

RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Group Teaching Strategies and Students' Learning: An Experimental Approach for Teaching of Sentence Structure

Zahid Ullah <sup>a</sup> Abdul Ghaffar <sup>b</sup> Asad Ali <sup>c</sup> Muhammad Arif <sup>d</sup> Habibul Haq <sup>e</sup>

**Abstract:** We express our views and thoughts with the help of words in both speaking and writing. We use small phrases and sentence for communication and expression. In English grammar sentence structure is the arrangement of words, phrases and clauses in a sentence. The grammatical function and meaning depends on this structural organization. The most common order in English sentence is subject-verb-object. Teaching of English at primary level is not only to teach a lesson and write a list of vocabulary. The main objectives of teaching English is to develop the four skills of a students which is Reading, Writing, listening and speaking. To know better about these four skills, we must have to learn its principles of sentence structure and grammar rules as well. The old English curriculum was only focused on reading skill of a student. Mostly students are not aware of sentence structure. Sentence structure is not only the collection of words and sounds. Sentence structure the central aspect of each sentence. Pakistani students do many mistakes in writing and speaking of English language. In this study we will teach sentence structure through activity-based learning small group teaching strategy. The study was experimental in nature and from true experimental design pretest posttest comparative group design was adopted. Through the results of pretest two randomly equal groups were framed and treatment was given to the experimental group. At the end of the treatment, posttest was taken from both groups to measure the effect of traditional and small groups teaching strategy on students learning sentence structure.

**Keywords:** Human Capital Investment, Illiterate Labour Force, Educated Labour Force, Technology Innovation, Pakistan

## Introduction

### Background of the study

English has evolved into a modern lingua franca, or a language that is used to communicate by people who speak different languages. As a result, English will assist in bridging cultural knowledge gaps. A recent concept known as globalization has dominated the last few decades.

It has a significant effect on various aspects of life, including social, political, and economic ones. It also has had a major impact on global connectivity dynamics. The most important tool in this modern age is English. As a subject has a supreme position in preparing the students to take up the challenges of the competitive survival and growing globalization (Salahuddin, [2013](#)).

The key goals of English Teaching there at elementary school level is to help the learners to comprehend and carry out basic orders, directives, and requests in English in everyday situations (Salahuddin, [2013](#)).

<sup>a</sup> M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

<sup>b</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Education, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

<sup>c</sup> M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

<sup>d</sup> M.Phil. Scholar, Centre for Education & Staff Training, University of Swat, Charbagh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

<sup>e</sup> M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Education, University of Malakand, Lower Dir, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

The pilot initiatives seek to equip students for meaningful resources to communicate competence and to prepare them with intensive English skills for social and academic contacts. By preparing them to be self-sufficient and lifelong learners. They would be better able to adapt to the ever-changing local and global society. For the majority of Pakistani students, learning the English is a conscious process. Learning English is a complex work for the most of Pakistani students. Learners have little chances to consume language from their surroundings in order to develop a natural feel for proper verbal form, vocabulary, sentence construction, and design in a variety of contexts, both scholarly and socially. As a result, it should not be the students that lose the potential to learn, but rather the whole academic environment that requires improvement.

Youngster begins dreaming of a future career in the very early stage of their schooling. But as they grow up and face the realities of life, they realize that there is a wide chasm between their dreams and the fulfillment of the dreams. The significance of English as a language has grown in modern environment. A reform in the national curriculum has also been made in relation to community needs and requirements of a global marketplace. The directorate of curriculum and Teacher Education has revised and updated the curriculum according to the need of current and modern world. The current revised edition of English Reader for class 5<sup>th</sup> contain materials from the original book as well as new insertions agreed upon by the English subject experts at the textbook Board. The overall revision of the current edition was undertaken to align the textbook with the national standards of quality education in Pakistan.

The textbook comprises lessons, all of which now have new stories, poems, new color illustration and a fresh layout and design. The exercises have been carefully designed under new heading and now include grammar components to develop linguistics skill. The current government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa has brought new reforms and implement new policies in education sector. Equipped schools from different facilities like solar system, play areas, new classrooms, recruiting of new high qualified teachers, different continuous professional trainings.

All these initiatives show that, the government is sincere with education department, but still our education standard is questionable. Students' performance and education level is not that much which is necessary for a developed society and standard life. The students show poor performance in major subjects specially in English subject.

A typical public-school student at primary level in Pakistan has to face a lot more challenges now than a student of his age 10-15 years ago. All subjects were taught in their mother tongue which was a familiar language but now they have one course in mother tongue and the rest of the courses are in national language (Urdu) or a foreign language (English). In such situation individualized small group teaching instruction can be a far better option than a typical whole class instruction.

Furthermore, instructional material is limited to textbook where passages are read usually translated in mother tongue, meaning of difficult words written on blackboard and exercises comprising comprehension questions are done mechanically by teacher dictating the answers or writing on blackboard. Examination system only used for promotion or retention of a child and not as a means to measure a child's growth or literacy development in early classes because most of the children are promoted to next class without having achieved the minimum level of literacy (Imran, [2008](#)).

During a discussion with government primary school head teacher regarding promotion policy, the researcher realized that one of the reason of students drop out is their failure in learning to read and write making them disillusioned and defeated enough to run away from school and if more students are detained in same class, year after year, they are more likely to drop out seeing no value in schooling and it is the same students who receive corporal punishment and are humiliated for not learning. Furthermore, our examination system wholly depends on written pattern, if students know a little bit, then they are unable to

write in English. This may lead them to show poor performance in exam and the result is high rate of failure in examination.

In our schools we wholly depend on reading and good handwriting. We judge the students' academic level by fluent reading and good handwriting in their notebook. They just cram the lesson and copy it from the book. They do not know what I am saying and writing, because their concept is not clear. If you asked from a good student to write some sentence on your school or village in English, then he is unable to write just a few sentences. Learning a language is very complex process, it needs a complete learning environment, and we cannot create this environment because we teach three languages at a time Pashto, Urdu and English. How a teacher will create such three environments in class. we teach English in Pashto Urdu in Pashto.

In modern and competitive world still, we teach in our schools on old traditional methods. We do not participate our students in our teaching. They are passive and remain passive up to higher education level. In this study we will teach to students on activity-based learning small group teaching strategy to find out the impact of small group teaching strategy and compare it with old traditional method.

### **Objectives of the Study**

Objectives of the study was:

1. To investigate the effect of small group teaching strategy on students learning sentence structure at grade 5<sup>th</sup>.
2. To find out the effect of Traditional teaching strategy on students learning sentence structure at primary level.
3. To measure the difference between small group activity versus Traditional method of teaching.

### **Hypotheses**

Following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. There is no significant impact of Grammar Translation Method on students learning of sentence structure at primary level.
2. There is no significant impact of Small Group teaching strategy on students learning of sentence structure at Primary level.
3. There is no significant difference between Grammar Translation Method and Small Group Teaching Strategy on students learning of sentence structure.

### **Review of Literature**

English as a subject has never been treated well. There are several problems related to the teaching and learning of English subject. There is a greater need of teaching English language, in still a letter way. As the teacher of English language, it is important to have the necessary language skills to transfer the knowledge to the students Besides there is a lack of appropriate teaching methods. To increase the learning and performance of students, the teacher has to be better equipped with both the language skills as well as the teaching methodologies.

The study found that students from government schools, especially in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, encounter more significant hurdles compared to those attending schools in urban areas or federal government institutions. These students struggle with both basic and more advanced language skills, which limits their ability to communicate effectively in English (AHMAD et.al, [2011](#))

The study emphasizes the need for improved teaching methods and resources to address these specific challenges and enhance English learning outcomes at the secondary school level in Pakistan. Teachers and educational policymakers are encouraged to focus on grammar instruction, reading skills, and more practical language exercises to help students overcome these difficulties.

In summary, the research provides valuable insight into the persistent challenges faced by secondary school students in Pakistan in mastering English and offers suggestions for targeted educational interventions to improve language acquisition.

### **Traditional Classroom**

In Pakistani school, the majority of instructors takes the form of conventional monologue. In the classroom, the students sit silently in neat groups, the teachers do all the talking, and the students sit silently listen to lectures. They can only talk when they ordered to do something specific, according to research, when students are lectured, they retain just about 5% of the information presented to them. According to the research getting one's hand on something and actually experimenting with it, is the best way to appreciate it. Teachers in traditional, classroom teach the way they were taught and choose teaching strategies.

the study highlights significant gaps in the current English teaching practices in private schools of Dir Upper and underscores the importance of adopting innovative and effective methodologies to improve language learning outcomes (Bacha & Ilyas, [2014](#)).

### **Small Group Work**

When we invite two or perhaps more professionals to enroll collectively, we call it group work. While several qualitative research appear to have found most successful small group teacher training for particular topics or lesson material, there are several variations of this general technique, each with its own set of benefits.

Cooperative learning should be thought of as a modified version of whole-class conversation, and group work's effectiveness is always dependent on the same variables that make up an entire class discussion effective. These include:

- a. A strong attention on students learning.
- b. Homework of the schoolchildren.
- c. A clear set of guidance for learners.
- d. The learning process must be closely monitored.
- e. All learners are welcome to contribute.
- f. The instructor is in charge of supervising and making suggestions.
- g. A logical conclusion.
- h. Careful time management by the teacher and the students.

### **When and Why Small Group Work be Used as a Teaching Strategy**

There is some learning situation in which small group work is essential. For example, when students are trying to achieve outcomes such as "collaboratively to solve the problem" they must work in groups. There are many other situations in which the teacher might choose to use group work because it seems to be the most effective way to help students achieve the outcomes. Group work, on the other hand, is only useful if it is able to yield certain desirable results that cannot be obtained more efficiently in another way. It must understand the students' attributes their familiarity of independent study, the appropriate opportunities, and the instructional quality of your lecture in addition to the results you aspire to accomplish. Some rewards of group work and some specific motives for using it are:

- Learners become active participants as a result of group learning, rather than passive receivers of information. This will enable the students succeed and stay in school (Swing & Peterson, [2017](#)).
- Cooperative learning is an effective way to activate students' previous experience while also assisting them in reconstructing their comprehension (De Grave, [1987](#)).
- Group learning will be an effective idea to show learners the ability to work on a practical assignment that would be too difficult or big for them to complete alone.

- Cooperative learning will help students develop their intercultural communicative competence as they study the program.
- Group learning will inspire students to work together. It teaches them to value one the other's abilities and shortcomings.
- Group study can be an enjoyable thing to study, inspiring pupils and encouraging constructive participation in the classroom (Killen, [2018](#)).
- Group work allows you to temporarily concentrate your teaching efforts on a small group student while the other students engage actively in learning.
- Group learning helps individuals to rely less on the instructor but more on their own abilities to learn and explore input from a variety of perspectives.
- In a non-threatening setting, group work allows all students to participate suggestions and attempt to learn the material (Killen, [2018](#)).

The study by Suleman and Gul ([2015](#)) aimed to compare the teaching effectiveness of three categories of subject specialists teaching at the higher secondary school level in Kohat Division, Pakistan:

**Directly Selected Subject Specialists:** Recruited through a competitive examination process conducted by the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Public Service Commission.

**In-Service Promoted Subject Specialists:** Teachers promoted to the position of subject specialist based on seniority from different cadres of teaching staff working at elementary and secondary levels.

**Online Selected Subject Specialists:** Teachers recruited through an online application process without conducting any test or interview. The study underscores the effectiveness of puppets in developing spoken English skills among young learners. By creating an engaging and supportive environment, puppetry facilitates meaningful language use and enhances student motivation. This approach aligns with communicative language teaching principles, emphasizing interaction and practical language application. (Toledo & Hoit, [2016](#))

### Research Design

There are different experimental designs, each with peculiar characteristic and demands that can be used for different purposes of research. These designs have been discussed by different experts of research and its proper usage and application have been also established (Gay et al., [2011](#)). The most popular experimental designs are:

- a. Pre-experimental, design
- b. Quasi, experimental. design
- c. Factorial design

This researcher followed True Experimental research design. Pretest and posttest control group design was adopted. The purpose was to investigate the impact of small group teaching strategies on students learning of sentence structure.

### Population

The papulation was all primary schools of District Malakand. There were 7567 students as per EMIS record shown.

### Sample

Sample was grade five of Government primary school Makhnawala No 1 having the strength of 50 students. 25 students were placed in control group and 25 students were placed in experimental group.

Pretest Result of the Study

Table 1

Students understanding on sentence pattern

| Paired Samples Test |                      |                    |                   |                    |                                              |       |      |    |                    |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------|------|----|--------------------|
|                     |                      | Paired Differences |                   |                    |                                              |       | t    | Df | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) |
|                     |                      | Mean               | Std.<br>Deviation | Std. Error<br>Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of<br>the Difference |       |      |    |                    |
|                     |                      |                    |                   |                    | Lower                                        | Upper |      |    |                    |
| Pair 1              | Control-experimental | .000               | 1.155             | .231               | -.477                                        | .477  | .000 | 24 | 1.000              |

This table shows the pretest result of both control and experimental group. The mean score of control and experimental group (8.88,8.88) with standard deviation of 1.394,1.166 showed a small difference t value is .000 and the significant value is 1.000 above 0.05 which shows that there is no significant difference between control and experimental group.

Pretest and posttest of experimental group

Table 2

Students Understanding on Sentence Pattern

| Paired Samples Correlations |                        |    |             |      |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|----|-------------|------|
|                             |                        | N  | Correlation | Sig. |
| Pair 1                      | pretest & experimental | 25 | .227        | .274 |

| Paired Samples Test |           |                    |                   |                    |                                              |        |        |    |                    |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----|--------------------|
|                     |           | Paired Differences |                   |                    |                                              |        | t      | Df | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) |
|                     |           | Mean               | Std.<br>Deviation | Std. Error<br>Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of<br>the Difference |        |        |    |                    |
|                     |           |                    |                   |                    | Lower                                        | Upper  |        |    |                    |
| Pair 1              | pre – exp | -1.920             | .909              | .182               | -2.295                                       | -1.545 | 10.559 | 24 | .000               |

Part 1<sup>st</sup> of the test was contained on sentence pattern to investigate the understanding level of students sentence pattern. The above table shows that the mean of pre and experimental group (2.12, 4.04) with standard deviation (0.781, 0.676) give t value 10.559 and significant value 0.000 which is below 0.005 shows that there is significant difference. Students who were taught on activity-based learning small group teaching strategy give very good result in learning sentence structure.

Pretest and Posttest of Control Group

Table 3

Students Understanding on Sentence Pattern

| Paired Samples Correlations |                    |    |             |      |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----|-------------|------|
|                             |                    | N  | Correlation | Sig. |
| Pair 1                      | pretest & posttest | 25 | .142        | .498 |

| Paired Samples Test |                    |                    |                   |                    |                                              |       |       |    |                    |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------|-------|----|--------------------|
|                     |                    | Paired Differences |                   |                    |                                              |       | t     | Df | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) |
|                     |                    | Mean               | Std.<br>Deviation | Std. Error<br>Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of<br>the Difference |       |       |    |                    |
|                     |                    |                    |                   |                    | Lower                                        | Upper |       |    |                    |
| Pair 1              | pretest – posttest | -.360              | .907              | .181               | -.735                                        | .015  | 1.984 | 24 | .059               |

In the above table student’s ore test and posttest of control group is compared. The above test result showed the mean of pretest and posttest of control group (2.12 ,2.48) with standard deviation (0.781, 0.586) gives t value -1.984 and significant value is 0.059 which is nearly to 0.05 shows very small difference. Students who were taught on Grammar translation method give very poor result in learning sentence pattern.

Post test, of Control and Experimental Group

Table 4

Students Understanding on Types of Sentence Structure

| Paired Samples Correlations |                         |                    |                   |                    |                                              |        |        |        |                    |      |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------------|------|
|                             |                         |                    |                   | N                  | Correlation                                  |        | Sig.   |        |                    |      |
| Pair 1                      | posttest & experimental |                    |                   | 25                 | .160                                         |        | .445   |        |                    |      |
| Paired Samples Test         |                         |                    |                   |                    |                                              |        |        |        |                    |      |
|                             |                         | Paired Differences |                   |                    |                                              |        | t      | Df     | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) |      |
|                             |                         | Mean               | Std.<br>Deviation | Std. Error<br>Mean | 95% Confidence Interval<br>of the Difference |        |        |        |                    |      |
|                             |                         |                    |                   |                    | Lower                                        | Upper  |        |        |                    |      |
| Pair 1                      | posttest – experimental |                    | -1.560            | .821               | .164                                         | -1.899 | -1.221 | -9.506 | 24                 | .000 |

This part of the test was contained on types of sentences to understand the students understanding on types of sentences. The above table shows the result of experimental group and control group. The result of control group with mean of 2.48 and standard deviation 0.586 and experimental group mean 4.04 and standard deviation is 0.676 gives t value -9.506 and significant value is 0.00 less than 0.05 which is acceptable. It indicates that there is an impact of small group teaching strategy on students learning of types of sentences. Pretest and posttest of experimental group

Table 5

Students Understanding on Types of Sentences

| Paired Samples Correlations |                    |                    |                   |                    |                                              |        |        |       |                    |      |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------------------|------|
|                             |                    |                    |                   | N                  | Correlation                                  |        | Sig.   |       |                    |      |
| Pair 1                      | pre & experimental |                    |                   | 25                 | -.089                                        |        | .674   |       |                    |      |
|                             |                    |                    |                   |                    |                                              |        |        |       |                    |      |
| Paired Samples Test         |                    |                    |                   |                    |                                              |        |        |       |                    |      |
|                             |                    | Paired Differences |                   |                    |                                              |        | t      | Df    | Sig.<br>(2-tailed) |      |
|                             |                    | Mean               | Std.<br>Deviation | Std. Error<br>Mean | 95% Confidence Interval<br>of the Difference |        |        |       |                    |      |
|                             |                    |                    |                   |                    | Lower                                        | Upper  |        |       |                    |      |
| Pair 1                      | pre – experimental |                    | -1.880            | 1.201              | .240                                         | -2.376 | -1.384 | 7.824 | 24                 | .000 |

This table shows the statistical analysis of pretest and posttest of experimental group. The mean of pretest 2.20 with standard deviation 0.764 and posttest mean 4.08 with standard deviation 0.862 gives t value 7.824 and significant value 0.00 less than 0.05. This result indicates that there is an impact of small group teaching strategy on students learning of sentence structure. Students who were thought on small group teaching strategy give very good result in posttest.



Post Test of Control and Experimental Group

Table 6

Students Understanding on Types of Sentences

| Paired Samples Correlations |                        |  |  |    |             |  |      |  |  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|----|-------------|--|------|--|--|
|                             |                        |  |  | N  | Correlation |  | Sig. |  |  |
| Pair 1                      | control & experimental |  |  | 25 | -.184       |  | .378 |  |  |

| Paired Samples Test |                        |                    |                |                 |                                           |        |        |       |                 |      |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-----------------|------|
|                     |                        | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           |        | t      | Df    | Sig. (2-tailed) |      |
|                     |                        | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |        |       |                 |      |
|                     |                        |                    |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper  |        |       |                 |      |
| Pair 1              | control - experimental |                    | -1.480         | 1.122           | .224                                      | -1.943 | -1.017 | 6.592 | 24              | .000 |

This table shows the result of posttest of control and experimental group. The mean of control group 2.60 with standard deviation 0.577 and experimental group mean 4.08 with standard deviation 0.0862 gives t value 6.592 and significant value is 0.00 less than 0.05 and is acceptable. The result of experimental group is good as compared to control group.

Pretest and Post Test of Control Group

Table 7

Students Understanding on Kinds of Sentences

| Paired Samples Correlations |                  |  |  |   |             |       |      |      |  |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--|---|-------------|-------|------|------|--|
|                             |                  |  |  | N | Correlation |       | Sig. |      |  |
| Pair 1                      | before & control |  |  |   | 25          | -.644 |      | .001 |  |

| Paired Samples Test |                  |                    |                |                 |                                           |       |      |        |                 |      |
|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|------|--------|-----------------|------|
|                     |                  | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           |       | t    | Df     | Sig. (2-tailed) |      |
|                     |                  | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |       |      |        |                 |      |
|                     |                  |                    |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper |      |        |                 |      |
| Pair 1              | before – control |                    | -.360          | 1.319           | .264                                      | -.904 | .184 | -1.365 | 24              | .185 |

This table shows the result of pretest and posttest of control group. The pretest means 2.16 and standard deviation 0.800 and posttest mean 2.52 with standard deviation 0.653 shows very slight difference gives t value -1.365 and significance vale is 0.185 which is above 0.05 and is not significant. Hence students who were taught with Grammar Translation Method showed very poor performance in understanding kinds of sentences

Pretest and Post Test of Experimental Group

Table 8

Students Understanding on Kinds of Sentences

| Paired Samples Correlations |                       |    |  |             |  |      |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----|--|-------------|--|------|--|--|--|
|                             |                       | N  |  | Correlation |  | Sig. |  |  |  |
| Pair 1                      | before & experimental | 25 |  | .031        |  | .884 |  |  |  |



| Paired Samples Test |                       |                    |                |                 |                                           |       |    |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|----|-----------------|
|                     |                       | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           | t     | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|                     |                       | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |       |    |                 |
|                     |                       |                    |                |                 | Lower Upper                               |       |    |                 |
| Pair 1              | before - experimental | -1.960             | 1.172          | .234            | -2.444 -1.476                             | 8.363 | 24 | .000            |

This table shows the analysis of pretest and posttest of experimental group. The mean score of pretests 2.16 with standard deviation 0.080 and posttest mean 4,12 with standard deviation 0.881 gives t value is 8.363 and p value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 and significantly acceptable.

Resultantly students of experimental group give very good result in understanding kinds of sentences. The small teaching strategy has an impact on students learning kinds of sentence structure.

### Post Test of Control and Experimental Group

**Table 9**

*Students Understanding on Kinds of Sentences*

| Paired Samples Correlations |                        |    |             |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|----|-------------|
|                             |                        | N  | Correlation |
| Pair 1                      | control & experimental | 25 | .032        |

| Paired Samples Test |                        |                    |                |                 |                                           |        |    |                 |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|----|-----------------|
|                     |                        | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           | t      | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|                     |                        | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |    |                 |
|                     |                        |                    |                |                 | Lower Upper                               |        |    |                 |
| Pair 1              | control - experimental | -1.600             | 1.080          | .216            | -2.046 -1.154                             | -7.407 | 24 | .000            |

This table shows the analysis of posttest control and experimental group. The mean of control group 2,52 with standard deviation 0.653 and experimental group mean 4.12 with standard deviation 0.881 give a t value is -7.407 and p value 0.00 less than 0.05 which is acceptable.

### Pre and Post Test of Control Group

**Table 10**

*Students Understanding on Rearrange the Words*

| Paired Samples Correlations |                  |    |             |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----|-------------|
|                             |                  | N  | Correlation |
| Pair 1                      | before & control | 25 | .169        |

| Paired Samples Test |                  |                    |                |                 |                                           |        |    |                 |
|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|----|-----------------|
|                     |                  | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           | t      | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|                     |                  | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |    |                 |
|                     |                  |                    |                |                 | Lower Upper                               |        |    |                 |
| Pair 1              | before – control | -.280              | .980           | .196            | -.684 .124                                | -1.429 | 24 | .166            |

Part 4 of the test was contained on rearrange the words in correct sentence structure to give a meaningful sentence. This table shows the result of pretest and posttest of control group. The mean of pretest 2,32 and standard deviation 0.627 and posttest of control group mean 2.60 and standard deviation 0.866 gives t value -1.429 and p value is 0.166 above 0.05. Hence it indicates that students learn with Grammar Translation Method in a very small ratio.

**Pre and Post Test of Experimental Group**  
**Table 11**

*Students Understanding on Rearrange the Words*

| Paired Samples Correlations |                       |    |  |             |  |      |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----|--|-------------|--|------|--|--|--|
|                             |                       | N  |  | Correlation |  | Sig. |  |  |  |
| Pair 1                      | before & experimental | 25 |  | .319        |  | .120 |  |  |  |

| Paired Samples Test |                       |                    |                |                 |                                           |        |        |    |                 |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----|-----------------|
|                     |                       | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           |        | t      | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|                     |                       | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |        |    |                 |
|                     |                       |                    |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper  |        |    |                 |
| Pair 1              | before - experimental | -1.760             | 1.091          | .218            | -2.210                                    | -1.310 | -8.067 | 24 | .000            |

This table shows the performance of pretest and posttest of experimental group. The pretest means 2.32 and standard deviation 0.627 and posttest mean 4.08 with standard deviation 0.223 gives t value -8.067 and p value is 0.00 less than 0.05 which is significant and acceptable. Students who were taught with small group teaching strategy gives good performance in rearrange the words.

**Post test of Control and Experimental Group**  
**Table 12**

*Students Understanding on Rearrange the Words*

| Paired Samples Correlations |                        |    |  |             |  |      |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|----|--|-------------|--|------|--|--|--|
|                             |                        | N  |  | Correlation |  | Sig. |  |  |  |
| Pair 1                      | control & experimental | 25 |  | -.138       |  | .510 |  |  |  |

| Paired Samples Test |                        |                    |                |                 |                                           |       |       |    |                 |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|-------|----|-----------------|
|                     |                        | Paired Differences |                |                 |                                           |       | t     | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|                     |                        | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |       |       |    |                 |
|                     |                        |                    |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper |       |    |                 |
| Pair 1              | control - experimental | -1.480             | 1.503          | .301            | -2.101                                    | -.859 | 4.922 | 24 | .000            |

This table shows the post test of control and experimental group. The mean of control group is 2.60 with standard deviation 0.866 and experimental group mean 4.08 with standard deviation 1.115. The pair difference mean is -1.480 with standard deviation 1.503 gives t value 4.922 and p value is 0.00 less than 0.05 which is statistically acceptable.

## Findings

The data was analyzed, the following descriptive and inferential statistics and major findings are listed here in the following lines:

1. This table shows the pretest result of both control and experimental group. The mean score of control and experimental group (8.88,8.88) with standard deviation of 1.394,1.166 showed a small difference t value is. 000 and the significant value is 1.000 above 0.05 which shows that there is no significant difference between control and experimental group. (table 1)
2. Part 1<sup>st</sup> of the test was contained on sentence pattern to investigate the understanding level of students sentence pattern. The mean of pre and experimental group (2.12, 4.04) with standard deviation (0.781, 0.676) give t value -10.559 and significant value 0.000 which is below 0.005 shows that there is significant difference. Students who were taught on activity-based learning small group teaching strategy give very good result in learning sentence structure. (table 2)
3. Students pretest and posttest of control group is compared. The above test result showed the mean of pretest and posttest of control group (2.12 ,2.48) with standard deviation (0.781, 0.586) gives t value -1.984 and significant value is 0.059 which is nearly to 0.05 shows very small difference. Students who were taught on Grammar translation method give very poor result in learning sentence pattern. (table 3)
4. This part of the test was contained on types of sentences to understand the students understanding on types of sentences. The result of control group with mean of 2.48 and standard deviation 0.586 and experimental group mean 4.04 and standard deviation is 0.676 gives t value -9.506 and significant value is 0.00 less than 0.05 which is acceptable. It indicates that there is an impact of small group teaching strategy on students learning of types of sentences. (table 4)
5. The mean of pretest 2.20 with standard deviation 0.764 and posttest mean 4.08 with standard deviation 0.862 gives t value -7.824 and significant value 0.00 less than 0.05. This result indicates that there is an impact of small group teaching strategy on students learning of sentence structure. Students who were thought on small group teaching strategy give very good result in posttest. (table 5)
6. The mean of control group 2.60 with standard deviation 0.577 and experimental group mean 4.08 with standard deviation 0.0862 gives t value -6.592 and significant value is 0.00 less than 0.05 and is acceptable. The result of experimental group is good as compared to control group. (table 6)
7. The mean of control group 2,52 with standard deviation 0.653 and experimental group mean 4.12 with standard deviation 0.881 give a t value is -7.407 and p value 0.00 less than 0.05 which is acceptable. (table 7)
8. The pretest means 2.16 and standard deviation 0.800 and posttest mean 2.52 with standard deviation 0.653 shows very slight difference gives t value -1.365 and significance vale is 0.185 which is above 0.05 and is not significant. Hence students who were taught with Grammar Translation Method showed very poor performance in understanding kinds of sentences. (table 8)
9. The mean score of pretests 2.16 with standard deviation 0.080 and posttest mean 4,12 with standard deviation 0.881 gives t value is -8.363 and p value is 0.00 which is less than 0.05 and significantly acceptable. Resultantly students of experimental group give very good result in understanding kinds of sentences. The small teaching strategy has an impact on students learning kinds of sentence structure. (table 9)
10. The pretest means 2.32 and standard deviation 0.627 and posttest mean 4.08 with standard deviation 0.223 gives t value -8.067 and p value is 0.00 less than 0.05 which is significant and acceptable. Students who were taught with small group teaching strategy gives good performance in rearrange the words. (table 10)
11. Part 4 of the test was contained on rearrange the words in correct sentence structure to give a meaningful sentence. The result of pretest and posttest of control group with mean of pretest 2,32 and

standard deviation 0.627 and posttest of control group mean 2.60 and standard deviation 0.866 gives t value -1.429 and p value is 0.166 above 0.05.

12. Hence it indicates that students learn with Grammar Translation Method in a very small ratio. (table 11)
13. The mean of control group is 2.60 with standard deviation 0.866 and experimental group mean 4.08 with standard deviation 1.115. The pair difference mean is -1.480 with standard deviation 1.503 gives t value -4.922 and p value is 0.00 less than 0.05 which is statistically acceptable. (table 12)

## **Recommendations**

Followings recommendations were suggested keeping in mind the literature review, methodology, analysis of data and findings of the study. The focus of the study was to investigate the impact of small group teaching strategy on students learning of sentence structure in an environment and compared with traditional classes.

1. Instead of using the Grammar translation approach, teachers can use a small group teaching technique in which all students are active participants in their learning.
2. Teacher is required to give practical practice on the grammar portion and other skills of language like reading, speaking, listening and writing rather than cramming.
3. The learning outcomes and academic achievement of a student largely depends on teachers, professional and academic competencies. So, the trainings of the teachers are highly recommended at primary level.
4. The researcher was able to determine that the material put in the primary level was above the students' mental level. As a result, it was suggested that when designing the curriculum, the course be designed in accordance with the socio-cultural, economic, and geographical demands of the region.

## References

- AHMAD, N., Ahmed, S., Bukhari, M. A., & Bukhari, T. A. (2011). The nature of difficulties in learning English by the students at secondary school level in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 2(10), 18-24.
- Bacha, M. S., & Ilyas, M. (2014). The Teaching of English language in the private schools of Dir Upper, KPK, Pakistan. *BEST: International Journal of Humanities, Arts, Medicine and Sciences (BEST: IJHAMS)*, 2(11), 43-54.
- De Volder, M. L., De Grave, W. S., & Gijsselaers, W. H. (1985). Peer teaching: Academic achievement of teacher-led versus student-led discussion groups. *Higher Education*, 14(6), 643-650. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00136502>
- Gay, L.R, Miles, G. E. and Airasian, P. (2011) *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. 10th Edition, Pearson Education International, Boston.
- Killen, R. (2018). *Effective Teaching Strategies: Lessons from Research and Practice* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning
- Leat, D., Reid, A., & Lofthouse, R. (2015). Teachers' experiences of engagement with and in educational research: What can be learned from teachers' views? *Oxford review of education*, 41(2), 270-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2015.1021193>
- Imran, M. (2008). *A comparative study of quality of education in public and private secondary schools of Punjab* (Doctoral dissertation, Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi Pakistan)
- Peter, D. O. G. O. (2016). Effects of English Language on Students' Performance in Teaching and Learning of Mathematical Modelling at Junior Secondary School Level in Bauchi State, Nigeria. *Nigeria Unpublish Dissertation*.
- Salahuddin, A. N. M., Khan, M. M. R., & Rahman, M. A. (2013). Challenges of implementing English curriculum at rural primary schools of Bangladesh. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 34-51.
- Khokhar, S., & Sangi, M. K. (2020). Language learning strategies and styles of second language learners. *Grassroots*, 54(1), 45-58. <https://sujo.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/Grassroots/article/view/1173>
- Swing, S. R., & Peterson, P. L. (2017). The relationship of student ability and small-group interaction to student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(2), 259-274. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312019002259>
- Suleman, Q., & Gul, R. (2015). A Comparative Study of Directly Selected, In-Service Promoted and Online Selected Subject Specialists Regarding Teaching Effectiveness in Kohat Division, Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(10), 25-36. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081655.pdf>
- Toledo, F., & Hoit, S. (2016). *Developing speaking skills in first grade: The impact of puppets on young learners' spoken interactions and motivation*. Cambridge University Press. Teacher Research Program. <https://puppetools.com/Reidmillerresearch.pdf>