design

A "pre-test-post-test control group design"(Cohen, et al, 2000;231) is used, in which two groups "matched for age, sex, ratio of boys and girls, social class"(Bell, 1987; 9) are chosen randomly. The form of this design is shown in table (1).

Table (1)
The Experimental Design

Experimental group	Pre- test	Independent variable	Post- test
Control group	Pre-test	-----	Post-test

Brown and Rodgers (2002; 211) call it "true experimental design" and characterized by the following features;

1. Selecting two groups at random and assigning them to an experimental and a control groups.
2. The independent variable is administered only to the experimental group.
3. Both groups of subjects submit to "a pre-test and post-test" to measure the influence of the dependent variables. (Ibid)

The experimental group is taught by using classroom interaction, while the control group is taught by using the traditional way.

2.4 The Sample

The sample of this study has been selected randomly from first year students in the Department of English. This sample consists of (40) students who are distributed into two groups, the experimental and control. Each group consists of (20) students, (17) females and (3) males.

2.5. The Test

2.5.1 Construction and Description of the Test

"Language tests can be a valuable tool for providing information that is relevant to several concerns in language teaching" (Bachman & Palmer, 2000; 8) . Tests are considered useful tools for language learning research since they benefit from this type of research and provide assistance to FL research. Bachman (1990; 2-3) puts test in plain words " Language tests are frequently used as criterion measures of language abilities in second language acquisition research.

The researchers have collected the items of the test from various grammar books and the web site. The written test is made up of five questions that encompass equally the level of recognition and of production. The first two questions cover the level of recognition, the third question is a half- production question, while the fourth & fifth questions are at the production level. (See Appendix 1).

2.5.2 Documentation of the Test

The test items can be documented as follows;

1. Items No. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 in Q1, item No. 3 in Q3, items No. 5 and 10 in Q4 and items No. 1, 2 and 3 in Q5 are taken from the www.manythings.org web site.
2. Item No. 3 in Q1 is taken from Allen (1974; 12).
3. Item No. 7 in Q1 is taken from Farhady, et al. (2003; 120).
4. Q2; is taken from Hashemi and Murphy (1995; 165).
5. Q2; B and item No. 1 and 4 in Q3 are taken from Langan (2006; 441)

6.Item No. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 in Q3, item No. 1, 3 and 4 in Q4 and item No. 10 in Q5 are taken from Murphy and Smalzer (2002;181)

7.Item No 7 in Q3 and item No. 2 in Q4 are taken from Azar (1999; 332)

8.Item No. 6, 7, 8 and 9 in Q4 and items No. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in Q5 are taken from Frank (1972; 124-125).

2.5.3 The Scoring Scheme of the Test

The total score of the test is (100) scores distributed as follows;

1.Items that are assigned two scores only, are;

Q1/ Multiple choice (1-10), Q2; A- rewrite as shown in the first example (1-5), Q3/ Tick the correct sentences and cross the wrong ones (1-10), Q4/ Fill in the blanks (1-10) and Q5/write the correct form (1-10).

2. Items that are assigned one score only, are;

Q2/ B- Underline the correct word (1-10).

Subject with no answer have also been given a zero score.

2.5.4 Validity of the Test

Harmer (2001; 322) says that validity means that the test should measure what it is supposed to measure. To achieve the face and content validity of the test, a jury of experts should check it (Eble, 1972;555). The jury of scholars who have evaluated the validity of the test are as follows;

-Professor Fatin Khairi Al- Rifai (Ph.D. in Applied Linguistic), College of Education/Ibn Rushd, University of Baghdad.

-Professor Mohammed J. Betti (Ph.D. in Methodology of English Drama) , College of Education, University of Thi-Qar.

-Asst, Prof. Abbas Lutfi Hussein (Ph.D. in Linguistics). College of Education/Ibn- Rushd. University of Baghdad.

-Asst. Prof. Adil Abdul- Ridha (MA. In Linguistics), College of Basic Education, University of Babylo..

-Asst. Prof. Asim A. Al- Duleimi (Ph.D in Methodology), College of Basic Education, University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Jassim M. Rayhan (Ph.D in Methodology), College of Basic Education, University of Babylon.

2.5.5 The Pilot Administration of the Test

The pilot test was carried out in order to help the researchers to try out the test before it takes its final shape. Through the pilot test the researchers can check the clarity of the test items, to check the average

time needed for answering each question, determine the difficulty level of the items, estimate the discrimination power of the test items and check the reliability of the test (Richards, et al, 1992;138). Therefore, (20) students who have similar level in English to that of population of the study from the first stage in the Department of English , College of Basic Education, Al- Mustansiriya University have submitted the pilot test.

2.5.6 Statistical Tools

1.The "t-test" formula is used in order to identify whether there are any significant differences between the two groups in certain variables such as age and level of achievement in English. It is also used to calculating the statistical differences between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test and post-test.

$$t = \frac{\bar{X} - \bar{X}}{\frac{(n-1)S^2 + (n-1)S^2}{n+n-2} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \right)}$$

(Brown & Rodgers, 2002; 208)

2.Pearson formula correlation coefficient is used to estimate reliability of the test.

$$r = \frac{\sum (X - M)(Y - M)}{N S S}$$

(Ibid; 173)

2.5.7 Test Reliability

One of the methods that can be used to find out test reliability is the split-half method which requires that the test as a whole to be divided into two equal halves . By using Pearson's formula below, the reliability coefficient of the test computed is (0.79). The reliability coefficient of a test would be accepted if it is not less than (0.50).

Pearson's Formula

$$r = \frac{\sum (X - M)(Y - M)}{N S S}$$

(Brown and Rodger 2002;173)

2.5.8 The Difficulty Level of difficulty of the Test Items

The suitable level of difficulty of the test item is measured by applying the following formula ;

$$DL = \frac{\text{High Correct} + \text{Low Correct}}{N}$$

The results indicated that the item difficulty ranged between (0.34 –0.76), which is considered a suitable difficulty level according to Eble (1972–; 399).

2.5.9 The Discrimination Power of the Test Items

In order to estimate the discrimination power of each item the formula of items discrimination below is applied. The results indicated that the discrimination level of the items ranged between (0.30–0.73), which is considered a suitable discrimination level (Ibid ; 397).

Correct upper half – Correct lower half

$$D = \frac{\text{Correct upper half} - \text{Correct lower half}}{N}$$

2.5.10 The Pre– test

There are two aims behind carrying out the pre–test; the first is to equalize the subjects of the control group, with that of the experimental group; the second is to compare the students' achievement scores in the pre– test with that of theirs in the post– test. See Appendix –A–

2.6 Instructional Material

The instructional material consisted of the following topics in the text book { An Advanced Course in General English}

1. Unit six (6.2 Grammar)

The Adjective

Kinds of Adjectives

The adjective Used as a Noun

2. Unit seven (6.2 Grammar)

Comparison of Adjectives

Construction with Comparisons

3. Unit eight (8.2 Grammar)

a. The Adverb

b. kinds of Adverbs

c. The position of Adverbs

4. Unit nine (9.2 Grammar)

Comparison of Adverbs Construction with Comparisons

5. Unit ten (10.2 Grammar).

2.7. Instruction

The experimental group was taught the English grammar through classroom interaction activities . The behavioral objectives of the

selected course material were formulated in the first place. Then , a plan for each lecture to achieve those objectives was designed. Afterwards, the first five minutes of the lecture were devoted to set the rules of the session and to arrange the students' seating according to the type of activity in order to control and manage the students' learning behavior during the lecture. Lecturing material of the experimental group took various types. The subjects were distributed into two or three groups as a round discussion group , in addition to role playing.

The control group was taught the same material by explaining the grammatical rules directly to the students through the traditional way which means by listening and taking notes. They also responded to the questions and gave examples or read the topics when they were asked.

2.8. The Post- test (Final Administration)

At the end of the teaching period, the subjects of the control group and the experimental group were post- tested . The same testing procedures were followed in conducting the test. The whole tests were applied by the researchers in coordination with the instructor of the first stage in the Department of English.

2.9. Analysis and Discussion of Results

2.9.1. Comparison of the Experimental and the Control Groups in the Post- test Scores.

The mean scores of the experimental group was compared with that of the control in the total scores of the post-test . The means was found to be (68.25) for the experimental group and (42.7) for the control group.

The "t" value was found to be (9.491) which indicates that there is a significant difference at (0.05) level of significance degree of freedom (38) between the two groups, in favor of the experimental group. Consequently the null hypothesis, which points out that there is no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the written test scores, is rejected. This also reveals that the achievement of students who were taught grammar(adjectives and adverbs) according to classroom interaction is superior to that of the students who were taught grammar without using classroom interaction, that is to say that classroom interaction is more effective in promoting foreign language learning. See (Table 2) and Appendix (B).

Table (2)

The Mean, Standard Deviation and the "t" Value of the Post- test

Scores of Both Groups

Variables	Sample size	Mean	SD	t Value	Significance Level at 0.05 and 38 df
-----------	-------------	------	----	---------	--------------------------------------

Group				t calculated	t tabled	
Experimental	20	68.25	8.46	9.491	1.687	There is a significant Statistical difference.
Control	20	42.7	8.51			

2.9.2 Comparison of the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Control Group.

The mean scores of the control group in the pre-test was found to be (37), while in the post-test it was found to be (42.7). Thus the "t" formula was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the scores of the control group in the pre and post-tests. The

calculated "t" value was found to be (5.655) at (0.05) level of the significance. This indicates that the progress in the achievement of the control group in the post-test is better than in the pre-test. See table (3) and Appendix (C).

Table(3)

The Mean, Standard Deviation and "t" Value of the Pre-test and the Post-test Learners Scores of the Control Group.

Variables	Sample Size	Mean	SD	t Value	Significant level at 0.05 and 38 df
Test				t calculated	t tabulated
Pre-test	20	37	45.210	5.65	2.861
There is significant statistical difference					
Post- test	20	42.7	6.723		

2.9.3 Comparison of the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Subjects of the Experimental Group.

The "t" formula was also used to find out whether there was a significance difference between the mean scores of the pre-test, which was found to be (38.8), and the mean scores of the post-test, which was found to be (68.25), for the experimental group. The "t" value was found to be (13.218) at (0.05) level of significance and a degree of freedom of (19), which indicates that there is a significant difference between the two test scores. This means that the experimental group is much better in the post-test than in the pre-test. This is due to the type of teaching the experimental group received which was based on the classroom interaction activities. See Table (4) and Appendix (D).

Table (4)

Comparison of the Pre-test and the Post-test Learners' Scores of the Experimental Group

Variables	Sample Size	Mean	SD	t Value	Significant	
Level at 0.05	and 38 df Tests			t calculated	t tabled	
Pr-test	20	38.8	13.51	13.218	2.861	Statistically
Post-test	20	68.25	8.453			Significant

2.10. Discussion of the Results

The statistical analysis of the results indicates that the mean value of the experimental group was found to be (68.25), which is higher than the mean value of the control group, in the post-test, which was found to be (42.7). This means that the achievement of learners in the experimental group is significantly higher in average than the achievement of learners in the control group in the total scores of the of the post- test. It can be concluded that this experiment demonstrates significantly higher learning effects for classroom interaction i.e, the first (null) hypothesis is rejected while the second alternative hypothesis is accepted.

This indicates that teaching grammar with various activities that promote interaction among the learners, with the teacher and the text, along with encouraging learning by doing plus problem solving is more advantages to EFL learning than the traditional method which does not give the students the chance to discuss and communicate inside the classroom. Therefore, interaction among the learners as well as with and under supervision of the teacher is better for learning EFL than just listening to the teacher's explanation and interaction with text, gives the students the opportunity to develop their thinking , a chance which may not be possible outside the class.

The results of the present study are in agreement with those of Slimany(1992), which shows that there are significant differences between the achievement of the first year University experimental group, who were instructed according to classroom interaction, and the achievements of their colleagues in the control group, who were ESP by using classroom interaction, in the post-test, was higher than that of the control group, who were taught without using classroom interaction.

The results are also in agreement with those of Negueruela (2003), which showed that there were significant differences in the achievements of the University learners in the fourth semester of studying Spanish as a foreign language, who were instructed according to strategic interaction model, were better in the achievement test than that of students who were taught the Spanish grammar through traditional way of instruction.

The results obtained in the present study are also in agreement with that of Al-Bayati (2005), which shows that there were significant differences between the achievement of the secondary students, who were taught English grammar via computer mediated interaction by adopting the Multimedia Computer –Assisted Language Learning, and the achievement of those who were taught English grammar according to the traditional audio–lingual method. In other words, classroom interaction through Multimedia Computer–Assisted Language Learning enables the students to comprehend and using the tenses of English language better than those who follow the traditional methods of teaching.

2.11. Conclusion

This study has investigated the efficiency of using three techniques of classroom interaction in teaching English grammar to develop the achievements of first year EFL learners. The findings of the study can be worded as follows;

1. In the light of the higher results of the subjects of the experimental group compared with the subject of the control group the first conclusion is that, the use of classroom interaction activities in teaching English grammar is more effective on improving the achievement of first year instruction.
 2. There is a relationship between teaching through interaction and the use of language in every day communication, for the reason that classroom interaction activities are based on the integration of the grammatical forms with their notions and function.
 3. Teaching through interaction creates the suitable climate, which similar to the real world for learning the foreign language.
- Consequently, students will be motivated in such an exciting joyful and pleasant environment.
4. The less the number of students in the class, the more the opportunities to interact and negotiate the meaning among students will be.

Bibliography

- Al-Bayati, Zeena Abid Dawood. (2005). The effect of Using Multimedia Computer–Assisted Language Learning Method on Achievement (Unpublished M.A Thesis). University of Mosul. College of Basic Education.
- Allen, W. Stannard. (1974) Living English Structure . London; Longman Group Limited.
- Ali, Nabeel. (2001). Arabic Schooling and the Era Technology . Kuwait; Politics Press.
- Azar, Betty Shramfer. (1999). Fundamental of English Grammar. London ; Longman Group Limited.

- Bachman, Lyle F. (1990). *Fundamental Consideration in Language Testing*. Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, Lyle F. and Palmer, Adrian S. (2000). *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Bell, Judith. (1987). *Doing Your Research Project ; A Guide for First-Time Research in Education and Social Science*. Buckingham; Open University Press.
- Brown, James Dean and Rodgers, Theodore S. (2002) *Doing Second Language Research*. Oxford University Press.
- Cook, Vivian.(2001) *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. New York; Oxford University Press Inc.
- Eble, Robert . (1972) *Essential of Educational Measurement*. New Jersey; Prentice – Hall, Inc.
- Farhady, Hussein. And Birjandi, Pravis. (2003) *Testing Language Skills From Theory of Practice*. Tehran ; Studying and Compiling Books in Humanities (SAMT)
- Frank, Marcella. (1972). *Modern English ; Exercises for non-native Speakers*. New Jersey; Prentice–Hall Inc.
- Hall, J. K, Verplaetse. (2000;10) *Second Language Learning Through Classroom Interaction*. N.J; Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007).*How to Teach English* . London; Pearson Education Limited.
- Hashemi, Louise and Murphy, Raymond. (2004). *English Grammar in Use*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hatch. E. (1978) *Discourse Analysis in Second Language Acquisition*.
- MA, Thesis Newbury House, pp. 402–435.
- Heringer. H.(1978) *Practical Semantic*. Germany; Mouton Publisher.
- Lagan, Jhon. (2006). *English Skills With Reading* . New York McGraw–Hill Inc.
- Murphy, Raymond and Smalizer, R . (2002). *Basic Grammar in Use* Cambridge University.
- Mortens. C. (1972) *Communication*. New York; McGraw– Hill.
- Nugueruela, F. (2003) *A Sociocultural A pproach to the Teaching*.
- Ph.D. Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.
- Richard. Jack C. and Platt. H.(1992). *Language Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* . Longman Group. UK Limited.
- Slimani, A. and Beretta. (1992). *Evaluation of Classroom Interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thornbury, Scott. (1999) *How to Teach Grammar*. Oxford Shire; Pearson Education Limited

Appendix-A-
Learners' Pre-test Scores

Experimental Group		Control Group	
No	Scores	No	Score
1	36	1	32
2	37	2	39
3	27	3	36
4	34	4	47
5	32	5	51
6	39	6	40
7	36	7	29
8	36	8	29
9	27	9	57
10	29	10	41
11	36	11	35
12	27	12	50
13	40	13	25
14	69	14	23
15	60	15	15
16	67	16	27
17	25	17	39
18	29	18	49
19	29	19	43
20	61	20	36

Appendix-B-
Learners' Post-test Scores

Experimental Group		Control Group	
No	Scores	No	Score
1	60	1	42
2	64	2	54
3	72	3	41

4	60	4	36
5	71	5	53
6	71	6	44
7	72	7	51
8	74	8	32
9	67	9	63
10	58	10	46
11	72	11	59
12	72	12	44
13	63	13	28
14	81	14	36
15	71	15	31
16	85	16	27
17	58	17	39
18	60	18	49
19	54	19	43
20	80	20	36

Appendix -C-

Scores of the Control Group in the Pre and Post test

Pre- test		Post- test	
N0	Scores	N0	Score
1	32	1	42
2	39	2	54
3	36	3	41
4	47	4	36
5	51	5	53
6	40	6	44
7	29	7	51
8	29	8	32
9	57	9	63
10	41	10	46
11	35	11	59
12	50	12	44
13	25	13	28

14	23	14	36
15	15	15	31
16	27	16	27
17	39	17	39
18	49	18	49
19	43	19	43
20	36	20	36

Appendix –D–

Scores of the Experimental Group in the Pre and Post tests

Pre-test		Post- test	
N0	Scores	N0	Scores
1	36	1	60
2	37	2	64
3	27	3	72
4	34	4	60
5	32	5	71
6	39	6	71
7	36	7	72
8	36	8	74
9	27	9	67
10	29	10	58
11	35	11	72
12	27	12	72
13	40	13	63
14	69	14	81
15	60	15	71
16	67	16	85
17	25	17	58
18	29	18	60
19	29	19	54
20	61	20	80

Appendix (1)

The Test

Q1: Choose the most appropriate choice: (20 marks)

1. It is _____ sunny in August.

- a. always b. never c. sometimes d. almost

2. He's _____ tall enough to be a policeman.

- a. hard b. harder c. hardly d. more hardly

3. The operation didn't cause her any pain. It was _____ .

- a. painful b. painfully c. painless d. more painful

4. Cyril was working _____ .

- a. at his office very hard all day yesterday b. very hard at his office all day yesterday
c. all day yesterday very hard at his office . d. very hard all day at his office yesterday

5. Some people are tall, whereas others are -----

- a. large b. thin c. short d. small

6. A train is ----- as a plane.

- a. as fat b. not as fast c. faster d. too fast

7. This water is very cold , isn't it ? It surely is.

I've never swim in such----- before.

- a. a water cold b. a cold water c. cold water d. water called.

- a. a water cold b. a cold water c. cold water d. water called

8. She has----- money than her sister.

- a. few b. less c. least d. little

9. I entered the classroom----- because I was late.

- a. quite b. quietly c. quiet d. more quiet.

10. What----- horse!

- a. an Arab splendid white b. a splendid white Arab
c. a splendid Arab white d. white splendid Arab

Q2: A- Rewrite each sentence beginning with the words given as in the first example (10 marks)

Ex ; Ursula is a very quick learner.

Ursula learns quickly.

1. Richard can cook really well.

Richard is a.....

2. Philippa is usually a hard worker.

Philippa usually works.....

3. Have the children been good today?

Have the children behaved.....

4.I wish you could swim fast.

I wish you were a

5.The hotel staff treated us in a very friendly manner.

The hotel staff were.....

Q2: B- Underline the correct word in the parentheses.

(10) marks

1.In Egypt , silver was once (more valued, most valued) than gold.

2.The doctor predicated that Ben would soon be(good, well) enough to go home.

3.The (little, less) coffee I drink , I better I feel.

4 .Light walls make a room look (more large, larger) than dark walls.

5.One of the (unfortunate, most unfortunate) men I know is a millionaire.

6.The moth (continuous, continuously) thumped against the screen.

7.Sitting alone is (good, well) without television.

8.When the store owner caught the little boys stealing , he scolded them (bad, badly) .

9.It is (good, better) to teach people to fish than to give them fish.

10.Today computers can send a letter around the world more (quick, quickly) than you can write your name on a sheet of paper.

Q3: Tick () correct sentences and cross (X) wrong ones. Then correct the wrong ones.

(20 marks)

1.The first night I quit smoking , I wanted a cigarette bad. (20 marks)

2.Athens is older than Rome. Rome is not as old as Athens.

3.They came yesterday to visit us here.

4.My most luckiest day was the day I met my wife.

5.Ed's car is black. Kim's car is black. Ed's car is the same color as Kim's.

6>Your work needs to be better. It is not good enough.

7.The hardest you study, the more you will learn.

8.Monday is important, but it isn't the most important thing in life.

9.The water wasn't enough warm to go swimming.

10.Don't call her now . It is too late to call her.

Q4: Fill in the blanks with the appropriate words as required:

(20 marks)

1.old , the oldest, late,-----, pretty,-----

2.expensive, more expensive, most expensive. Bad,-----, -----

3.slow, slower, heavy,----- far,-----

4.brightly, more brightly, early,-----, well,-----

- 5.easy, easily, good, -----, near,-----
- 6.desire + able, desirable, manage + able, -----, rely + able,-----
- 7.total, totally, sincere, -----, merry , -----
- 8.equal, equally. Hopeful, -----, evident, -----
- 9.beauty + ful , beautiful, victory + ous, -----, awe + ful,-----
- 10.harmful, harmless, regular, ----- . literate, -----

Q5: Write the correct form of the words between brackets. (20 marks)

- 1.The plane landed (safe) in the airport.
3. (luck) the driver was not in the accident.
- 4.The day was so (fog) that you couldn't see a thing in front of you.
- 5.All the strawberries in this box are (rot).
- 6.It was very (courage) of him to risk his life trying to save a drawing child .
- 7.He appears (uneasy) about something.
- 8.She is a very (fascinate) woman.
- 9.Please don't drive so (fast) .
- 10.Which is (bad) – a headache or toothache ?