



**ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERISTY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH
[GRADUATE PROGRAMME]**

**ASSESSEMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ONE TO FIVE COOPERATIVE
LEARNING AND THE ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS AND STUDENTS
TOWARDS IT IN EFL CLASSROOM: THE CASE OF NEGELLE
PREPARATORY SCHOOL WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO GRADE 11**

BY MELAKU DIRIBA

A Thesis presented to the Department of English

[Graduate Program]

**In Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Teaching English as a foreign language [TEFL]**

June, 2016

APPROVAL SHEET

Adama Science and Technology University

School of Humanities and Law.

Department of English.

Submitted by: _____

Name

Date

Signature

Approved by: _____

Name of Chairperson

Date

Signature

Name of Major Advisor

Date

Signature

Name of Internal Examiner

Date

Signature

Name of External Examiner

Date

Signature

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, graduate student hereby declare that, this thesis is my original work, has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name : _____

Signature _____

Advisor: Mekonin Gemechu(PhD)

Place Adama. School of Humanities and Law

Date of submission: July7, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep and heartfelt thanks to my M.A thesis advisor, Dr, Mekonen Gemechu for his knowledgeable advice and constructive comments that have shaped this thesis immeasurably. Without his proper guidance, the study would never have seen in the light of today.

I am grateful to W/t Adi Bedada who helped me in writing my thesis and sharing her valuable time. I wish to extend my deepest gratitude to all my friends and relatives who in one or another contribute to the completion of this paper. Special thanks go to Ato Ayenew Tamirat, Kuli Abe, Lulu kibret, Asmamaw and my wife Nigatwa Begna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Table of contents	ii
List of tables	vi
Abstract	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Statement the Problem	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study	5
1.3.1 General Objective	5
1.3.2 Specific Objectives	5
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Significance of the Study	6
1.6 Scope of the Study	7
1.7 Limitation of the study	7
1.8 Organization of the study paper	7
1.9 Definition of terms	8
1.9.1 One to five cooperative learning	8
1.9.2 Communicative competence	8
1.9.3 Didactic teaching method	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAME WORK	
2.1 Issues with implementing cooperative learning	9
2.2 The emerging of cooperative learning	10
2.3 Essential elements of cooperative learning	11
2.3.1 Positive interdependence	12
2.3.2 Face to face interaction	13
2.3.3 Individual accountability	14

2.3.4 Teaching of the social skills.....	15
2.3.5 Group processing	15
2.4 Types of cooperative learning groups.....	16
2.4.1 Formal cooperative learning group	16
2.4.2 Informal cooperative learning groups	16
2.4.3 Cooperative base group	17
2.5 Forming cooperative groups	17
2.5.1 Cooperative group size.....	17
2.5.2. Strategies for composing pupils to cooperative groups	18
2.6. Teachers Roles in group learning	20
2.7 Students Roles in cooperative group learning	21
2.8 Challenges of cooperative learning.....	22
2.8.1 Noise	23
2.8.2 Teachers' lack of training	23
2.8.3 Over-user of Mother tongue	23
2.8.4 Problem of Dominance	23
2.9 Factors that affect student's interaction in group work	24
2.9.1 Personal factors	24
2.9.2 Lack of self-esteem	24
2.9.3 Inhibition	24
2.9.4 Anxiety	25
2.9.5 Low English language proficiency	25
2.9.6 Leadership problem	25
2.9.7 Lack of experience	25
2.10 One to five cooperative group structures.....	25
2.11. Important consideration in establishing cooperative groups	27
2.11.1 Teaching context	27
2.11.2 Teaching context	28
2.11.3 Individual learner	28
2.12. Rational to use cooperative group work	29
2.13 Increase students talk	29

2.14 Promotes learners responsibility and autonomy	29
2.15 Reduces learning anxiety and improve self esteem	30
2.16 Promote retention.....	30

CHAPTER THREE: Method of the Stud

3.1 Research Method	31
3.2 Research Design.....	31
3.3 Sampling	31
3.3.1 Selection of school and grade level	31
3.3.2 Selection of Participant's.....	31
3.3.3 Instrumentation and Data analysis Procedures.....	32
3.4 Instrument of data collection	32
3.4.1. Questionnaire.....	32
3.4.2 Class room observation	32
3.4.3 Interview.....	33
3.5 Data analysis	33

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISUSSION

4.1. How one to five cooperative learning is implemented in grade eleventh preparatory school EFL class rooms? The questions were as held to respondents to	35
4.1.1. The presence of one to five cooperative group learning	35
4.1.2. Organizing one to five cooperative learning groups.....	36
4.1.3. Cooperative group size	36
4.1.4. Composition of cooperative groups	36
4.1.5. Concerns with cooperative leaders	38
4.2. The frequency of using one to five groups in EFL class	39
4.3. Teachers and students roles in implementing one to five cooperative learning	40
4.3.1. Teachers roles	40
4.3.2. Students' roles	44
4.4. EFL teachers' and students perception towards advantage of one to five cooperative learning.....	46
4.4.1. General academic advantages	47

4.4.2. Advantage Related EFL Learning and Teaching	49
4.4.3. Improves the Learning Environment	50
4.4.4. Social Benefits	51
4.5. EFL teachers' and students perception towards disadvantage of one to five cooperative learning structures	51
4.6. General view of EFL teachers and students to wards one to five cooperative learning structures	54
4.7 factors that affect student's participant on in one to five cooperative learning	54
4.7.1. Personal factors	55
4.7.2. Factors related situations	56
4.8. Classroom Observation.....	57
4.8.1. Observation analysis	58
4.8.2. Teachers related problems	58
4.8.3. Student related problems	58

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMENDATION

5.1 Summary	60
5.2 Conclusion	62
5.3 Recommendation	63
References	
Appendix	

LIST OF TABLES

Table-2.1. Hammer's teachers' roles frame work	21
Table 3.1. The distribution of the population of the study	32
Table 4.1The presence of one to five cooperative group learning	35
Table 4.2 organizing one to five cooperative learning groups.	36
Table 4.3 Cooperative group size	36
Table 4.4. How students are grouped into different cooperative learning	36
Table 4.5. Memberships of cooperative learning in terms of gender	37
Table 4.6. Problems in organizing cooperative groups	37
Table 4.7. Positive thinking about one to five cooperative learning groups.	37
Table 4.8 Members of cooperative groups in terms of achievement	38
Table 4.9 Selection of cooperative learning leader	38
Table 4.10. The role of cooperative learning leaders	39
Table 4.11. The frequency of using one to five cooperative learning	39
Table 4.12. Teachers' pre instructional activities	40
Table 4.13. The teacher's activities during introducing and facilitating group discussion ...	41
Table 4.14. The teachers' activities during monitoring and intervening session	43
Table 4.15. The teacher's activities in closing up lessons	44
Table 4.16. Student's roles when they are in EFL classrooms.	45
Table 4.17. Academic benefits that students obtain from using one to five Cooperative learning	47
Table 4.18 Advantage Related EFL Learning and Teaching	49
Table 4.19. One To Five Cooperative Learning Is Interesting	50
Table 4.20. Social benefits that students get from participating in one to five Cooperative learning	51
Table 4.21. Negative outlook of students and teachers	52
Table 4.22. The effectiveness of one to five cooperative learning	54
Table 4.23. Factors related in individual personality	55
Table 4.24. Situational factors	56
Table 4.25 Student related problems	58
Table 4.26 Teacher related problems	58

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the implementation of one to five cooperating learning and the aptitudes of teachers and students towards it Negelle Preparatory School English classroom context. To accomplish this questionnaire, interview along with classroom observation were used to collect the data. Ninety students were selected through random sampling techniques and three teachers were participated in the study. This study used both quantitative and qualitative method to analyse the data. The finding of this study showed that Preparatory EFL teachers rarely use one to five cooperative learning in their classroom and that is less effective in teaching and learning English language. Therefore it can be concluded that teachers and students did not implement one to five cooperative learning, their attitudes towards it seem to be negative, the majority of participants did not seem to have clear perception about one to five cooperative learning and teachers and students were not play their expected roles. It is recommended that students need to be thought the appropriate interactional skill knowing how to work effectively, teachers lessons and tasks need to be well organised and assign roles for every individuals.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

Under chapter one many ideas were raised, discussed and explained in respect of one another. There are some subtitles were included on it. Such as back ground of the study , objective of the study, research questions, significance of the study, organization of the study paper, definition of terms, communicative competence and didactic teaching method.

1.1 Background of the study

Over the last decades, a slow but important shift has taken place in the field of language teaching. As Richards, (2002) states one of the consequence of the above shift is use of cooperative learning strategy in second and foreign learning and teaching.

Discrete grammatical structures from the teacher- centered practice extends to the student-centered acquisition of communicative competence are the focus of language teaching. (Celce-Murcia, etal , 1995).

According to Richards and Rodgers(2001) state cooperative activities could be one of the basic tools in communicative language teaching because cooperative learning provide opportunities for pupils to communicate and a means of integrating the four language skills.

There is a continuous debate about effective methodology to be used in all level of education. Some argue that teachers impose knowledge on students and other makes sense for students to discover them. Lasley and Ornstein (2000)

Baloche.L. (1998) states in higher education lectures can move away from traditional method (teacher- centered) to move active involvement of students (student- centered). Cooperative learning is in which a teacher makes students in a few groups so that they can do purpose full communicative tasks interactively (Nation, 1994).

According to second language teaching experts, communicative language teaching gives higher priority to communicate competence which is involved in acquiring both skill and knowledge to use language. Communicative is the key word to symbolize the changes in the field over the years

is the idea that way to engage in learning another language lies on students target language (Harmer 2001, Jacob, etal. 1997).

Slaving,(1991), Kagan (1995), Johnson and Johnson (1994) state language learners from small cooperative learning activities benefit three major categories of theoretical importance for language development that are the comprehensible input, the comprehensible output or interaction and contextualization of knowledge.

Determining the most effective teaching for their students is one of the greatest challenges that educators faced. In addition, where building relationships and productivity go hand in hand, instructors must consider which skills will be the most practical for student.

Cooperative learning is a valuable tool for learning in academic institutions to day and became a commonly used form of active pedagogy in 1980's (Johnson , Johnson , Smith, 1991).

There days, in Ethiopia, one to five cooperative is commonly practiced in different levels of schooling, classrooms are organized in one to five group learning structures in which students work or learning activities in small groups and receive rewards based on their group performance. Ato Aynekulu Abebe (Amhara Regional State, North Shewa Zone Education Departement Vice Head, 2015) confirmed that one to five cooperative learning has been introduced in 2010 as instructional method in schools. Since then, it is broadly practiced through out the country.

The researcher utilized the didactic method mainly because that he was thought. However, it appears that this method is not the most effective learning tool. For instance, after teaching using the deductive method when students are given quiazzes, they do well or simple recall questions, but whenever there is need for application practice, analysis, synthesis and evaluation of students perform poorly.

Therefore it can be said students reasoning abilities are not being fully realized. As a result, the researcher interest sparked on this one to five group learning. Thus, the researcher question will be how to motivate his students to become stakeholder in their learning.

In addition, previous researches such as (Brown, 2007 , Slavin , 1991) suggest that the greatest growth in language and cognitive development is made by a child. “What children can do together today, they can do alone tomorrow” Vygotsky, (1978)

According to researcher (Slavin, 1991, Kanga, 1995, Johnson and Johnson, 1994) cooperative learning increase students’ academic learning as well as personal growth because (1) it reduces learning anxiety and improve self-esteem, (2) it increase the number of student participate and student talk in the target language, (3) it builds supportive and less threatening learning environment, and (4) it helps the rate of learning retention, (5) it leads to great motivation towards learning (6) it increase time on task, (7) it emphasizes active interaction between students of diverse abilities and background and (8) it enables to care about the class and the material.

Motivated students are less likely to miss class even if student satisfaction is not an end in it self (Slavin, 1991, Kanga ,1995, Johnson and Johnson , 1994).

According to Bejarano (1987), Long and Porter (1985) cooperative learning strategy is mainly essential for second language learners.

As Gillies, (2003b) Webb, (1992) state it can be trusted that social interaction plays a major role in how children learn. However, several classrooms students are not being active in its creation than students are often the inactive recipients of knowledge.

According Gillies, (2008), Webb and Farivar (1992) pointed out students show increased participation in group discussions, perform a more sophisticated level of discourse and involve in fewer interventions when other speak when work cooperatively together.

1.2. Statement of the problem

In situations where the target language is seldom used outside the classroom, classroom interaction between teacher and students among students themselves is very demandable in communicative language teaching. As mentioned in the previous sections the communicative goal of foreign language classroom can be achieved through active students' interaction with each other. Students-to-student's interaction in classroom is highly realized and manifested more through the use of cooperative learning.

Grade eleven students of Negele Preparatory School expect teacher centered approach to be a key to acquire knowledge with very limited input from them. It was sure that many students just depend on the teachers talk and did very little or no work outside the class setting. As a result they usually could not show a clear understanding of the subject matter and didn't come up with their own potential. There could be a perception that different teaching strategies lead to difference in student's academic performance. Therefore learning at this preparatory school could be more students centered to ensure greater students understanding.

Currently, in Ethiopia one to five cooperative learning strategies is largely implemented at different levels of schooling so as to improve group interaction and cooperation. Pupils are organized into different one to five cooperative learning. One pupil, who is possibly high achievers, is assigned as cooperative leader, the rest five students are considered as members of that cooperative group. According to scholars, through this implementation pupils are given the chance to work together with their parents towards accomplishing academic and social goals. This strategy could improve cooperative team work between teacher and students and amongst students (Alamrew (1992) and Birhanu (2000)).

The researcher trusted that the low skilled of the Ethiopian students would be due to less practice of this system of instructional method in EFL. Focusing on this view, Mulat (2007) a study on assessment of teacher's roles in implementing of co-operative learning with particular reference to Debre Birhan College found that teachers act against co-operative learning. Using mother tongue affects co-operative learning so that teachers didn't plan cooperative activities.

Adem Mohamed (2007) in the same way conducted a study "challenges and opportunities of using group work in EFL classes" "The failure to address specific questions and problems that appear after implementation are ; as follows: To discuss on class activities, teachers used only a few high

achievers students, they didn't aim to have different group, many teachers and students lack the trend to use co-operative learning in the EFL classroom and lacks necessary support by professionals and inadequate training in cooperative learning. According to Sharan (1986) if one to one cooperative learning system failed to support it, the students resist being in the same group even though cooperative learning method works and some students after all, may be "Threatened by group work as a legitimate way of working and so gives sensible message to the teacher who experiments with a new method" (Cowie and Rudduch, 1990).

To make affective teaching and learning in cooperative learning, teachers and students should have passed through experience of making small group. Emphasizing this view Altman and Pulizer (1971) as cited in Mehary (2011) effective learning in small group requires experience in both teachers and students.

It is also suggested by Yu (1995) experiencing with cooperative learning and teachers practice could affect the result of teaching method.

On the bases of this assumption the researcher was inspired to assess implementation of one to five cooperative learning English language classrooms. It was therefore my intention to assess the views of teachers and students at Negelle Preparatory School towards one to five cooperative learning.

1.3 Objective of the study

1.3.1 General objective of the study

The purpose of this is to assess the implementation of one to five cooperative learning and the attitudes of teachers and students towards it in Negelle Preparatory School.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

Up on the completion of the study this study was able to

- A. Examine the positive effects of one to five cooperative learning in Negelle Preparatory learners.
- B. Investigate whether preparatory school teachers and students play their expected roles in one to five cooperative learning or not

- C. Assess EFL teachers and learners perceptions about one to five cooperative learning in English language.
- D. Investigate problems that teachers and students face when using one to five cooperative learning in EFL class- room

1.4 Research questions

1. What problems do teachers and students face when using one to five cooperative learning in EFL?
2. What do preparatory school teachers and students play their expected roles in implementing one to five cooperative learning or not?
3. How do teachers and students of preparatory school perceive one to five cooperative learning?
4. What are they positive effect of one to five cooperative learning on preparatory school language performance?

1.5 Significance of the study

The main objective of this study was to assess the implementation of one to five cooperative learning and the attitudes of teachers and students towards it in Negelle Preparatory School. So the following would be the main contribution of the study

- ❖ The finding of this study can assist students to bring together the fields of cooperative learning, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching to create optimal schooling experiences. This study would aid the government in policy development and implementation.
- ❖ The result of the study could also help teachers in understanding their student's attitude and interpretation of one to five cooperative learning they are assigning.
- ❖ Understanding of student's attitude towards cooperative learning method could also help teachers, organization, society and school administrators, in particular for understanding the feedback of students for the implementation of the cooperative learning method.
- ❖ At the end of this study can further helped students to share information, earn higher grades, and give comments and recommendation for school teachers and administrators.

Furthermore, it will help other students who may wish to conduct research studies on cooperative learning.

1.6. Scope of the study

The study was delimited to Negelle Preparatory School grade eleventh in focus. The study was also delimited in terms of the problem to be addressed and therefore, the study concerned to assess the implementation of one to five cooperative learning and the attitudes of teachers and students towards it.

1.7 Limitation of the study

Besides to its strengths and significances, this study, has certain limitations. In fact, success and failure are a coin of one piece of paper.

Therefore, the researcher had faced problems while conducting this study because of the following reasons.

- ❖ There were limited researches done on the areas of one to five cooperative learning methods in Ethiopia and hence the research lacks sufficient literatures and reference materials to fully examine the nature of the problem.
- ❖ There were lack of enough finance, time and material to do this study.
- ❖ There were insufficient internet accesses to get further information.

1.8 Organization of the study paper

This research paper made of five chapters. These are; Introduction at first chapters, the second chapter is review of related literature and provides a theoretical rational for the present study. The third chapter is on methodology and the results ensured are presented in chapter four. The last chapter of this study paper contains the discussion, conclusions, proposed guidelines of implementation of one to five cooperative learning implications of the present study, and the suggestions for further research.

1.9 Definition of terms

In this section terms are defined in the context of this study embedded (A) one to five cooperative learning (B) communicative competence and (C) Did active method of teaching.

1.9.1 One to five cooperative learning

One to five cooperative learning is defined as a teaching arrangement in which small, heterogeneous groups of students work together to achieve a common goal. Therefore, teachers arrange pupils in small cooperative group so as to work together and encourage and support each other.

Here; one to five refers to assume responsibility for their own and each other's learning and group related social skills. This means that one student who possibly high achiever is assigned as permanent group leader and the remaining students are considered as member of that cooperative learning

1.9.2 Communicative competence

Communicative competence defined as the ability of students to use language effectively and appropriately. In effective ability or communicative competence is viewed that as involving both knowledge of grammar and knowledge of communication takes place. In contrary with the belief that only knowledge of grammar is needed so as to produce and understand correct sentence.

1.9.3 Didactic teaching method

A very simplistic definition; the didactic from of instruction is a teacher centered approach that occurs when a teachers mainly lectures instead of facilitating learning or in other words called it traditional method of teaching , here refers to the method that in corporate lectures on grammatical rules and sentence structures in the teaching English as a foreign language.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAME WORK

In this chapter, relevant literature and theoretical frame work are mentioned.

2.1. Issues with implementing cooperative learning

Introduction

In this chapter two, relevant literature and theoretical framework are mentioned. In addition there are subtitles included on it. Such as, issues with implementing cooperative learning, the emgging of cooperative learning, essential elements to cooperative learning, types of cooperative learning groups, forming cooperative groups, teachers roles in group learning , students roles in cooperative learning group, challenges of cooperative learning , factors that affect students interaction in group work , one to five cooperative group structure, important consideration in establishing.

In Ethiopia context, Wondwosen (2008) in his research finding stated that, teachers do not implement the lesson as a cooperative learning though Ethiopia English text books invite students to do in pairs on group in classroom.

For the above information give teachers should involve workable and efficient models out of class room instruction so that this teaching practice resulted in profiting pupils and teachers.

As to Catherine (2005) as cited in Tesfamicael (2011) , to solve reading comprehension problems, effective teaching is one of the best means of developing proficient comprehenders.

The didactic method approach has dominated four English in Ethiopia for along time, some writers like longad Porter (1985), argued that students are not given opportunities to practice inside and out side the classroom so that many low achieving language learners are unable to communicate each other.

Gillies(2003) and Webb(1992) suggested that social interactions plays a crucial role in how children learn. Students are often inactive (passive) recipients of knowledge than being active in its creation. This may be because of teachers ‘tendency to talk at students who are required to listen and respond, often just repeating information given by the teacher previously.

Chndinova, and Khavkin(1998) argued that teachers have a capacity to improve and shape children' questioning by giving reply to encourage enthusiasm in the topic at hand..In spite of being assigned in small groups, elementary children seldom worked together in cooperative groups.(Blatchford,and Kutnic(2003),

2.2. The Emerging of cooperative learning

Johnson, Johnson and Stanne,(2000) proposed that group work is strong and vital and the group members changes from individual to the whole group and their interdependence could vary among individuals..Vygotsk (1978) trusted that learners have some potentiality that will be developed interaction with others. It is also believed that the process of learning should be integrative nature among students in which students are required to use their knowledge in the real world environment.

It has been claimed that cooperative work among individuals can increase motivation considerably (Dornyei,2005)

Group work learning is a cooperative learning strategy in which a teacher arranges students in small groups so that they can perform purposeful communicative tasks interactively (Nation, 1994)

Stevens and Slavin(1995) described the function of a 'cognitive apprenticeship' students learn new material together with different achievement levels..Higher level academic students are able to use their mastery of concepts to give explanation to the other students, onotherhand, scaffolding of their fellow classmates as a comprehension technique to understand the material are able to use by the lower students. Rewarding groups as well as individuals for their academic achievement is the main idea behind cooperative learning and performers will come to support than against high achievement. (Slavin,1984)

More recently, the concept of output has gained popularity and some researchers across the world have tried to show its positive effects (Shehadeh,2001) ;Swain,2005). Cooperative work can be a suitable activity in order to take output in to consideration. When the learners work collaboratively

and there will be more inclined to progress. Teachers should be able to engage students in the process of learning in a way that they even forget there is such a thing as the teacher in the class.' Students have the potential to lead the discussion, take responsibilities for what they are doing, and use their knowledge in order to communicate. . This would help them to recognize what they are doing is practical and can bring about change for environment with their friends. "(Brown 2007)

The whole mentioned authors above have recognized and supported the role of cooperative in language. In this kind of procedures, pupils should depend up on their own abilities not any more dependent on the authoritative role of teacher and they try to learn from each other.

African indigenous education was an everlasting process of learning progressed b y human through predetermined stages of life from childhood to old age. Cameroon and doff (1970)

Nyerere (1975) says, 11 at the didactic level the teaching process took the from of stories , legends, riddles and songs; while at the practical level individuals enacted what they had learned didactically, by imitating and watching what their elders performed. That is young adult learned through participating, watching and executing what they learned. The skills line cooking, cloth making, clay making were insisted among children in the community.

Nyerere (1975 in Mushi 2009) declared that learned by doing is very important. The best way to know sewing is to sew ; the best way to learn forming is to form. Those means that learning become strong when accompanied through practice.

2.3 Essential elements of cooperative learning

According to Johnson and Johnson (2009) there are five essential elements in cooperative learning. These variables that mediate the effectiveness of cooperation and make cooperative learning more successful therefore, it is important to structure these basic elements in to cooperative learning situations systematically.

2.3.1 Positive interdependence

Positive interdependence is creating the sense that “we sink or swim together” (Johnson et al 1998). It is a sense of working together for common goal and caring about each other’s learning. According to Johnson and Johnson (2009) forwarded that positive interdependence students in cooperative learning has a task therefore, must believe that they are responsible for their learning and that of their cooperative members and must participate and full effort with in cooperative group. Within cooperative learning situation, students have two responsibilities (1) learn the assigned material, and (2) ensure that all members of the cooperative learning team learn the assigned materials. When positive interdependence is clearly understood, it establishes that (1) each cooperative member’s are required and essential for cooperative members success (2) each cooperative member’s make to the joint effort and has unique contribution to his or her resources and task responsibilities (Johnson and Johnson 1994) within cooperative learning there were a member and ways of structuring positive interdependence

Positive goal interdependence: According to Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1991) suggested that in positive interdependence if one member fails to perform his or her work, the entire group suffer where members are rely on one another to achieve common goal. Positive goal interdependence might be structured by informing group members they are responsible for (1) all members scoring have got a specified criterion when tested individually (2) the overall group score being a specified criterion (3) one product successfully completed by the cooperative group (Johnson and Johnson, (1994) This means the cooperative members has a clear task or goal. The efforts of each person benefit not only the individual but also everyone else in the group. The key to positive interdependence is committing to personal success as well as the success and every member of cooperative learning.

Roles inter dependence: is structured in terms of their roles (such as reader, recorder, checker of understanding, encourages of participation, and elaboration and knowledge) and each member is assigned complimentary and interconnected roles. Therefore, a task is divided into jobs and can’t be finished unless all support, each person learns a topic and then teaches it the group and offer a reward (e.g. bonus points) if everyone in the group succeeds.. Hence that specify responsibilities that the group needs in order to complete the joint task.

Resource interdependence: is structured when each member has only a portion of the information, materials, or responses necessary for the task to be completed and members’

resources have to be combined in order for the group to achieve its goal. Consequently, the group has only one pencil, paper, book or other resources, one paper is written by the group and pass one paper around the group on which each member must write a section.

According to Johnson and Ahlgren (1976) and Johnson et al. (2009) effective collaboration and positive interdependence or cooperative group plays an essential role to accomplish a common goal “positive interdependence exists when individuals perceive that they come and reach their goals if and only if the other individuals with whom they are cooperatively link each other. Also reach their goals and promote each other’s efforts to achieve the goals’ (Johnson et al., 2007,, p.16). There are a number of ways of structuring positive interdependence. One way is to have a single group product; another is to assign roles for each student; providing a group reward also fosters positive interdependence. Without positive interdependence, students sometimes fall in to the trap” hitch-hiking” where they let one students do all the work for them or of being “off task” (Cohen, 1994b). According to Johnson, and Smith (1991) developing positive interdependence is not copying down lecture notes or answering simple recall questions but this elements is only on the quality of the task assigned to each group and demand participation from all group members.

2.3.2. Face to face interaction

Face to face interaction where, some of the group work may be done in divided bases, most of the tasks are preferred through an interactive process in which each group member provides feedback, challenges one another and teaches and encourages his or her mates. This means that students promote each other’s success by sharing resources. They help, support, encourage, and praise each other efforts to learn. Although it is an important element of cooperative learning, positive interdependence alone doesn’t generate the degree and intensify interaction required in cooperative learning activities. First cooperative members need to think that success of the cooperation on the contribution of each member. Next, they need to think that ongoing interactions, particularly face to face interactions, are required for success. Face to face verbal interactions refers to the physical set up of the group. Students need to be clustered together in a tight group, facing each other, in order to have the kind of inter change necessary to accomplish the task.

To provide abundant verbal, face to face interaction, where learners explain argues, elaborate and link current material with what they have learned. Previously is important in cooperative learning. (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998, p144).

As Johnson, Johnson and Smith(1991) described students must comprehend that it is not only the final product that matters in cooperative learning but also the ongoing dialogue process that is a critical part of their success and in the completion of their task students have given time in class to discuss, ask questions and support each other, this resulted in positive interdependence face to face interaction are occurred.

2.3.3 Individual accountability

Individual accountability refers to a belief that the group is accountable for achieving its goal and each member of group is held accountable for doing his or her share of the work. Each student is accountable for their learning and works no one” hitchhike!” on the work of others. He /she cannot get a satisfactory result by riding on other members of a group. Thus, there is no hitching or free loading for everyone in the group. The performance of each individual must be assessed and the results given back to the group. The teacher must have a way of determining what each individual had learned, as well as what the group had accomplished. Therefore, a number of ways assessing individual accountability, random selection students’ papers. If each student is doing within the group, random oral quizzes of students, written quizzes or examination at the end of the work. On the other hand, individual accountability is the structural element required to discourage and lower the likelihood of the free skilled riders or social loafing.. (Johnson and Johnson (1991).According to Johnson, Johnson and Smith(1991) stated that when student does all of the work while remaining group gets idle is a ‘social loafing’ this is the clear issue of concern for students in cooperative learning. This is an indication of ill defined and unstructured group work, not based on cooperative learning (Tannen etal, 2003).

As foundation coalition (2008) stated that in the whole cooperative learning ,students provide with the resource they need to perform better on their own than the group dynamics individual accountability strength and individual performance.

2.3.4. Teaching of the social skills

It is essential to students to develop team building and group maintenance skills necessary for cooperative learning to work. For cooperative learning to be successful, teacher build academic skills to ensure cognitive gain and need to use the same dynamic and international teaching of social skills (optiz, 2008). This means the teacher must provide opportunities the students to practice and develop expectations for each specific social skill than provide feedback regarding their implementation.

It is very important for students to have sufficient social skills, involving an explicit teaching of appropriate leadership, communication, trust and conflict resolution skills so that they could cooperate effectively. With this each student get motivated internally by need for freedom, love, and fun and also students must be taught these skills should be explicitly taught to the students so that students could work among themselves, not only in terms of cooperation but also without hostility and the teacher's authority. If group members lack the interpersonal and small-group skill to cooperate effectively, cooperative learning would not be productive. Johnson and Johnson (1994)

According to optiz, (2008) without an intentional practice and careful planning social skills, cannot be improved or developed. This means, students set goals for continuous improvement and need to know not only what competences they must possess, but also their current level of aptitude and suggestions for improvement, as well as numerous formal opportunities to reflect on their succeeds.

2.3.5. Group processing

Group processing is important to determine the succors of cooperative learning learn and provide students the opportunity to reflect up on the quality of their group work. (Johnson, Johnson and smith, (1991). This means by strengthen intrapersonal and interpersonal competences students will increase the quality of cooperative learning through giving time for individual and group reflection.

Group processing very important for it enable students to discuss how verbal, face to face communication helps them describe what members actions helpful and unhelpful, and make decision about what action to continue or change.. The purpose of processing is to active group's goal, link current material with what they have provisionally learned, facilitate the learning of cooperative skills and

maintain effective working relationships by clarifying and receiving feedback on how the effectiveness of members contributes to the collaborative efforts of the group (Johnson and Johnson 1989). Moreover, group processing ensures that students think on both the metacognitive and cognitive level and provides the means to celebrate the successes of the group and reinforce the positive behavior of group members (Johnson and Johnson 1989). The role of teacher is also crucial to the group processing; they are supposed to observe the groups, analyze the problems that students come across weekly together, and give feedback to each group on how well they are cooperating.. Not only should teachers serve as monitors in group processing, but they should also remind students to use their team work skills during processing and ensure that clear expectations related to the purpose of processing have been communicated. (Christison,,1990)cited in Atkins ,et.al (1996)

2.4. Types of cooperative learning Groups

Formal, informal and base group are types of cooperative learning groups. (Johnson , Johnson and Huber's (1998)

2.4.1. Formal cooperative learning group

The teacher can propose any course requirement or academic assignment for formal cooperative learning in the range of time span from one class period to several weeks. "Formal cooperative learning groups ensure that students are actively involved in the intellectual work of organizing material explaining it, summarizing it and integrating it into existing conceptual structures. They are the heart of using cooperative learning. (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 1998, p.1:7)

2.4.2. Informal cooperative learning groups

As Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec, (1998) stated that these are unplanned groups that may extend from a few minutes to a whole class period. The teacher sets a mood conductor learning, uses them during direct teaching (lectures, demonstrations) to focus student attention on the material to be learned, what the lesson will cover, provide closure to an instructional session and ensure that students are cognitively proceeding the material being taught.

2.4.3. Cooperative base groups

“Long-term (lasting for at least a year) heterogeneous groups with stable membership whose primary purpose is for members to give each other support, help, encouragement and assistance of each needs to progress academically. Base groups provide students with long-term, committed relationship.” (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec(1998) p. 1:8)”.

2.5. Forming cooperative groups

It is critical issues for the selection of members for each cooperative group whenever cooperative groups are formed for ESL class-room.

2.5.1. Cooperative group's size

Deciding a cooperative size groups is a very essential step in introducing cooperative work learning. As the size of cooperative groups directly influences the amount of possible “talking time” each student has: in a group of three, for about a third of the time, in pair , each student can talk for about half the time; in a group of four, for about a quarter of the time, and so on. With regard to cooperative group size, the larger the cooperative group, the broader the range of experiences, expertise, skills and interests to contribute the learning activity. However, as Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1991) argue that:

“Larger groups decrease each members opportunity to participate and often results in some members not actively contributing to the group. In situations where there is shorter amount of time available to complete a group task, such as in class Collaborative learning exercise, it is suggested that smaller groups are more appropriate. The shorter amount of time available the smaller the group should be”. It may be difficult for students in a larger cooperative group to get close enough to one another to converse comfortably but talkative students who are full of ideas may work better in groups of three. Less talkative students may do better in cooperative groups of four or five”.

According to Atkins, Hailom and Nuru (1996) advised that the optimal number of students should not exceed six with in groups (p.207). The favorable size of cooperative group is three or four are mentioned by other scholars.

As Weber (1994), the size of cooperative group is determined by (1) the number of component responsibilities (2) the amount of materials (3) the size of the task, and (4) the amount of time allocated for the learning activity. In their class room, teachers use different sites of cooperative group's. Differ in group size will mean differ in student experience and learning.

Similarly, Williams (2002) stated that the students' comfort level and the nature of the assignment are two factors in effective group size. The size of the cooperative group change as the circumstances change.

The effective group size might rely on the age of students and their experience in working cooperatively (Glanz, 2004).

Likewise, Weber (1994) believed that cooperative groups should be regularly rearranged in EFL class room. These rearranging groups regularly can help here: Vary the way you pair your students sometimes put weaker and stronger students together; sometimes group students with others of the same ability, otherwise, weaker students may not be able to cope with, and stronger students may get bored. People get stuck in their habits, and it's hard to change them when you're always with the same people. Weaker and shy students shouldn't always be with the same partners

2.5.2. Strategies for composing pupils to cooperative groups

There are several ways in which teachers put their students in cooperative groups to discuss certain tasks. For example, Cohen,,(1994) pointed out the following strategies for assigned students in cooperative:

- ❖ Age grouping: students are assigned based on their ages.
- ❖ Achievement: students are grouped in to different cooperative groups based on their previous achievements. Similar achievers or homogenous group or mixed or heterogeneous group are formed.

- ❖ Interest: Pupils are grouped on the base of their own interest and performance “ If groups are not arranged according to students’ preference, some students may not like to work with the students they have been assigned to work with “Atkison , Hailom and Nuru (1996).
- ❖ Friendship grouping: in this way of grouping, simply teachers put students with their friends next to them.
- ❖ Gender grouping; students are assigned on the base of their sex. Mixed or similar sexes are grouped in cooperative group.
- ❖ Random assignment: students are grouped randomly.

According to Blown (1994) “any and all decisions on compositions of groups made by teachers should be under taken to facilitate greater interaction between the following: one learner and the other one group and another, and the teacher and groups”.

However, Johnson and Johnson (1994) strongly advise to have heterogeneous cooperative groups composition of one low –ability student, two medium –ability students, and one high achieving students as well as in terms of gender, ethnicity. Vary the way you pair your students-sometimes put weaker and stronger students together; sometimes group students with other of the same ability. Leo Jones (2007 retrieved on Feb.2015 from www.cambridge.org.)

There are no hard and fast rules about what to do –we make our decisions based on our knowledge of each class and the individuals within it (Leo Jones, 2007). This can be hard to do in a very large class.

Constructing groups of students work well together can be difficult, however, some insights on group compositions and group size with gender. Composition being an issue that due consideration. Webb (1992) during small group mathematics lesson the students’ interaction found that when the boy numbers exceeds the girls, they inclined to interact with each other more and ignore the girl. In contrary, the girl spent more time in the discussions to involve the boy in groups where there were more girls than boys. However, there were no differences in achievement outcomes when groups were gender balanced and boys and girls were equally interactive. In short, the gender composition of the group appears to be issue that warrants attention.

2.6. Teachers Roles in group learning

The role of the teacher in the class room is different from the traditional teacher-centered class room to that of cooperative learning in implementation (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The teachers is a facilitator or guider of learning rather than giving lecture or transmitter of materials who focuses on the learning process by encouraging cooperation among the students' (Bejarano, 1987, p.485).

Grouping students in small cooperative groups to have tasks to accomplish together interactively and cooperatively is one of the most common activities that teachers do in grouping students (Kramsch, 1992).

As Mc Donell, (1992) stated that in the role of facilitator, the teacher gives students the opportunity to learn the material by themselves while helping them if need arises. Teachers interact with students, encourage them to solve the problems they encounter by using thinking skills, give feedback, clarify difficulties and empathize as a facilitator.

Teachers in cooperative language classroom are also observers. They listen to learner s while they are studying in cooperative groups to discover the needs, interests, problems, and strengths of learners. These observations help teachers gather information about the learning process of the students, and organize plans activities according to this process (Mc Donell, 1992).

According to sharan, (1994) teachers observe also if students in cooperative group need assistance or redirection towards the objective of the given tasks.

In order to achieve the objectives of cooperative language learning and provide maximum benefit, teachers have to create well structured tasks, set the goals of activities clearly, organize cooperative groups and assign students to different roles, and select suitable materials to be taught (Johnson and Johnson, 1994).

Teachers and students work together to make sure everyone benefits from the lessons and supporting one another is student-centered class-room activities.

On the other hand, Harmer (2001) assumes that teacher's roles "may change from one activity to another or from one stage of an activity to another" in the class-room (p.57). He suggests frame work of the teachers roles that are dependent on what students are wished to achieve as illustrated in Table one

Table-1. Hammer's teachers' roles frame work

Role	Role feature
Controller	The teacher charge of the whole class and activities by taking the role, telling students instructions, organizing skills, reading aloud, and manifesting the teacher-fronted approach.
Assessor	Provides students with feedback regarding their performance and grades them in distinct ways
Corrector	Offer students correction of their linguistic errors while assessing their language learning competence.
Organizer	Organizes students to work on classroom activities.
Prompter	Prompt students so that they can proceed with learner procedure.
Resource	Acts as students' reliable resource when they encounter difficulties.
Participant	Participants in students' classroom activities.
Tutor	Work with students individually or in small groups if they under take challenging learning programs.
Observer	Observes students' performance to offer them individual/group feedback.

Cited from the practice of English language teaching by J.Harner, 2001,pp.57-62.

2.7. Students Roles in cooperative group learning

The role of the traditional teacher-centered classrooms is significantly different from their roles of the students in cooperative group work in language learning classes. The students in cooperative language learning are “no longer trying to impress their teacher but are busy learning actively”(Bejamo,1987).

According to Richards and Rodgers,(2001) students organize their own learning and become autonomous learners. This means, the primary role of the learner is to contribute to the completion of the group tasks while collaboratively working the members of the group. Because they are

thought how to organize their study to keep their group working and to monitor and assess their learning process, they become the directors of their learning.

Moreover, students need to have different roles and labors EFL classes. This assigning roles for each individual student, helps to establish role independence. According to Kagan (1989), in cooperative language learning students could have the following divisions of labors.

- ❖ Leader: The Leader is the chair person who hosts the group discussion and makes sure that each member is on task by participating the discussion or any given task.
- ❖ Recorder: The recorder needs to take notes during the discussion. The written report will be given to the reporter.
- ❖ Reporter: The reporter is responsible for reporting the summary of his/her group' discussion to the class on behalf of his/her team.
- ❖ Timer: The timer controls the time given to their group and makes sure that the assigned task is completed in time. If time is not enough to complete the task ,the time has request more time from the teacher.
- ❖ Checker: The checker makes sure that each one in the group finishes the work sheet or assigned task in class. If someone in the group has problem in completing individuals' worksheet, the teacher reports to the leader who decided what kind of help will be given to that member.
- ❖ Quiet captain: The quiet captain sees to it that the group doesn't disturb other groups
- ❖ English monitor: Makes sure everyone is speaking English.

2.8. Challenges of cooperative learning

The challenges occurs to teachers' control of the channels of communication, the demands it places on curriculum organization and the personal commitment teachers need to make to sustain their efforts and unwillingness to embedded cooperative learning (Kohn, 1992).

According to Doff, A.(1998) and Harnner, J (1991) Some educators can argue that cooperative group work bring a lot of disadvantage for both learners and teachers. The following problems can be mentioned.

2.8.1. Noise

Noise is more troublesome for the teacher than it is for learners. This is a problem of cooperative group work is connected with noise and indiscipline, members in cooperative group work activity are normally unaware of the noise and what other pair groups are doing. If the activity is organized well and the learners are actively speaking than a teacher should let them make noise, because it is “productive noise”.

2.8.2. Teachers’ lack of training

Those teachers who had not been trained in how to establish cooperative learning activities in their curricula are less than students performed better in those schools where teachers had been trained in cooperative learning activities (Gillies, 2008)

2.8.3. Over-use of Mother tongue

Students often speak in their vernacular language creates a great problem. This is difficult to eliminate if the class is really big and made of sixty students. The teacher cannot listen to all cooperative groups at the same time, but it doesn’t mean that he/she is unable to do anything about it. The teacher should establish certain rules at the beginning of the school year and be very strict about them. She/he can play the role of the “English police” and look for “offenders” those who speak their mother language giving them a punishment (For example extra home work). After sometimes the good habit of speaking only may be established.

2.8.4. Problem of Dominance

One of the main disadvantages for the learners shy or weak students can be eliminated from the practice, because of individuals who always tend to dominate. At the same time, some members may rely too heavily on others to do the work. This is one of the most salient problems that face groups. Some members do not pitch in and help and don’t adequately contribute to the group (Freeman and Greenacre, 2011). The teacher should assign roles for every individual to avoid one or two learners taking over the activity and others are becoming pensive observers. Make the group tasks to have some parts that cannot be performed by one or two students rather need the participation of all members. Students should understand that cooperation is a fact of life pair work and group work in a class-room teaches them a very important life skill-how to work with other people.

2.9. Factors that affect students’ interaction in Group work

In interactive and cooperative group learning EFL class-rooms, students are active participants in the learning and teaching process. However, this may not always be true. Number of factors affects students' group participation. The following factors are suggested by different writers.

2.9.1. Personal factors

There are a lot of factors that are related to personality and affect students' engagement in cooperative learning.

2.9.2. Lacks of self-esteem

Self-esteem personal judgment is expressed in attitude that holds towards himself and indicates the extent to which the individual believe in himself to capable of significant and worthy. Research has shown that a student who feels good about himself is more likely to succeed in working together and learning EFL (Brown (1994).

2.9.3. Inhibition

Inhibition is closely related to self esteem. The weaker the self-esteem, the stronger the inhibition and reserve himself/herself from involving group activities. Ehrman (1993) cited in brown (1994) suggests,

‘thick perfectionist boundaries find language learning more difficult than those learners with thin boundaries who favors attitudes of openness and tolerance.. As brown (1994) noted language learning a great deal of self-exposure as if necessary involves making mistake.

2.9.4. Anxiety

Any task that involves a certain degree of challenge can expose the learner to feelings of self doubt, uneasiness, or fear.. Behind this emotion lies the question shall I succeed? “As foreign language learning is highly demanding task, it is likely to raise anxiety in learner’ Krashen (1982). Therefore, rising of anxiety affects student's participation of cooperative work.

2.9.5. Low English language proficiency

According to Atkins, Hailom and Nuru (1996) low English language proficiency affects students' active engagement in group task "The more proficient the student is, the greater his/her willingness to interact may be, since the class-room interaction is learn stressful"(P.189). While less proficient is likely not to take parts in group discussion.

2.9.6. Leadership problem

Formal group have managers or supervisors as their leaders. Informal group usually select their leaders. Informal groups usually select their leaders by Consensus. In both types of groups the quality of leadership is highly influential on the quality of the group. If the leader may not be knowledgeable, patient and respectful to the group, he/she will not give proper guidance to the group and support cooperative group efforts in not only achieving cooperative group goal but also individual goals within the group, Brown (1994).

2.9.7. Lack of experience

Many teachers and students lack the trend to use cooperative group learning in their EFL classrooms. Sometimes students seen reluctant to work in cooperative groups. And then, this lack of experience affects effective learning in small group, (Aleman and purifier (1997).

2.10. One to five cooperative group structures

Now days, it is very simple listening about one to five cooperative group structures in Ethiopia. It is widely practice almost in very sphere of life. Office workers are grouped in to one to five cooperative group structures with their colleague, farmers are arranged in one to five cooperative group structures with their neighbors, the youth are also put into those groups with their peers and even ladies are grouped into this one to five cooperative group structure to courage teamwork and to share experience.

Likewise, one to five cooperative group structures is much common in school compounds..Not only school workers and teachers but also students are arranged in one to five cooperative group learning structures. Starting from elementary school up to college and university, classrooms are organized in one to five cooperative groups learning structures in which students work on learning

activities in small groups and receive rewards or recognition based on their cooperative group performance. According to Ato Ayinkulu Abebe (Amhara Regional state, North Shewa Education Department Vice Head,(2015) confirmed that one to five cooperative group learning structures has been introduced in 2010 as a structural method in schools. Since then, it is broadly practiced through the country.

According to him, one to five cooperative group learning is an instructional method in which teachers arrange students in small cooperative one to five group structures so as to work together to maximize their own and each other's language learning. Here "one to five" refers to the number of students who participate in one cooperative group. This means that one student who is possibly high achiever, is assigned as group leader and the rest five students are considered as members of that group.

Having this strategy, learning becomes more interactive and cooperative with students and teachers as participants. Such interactions in classroom promote successful cooperative learning for reducing stereotyping and social rejection across disability, race and gender line. In addition, group activity enables students to acquire relevant skills of communication, skills of discussion and argument, skills of interactive learning and cooperative inquiry and to develop appropriate attitudes to learning and teaching. Significantly, he added, "This strategy creates a connection between the students and the curriculum and provides opportunity for open discussion with students (students for students) as well as the teacher; through this practice, students are given the opportunity to work together with their partners towards accomplishing academic and social goals. Furthermore, students exercise cooperative skills and leadership from the very beginning which is pertinent to lifehood.

Many adaptations of one to five cooperative group learning strategies are designed to assist students who may not learn effectively during the standard teacher-led lectures. Because it highlights low-key participation in different cooperative groups, the learning strategy allows under-performing students to think aloud, take risk with fellow peers and help them develop a higher level of thinking.

It is believed that learners have opportunities to frequently encounter material under study through various modes of delivery.

Learners listen to the teacher's explanation of the new material, ask questions, take notes and assimilate new knowledge. Then, they apply what they have learned as they complete exercises and worksheets during the second stage of plan (team study). Still they have other opportunities to review the material as they prepare for individual quizzes and when checking their own work both during the stage of team study and that of quiz correction. This frequent exposure to materials under study accommodates the learning styles of all learners, creates redundancy, and enables learners to master and retain new material.

2.11. Important consideration in establishing cooperative groups

In grouping students for EFL classrooms, three important aspects need care and considerations. They are the teaching context, and the individual learner.

2.11.1. Teaching context

According to (Gower and Walters, 1983), the arrangements of students' seats depend on (1) the size of the class, (2) the size of the groups, (3) the types of activities and (4) the layout of the furniture. So teachers are expected to consider these factors. Furthermore, in EFL class teachers should avoid a situation where all members of a group are only on one side of a table, as it is important that they face each other. The teacher should also avoid separating the members of a group too far, making it difficult for them to talk easily. Another contextual consideration is time. A time limit encourages students to take their time and in doing so, have a stimulating exchange of views as they explore a topic in depth and share ideas. Judging exactly how long the time should be depends on how much time is available and how talkative a particular class is.

2.11.2. Teaching context

Teaching contents are organized on the basis of intended outcomes, which may be skills or attitudes, knowledge or understanding. Cooperative grouping provides the opportunity for peer interpretation and sharing of experiences and insights. In small cooperative groups, students may have more opportunities to paraphrase, explain, describe, ask for clarification, and talk about content than what whole class interactions may provide (Freiberg and Driscoll, 1992). When teachers work on attitudes with students, the cooperative group norms are noticed. Therefore, it is necessary to

provide opportunity for cooperative group discussion when we teach content with attitude and value outcomes so that students can hear different points of view, and as discussion permits free expression of opinions (Cross, 1992).

2.11.3. Individual learner

In their participation and the kind of roles they play in language class-room activities students come into class-room with their individual differences. At Kins, Hailom and Nuru (1996).

Hence, teachers should be able to accommodate learner difference by varying student role and types of student involvement when arranging the cooperative groups.

Cooperative learning strategies can offer alternative choices by allowing for varied roles for different experience in the same activity (Kagan, 1989).

2.12 Rational to use cooperative group work

One of the greatest and inevitable challenges educators face is determine the most effective teaching strategies for their students. Understanding and assessing student involvement in learning can help teachers design the most effective curriculum and determine how student learn.

In fact, students receive many benefits from working in cooperative groups as they study English and pursue language fluency. It provides benefits for both students and instructor (Shimazoe and Aldrich 2010). Cooperative group work aids the language learning in many way even when they may not realize what is happening. According for Brown (2001) and Harmer (2001) a well designed and monifured cooperative group activity benefits students with the following advantages.

2.12.1 Rational to use cooperative group work

Compared to the other forms of instructions research indicated that cooperative learning benefits students for effective leader and cooperative members of a team become better his terns and communicators (storm and storm, 2003; Lie 2008;Goodwin,1999). This means using cooperative learning the students give up cheating and enables students with the mindset that one must exercise their collaborative skills and work with others to achieve a common goal.

Cooperative learning has social benefits as well as academic children learn to take risks and are praised for their contribution. Students work with classmates who have different learning skills, cultural background, attitudes, and personalities. These differences force them to deal with conflict and to interact with others. Social interaction improves communication skills that become a necessity to functioning in society, (Atkins, Hailom and Nuru) (1994).

2.13 Increase students talk

Cooperative learning makes students to interact and utilize the target language more freely. Instead of just having a few seconds to talk in teacher controlled classes. Pupils can participate longer in a small cooperative group work and feel more confident to give their opinions and even make mistakes when just three or four classmates are looking at them. Browns (2001) states that “small groups provides opportunities for students initiation, for face to face give and take, for practice negotiation of meaning and for extended conversational exchanges, and for students adoption of roles that would otherwise be impossible” (P.178)

2.14 Promotes learners responsibility and autonomy

Learner's responsibility and autonomy are encouraged through cooperative work. “The small group becomes a community of learners cooperating with each other in pursuit of common goals” (Brown, 2001, P.178). Students can complete an activity successfully with the help of other classmates or by themselves not constantly relying on the teacher to complete their task.

2.15. Reduces learning anxiety and improves self –esteem

Students reduce feeling and improve their confidence in speaking the target language with in small cooperative small groups (Brown, 1994) students in cooperative groups feel as they are more liked by their cooperative group mates because of the increased opportunities to interact.

As Krashen(1982) stated that foreign language learning is affected by some psychological factors. It is likely to be true for a student has little motivation, lack of self-esteem, of is afraid of making

mistake. Students with such negative emotional factor face problems merely in whole class-room learning afraid of being wrong or losing face in public.

On the other hand, Brown (1994) argued that “small group learning creates relaxed and non-threatening environment in the class room” (P.174) .

It seems easier for students to have less psychological pressure when students are in groups and making speech. In addition, it is worthy that this reducing anxiety can encourage shy and preserved students so as to involve actively in language learning while being supported by their peers. When students feel they are making significant contributions to the group processing and these contributions are valued by the group members, they are more likely feel successful academically. Thus, self-esteem is improved.

2.16. Promote retention

Learners have opportunities to frequently encounter the material under study through various venues and modes of delivery. For instance, during the first of the sample lesson plan (teacher presentation) learners listen to the teacher’s explanation of the new material, ask questions, take notes and assimilate new knowledge. Then, they apply what they have learned as they complete exercises and work sheets during the second stage of the plan. (Team study) still they have other opportunities to review the material as they prepare for individual quizzes and when checking their own work both during the stage of team study and that of quiz correction . This frequent exposure to materials under study accommodates the learning styles of all learners, creates redundancy, and enables learners to master and retain new material (Johnson and Johnson, 1989; Kessler, 1992)

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD OF THE STUDY

Introduction

In this chapter three different data gathering instruments were selected. Besides to that subtitles were imbedded in it. Such as; research method, research design sampling and data analysis.

3.1. Research Method

This study used mixed research method utilizing both qualitative research methods and

Participants of the study	No of students	Total	%
Students	300	90	30%
English teachers	3	3	100%

quantitative methods. It was desirable method because the study was intended to describe the current situation of one to five cooperative learning in preparatory school level in terms of teacher's and students' actual practice

3.2. Research Design

The major objective of this study was to assess the implementation of one to five cooperative learning and the attitudes of teachers and students to wards it among Negelle Preparatory School learners. In order to do that a descriptive survey research method was used as research design.

3.3. Sampling

3.3.1. Selection of School and Grade Level

The study was conducted at Negelle Preparatory School in south Oromia, Ethiopia. This school was selected because of the fact that the researcher had familiarity with teachers and the school administration. This familiarity and acquaintance with teachers and school principals would help the researcher to have access to do currents for the study.

3.3.2. Selection of participants

In order to investigate the assessment and implementation of one to five cooperative learning structures in English language classroom, there were three hundred students (300) in six classes and each class contained fifty students. Therefore, ninety students were selected randomly out of thirty percent (30%) and all three teachers were taken out of hundred percent(100%).

Table 1. The distribution of the population of the study

3.3.3. Instrumentation and Data Analysis Procedures

A Questionnaire, an interview and class-room observations were the most suitable tool for achieving the purpose of the study in one to five cooperative learning in EFL classes. All instruments were used to collect, describe and analyze authentic data concerning the one to five cooperative learning.

3.4 Instrumentation and Data Collection

Three instruments: a questionnaire, observation and interview would be used in study.

3.4.1. Questionnaire

The researcher would use a questionnaire as a main instrument to achieve the aim of the study. Therefore, the researcher relied on sources to construct the questionnaire students were asked to reflect as to whether one to five cooperative group learning activities benefit them in their acquisition of English language. These questions comprised ideas; facts about one to five cooperative learning. Students perception about one to five cooperative group learning, learners' and their teachers' roles in applying one to five cooperative group learning and factors that affect students participation during group discussion. The items in the questionnaire were designed using four – interval scales. "strongly agree", "Agree", "Disagree", "strongly disagree", "Always", "Sometimes", "Rarely", "Never" and "High extent", "Some extent", "Little affect", "No affect", At the end of the questionnaire, students were space to write their comments.

3.4.2 Classroom Observation

In order to have a clear picture of what the actual teaching and learning process looks like, how EFL teachers implement one to five cooperative learning and how learners of EFL engage in cooperative group learning, the researcher applied classroom observation as a tool of the study. It was believed that it enabled the researcher to document and reflect systematically upon class-room interaction and events as they actually occur rather than we think they occur.

To conduct the classroom observation, the researcher had designed an observational check list. The researcher observed six English language grade eleven classrooms in total. Two classrooms from each subgroup were selected randomly. Each classroom was observed twice before conducting interview and distributing questionnaire.

3.4.3 Interview

In order to formulate data that were gathered through questionnaire and class-room observation, the researcher had used interview as data gathering instrument in this study. The interviews were semi structured three teachers participate in the interview from Negelle Preparatory School.

3.5 The data Analysis

After the data was collected systematically, it was analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative methods. According to the nature of the data simple descriptive statistics was used for the purpose of assessing and implementing the teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning method. After collecting relevant information through the three varieties of instruments, the researcher categorized the data appropriately so as to analysis and interperates them. In order to organize and facilitate the analysis of data gathered through questionnaires, the researcher tallied before tabulating the response under each item using simple descriptive statics such as frequency and percentage.

On the basis of the discussion held, major findings, conclusions and recommendation were drawn accordingly.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

Under this chapter data was presented, analyzed, discussed and interpreted. There are subtitles supported by tables are found. Such as; how one to five cooperative learning are implemented, the frequency of using one to five cooperative groups in EFL classes; teachers and students role in implementing one to five cooperative learning EFL teachers' and students perception towards advantage of one to five cooperative learning, EFL teachers and students perception towards disadvantage of one to five cooperative learning structures. General view of EFL teachers and students towards one to five cooperative learning structures. Factors that affect students' participation in one to five cooperative learning and classroom observation.

This study concerned with the presentation, analysis, discussion and interpretation of data collected from the subjects in Negelle Preparatory School to obtain answers from the basic research questions. As mentioned in chapter one of this thesis, the general objective of the current study was to assess the implementation of one to five cooperative learning and the attitudes of teachers and students towards it in preparatory school English language classrooms with regard to (1) Examine the positive effects of one to five cooperative learning in Negelle Preparatory School learners (2) Investigate whether preparatory school teachers and students play their expected roles in one to five cooperative learning or not (3) Assess EFL teacher's and learners' perception about one to five cooperative learning in English language and (4) investigate problems that teachers and students face when using one to five cooperative learning in EFL class – room. Using a combination of complete data sources for the discussion and data analysis help to assemble a more comprehensive and complete picture of the topic. Therefore, in orders to address the specific objective stated in the first chapter the data collected from all the subjects of the study were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage. These data tabulated and analysis can be seen in the forgoing pages. In addition, owing to the abundant results yielded in this study, the finding were presented and analyzed together in most cases. Thus, presentation, analysis and interpretation of data were made based on the responses gained from respondents of the research as follows.

4.1. How one to five cooperative learning is implemented in grade eleventh preparatory school EFL class rooms? The questions were as held to respondents to examine how preparatory school EFL teachers implement one to five cooperative learning in their class-rooms.

4.1.1. The presence of one to five cooperative group learning

Table 1. The existence of one to five learning

No	Item	Respondents responses			
		Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Is there one to five cooperative learning in your classroom?	82	91	8	9
2	Are you member of one to five cooperative group learning ?	62	69	28	31

Findings shows in item of the above table indicated that majority of respondents of the study (91%) confirmed the presence of one to five cooperative learning in their classroom where as the least respondents (9%) are not trusted in its existence. This revealed that greater number of students assured the presence of cooperative learning in their class-room.

In the second item of table one shown that respondents of study (69%) confirmed as a member of one to five cooperative learning while other respondents (31%) didn't accept as a member of cooperative learning. From this we concluded that there was difference idea in one to five cooperative learning among students. For example, some children may be "threatened by group work - - - as a legitimate way of working and so give a powerful message to the teachers who experiments with a new method" (Cowie and Rudduck, 1990, P250)

4.1.2. Organizing one to five cooperative learning groups.

Table 2. A person who construct one to five cooperative groups.

No		Respondents responses
----	--	-----------------------

1	Who construct cooperative group in your class room	Home room teacher		EFL teacher		Students	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
		74	82.2	16	17.7	-	-

In the second table, the majority of the respondents of the present research (82.2) shown as home room teachers organized one to five cooperative learning groups.

4.1.3. Cooperative group size

Table 3. Number of students in one to five cooperative learning

Table 3 demonstrates that both subjects (39%) responded confirmed six or five students found in

No	How many students are there in your cooperative group?	Respondents responses							
1		Six		Five		Four		Seven and more than seven	
		<u>No</u>	%	<u>No</u>	%	<u>No</u>	%	<u>No</u>	%
		35	39	35	39	-	-	20	22

one to five cooperative learning. Whereas few number of students showed their cooperative group members (22%) are seven and more than that.

4.1.4. Composition of cooperative groups

Table 4. How students are grouped into different cooperative learning

Table 4. Has shown us a large number students (47.7%) are grouped based on their students interest

No	What is the criterion	Respondents responses							
1	To group students in to different cooperative groups	Age		Attainment		Interest		Gender	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
		3	3	36	40	43	47.7	8	9

while other students (40%) are assigned on the bases of students attainments. We can understand that student's age and gender didn't give much emphasis on assigning student in one to five cooperative learning.

Table 5. Memberships of cooperative learning in terms of gender

No	What is the criterion	Respondents responses					
1	Members of cooperative learning in terms of gender	Only girls		Only boys		Both boys and girls	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
		-	-	-	-	90	100

Table 5. In terms of gender both boys and girls were involved in a given cooperative learning groups (100%) while others members were not existed. From this cooperative groups were formed with the combination of both boys and girls in one cooperative learning strategy.

Table 6. Problems in organizing cooperative groups

No	Is there a problem face in constructing one to five cooperative learning group	Respondent's responses			
1		Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
		52	58	38	42

The table above declared to as higher number of respondents(58%) on study confirmed that problems where created in organizing one to five cooperative learning where as from the respondents (42%) were rejecting the problem.

Table 7. Positive thinking about one to five cooperative learning groups.

No	Do you feel positive about one to five cooperative learning groups?	Respondent's responses			
		Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1		17	19	73	81

Table 7. Shows the positive feeling of one to five cooperative learning from the given respondents indicated majority of subjects (81%) thought negative feeling towards one to five cooperative strategy and the least respondents (19%) were positive feeling.

This revealed that respondents attitude towards cooperative learning were negative

Table 8. Members of cooperative groups in terms of achievement

Table 8. Revealed, how one to five cooperative learning are formed in terms of members'

Table 6: Revealed, how one to five cooperative learning are formed in terms of members										
No	What is the achievement of your cooperative learning ?	Respondents responses								
1		Lower achievers		Average achievers		Mixed achievers		All types of achievers		
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
		7	18	57	63	36	29	24	27	

achievement. Most respondents agreed that average achievers (63%) were in their cooperative groups.

Whereas mixed achiever (29%) and all types of achievers (27%) were nearly in the same range few respondents choose lower achiever (8%). This reveals, the one to five cooperative learning were formed from the medium achievers.

4.1.5. Concerns with cooperative leaders

Table 9. Selection of cooperative learning leader

No		Respondents responses					
1	Who does select cooperative group leader?	Home room teacher		English teacher		The students themselves	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
		66	73	8	9	16	18

Concerned with selection of cooperative learning leader, majority of respondents (73%) responded home room teachers took share in selection of cooperative learning group leader. Some of respondents involved (18%) in selection of cooperative group leaders where as almost few respondents share (9%) selected their cooperative learning leader. This shows that despite his/her responsibility to assign different roles for their cooperative learning groups, he/she didn't do that in one to five cooperative group learning.

Table 10. The role of cooperative learning leaders

No		Respondents' responses	
1		No	Yes

	In your cooperative learning group, the cooperative leader changed from time to time	N <u>o</u>	%	N <u>o</u>	%
		57	63	33	36

In table 10, respondents are asked to answer the question connected with the role of cooperative learning leader in one to five cooperative learning structures. Most respondents (63%) responded that the cooperative learning leaders were not changed from time to time. On the contrary a few of respondents agreed to change their leader from time to time. This result showed us the respondents were interested with their leader they assigned.

4.2. The frequency of using one to five groups in EFL class

The data in this section mainly find out how after preparatory school EFL teachers use one to five cooperative learning strategies in their classrooms.

Table 11. The frequency of using one to five cooperative learning

No	How often your EFL teachers use one to five cooperative learning strategies in their class rooms?	Respondents' responses							
1		Always		Some times		Rarely		Never	
		N <u>o</u>	%	N <u>o</u>	%	N <u>o</u>	%	N <u>o</u>	%
		8	9	24	27	50	56	8	9

Result of table 11 revealed that most EFL teachers(56%) sometimes use one to five cooperative learning strategy in their classrooms and a few teachers(27%) sometimes use cooperative learning strategy . From this we can conclude that majority of EFL teachers rarely use one to five cooperative learning strategy.

4.3. Teachers and students roles in implementing one to five cooperative learning

4.3.1. Teachers roles

Teacher's role is to arrange the students in different cooperative learning groups, to provide students with proper materials and to design what the students need to learn. In communicative language classes, the role of teachers is quite different from that of traditional method (see literature role of teachers). In this section what roles EFL teachers play in one to five cooperative learning.

Table 12. Teachers' pre instructional activities

No	How often does your English teachers play the following roles effectively	Always		Some times		Rarely		Never	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Arrange the class room in to different cooperative groups	23	26	30	33	12	13	25	27
2	Structure cooperative learning tasks	3	3	26	29	18	20	43	48
3	Teach students about cooperative learning , its benefits and skills of working together	14	16	28	31	36	40	12	13

Regarding the first item in table12, majority of respondents (3%) of the research confirmed that the EFL teachers sometimes arranged class room in one to five cooperative learning. During the interview session teachers admitted as they did not organized the class room in one to five cooperative learning. For the second item in table 12, a large number of respondents (48%) replied that their EFL teachers never stracture in cooperative learning tasks. However, the last item of table 12, more than half of the participants (40%) responded as their teachers rarely teach about cooperative learning and its benefits skill of working together. These relevant data shows that teachers to often provide little or rarely guidance students on how to work together.

Table 13. The teacher's activities during introducing and facilitating group discussion

No	How often does your English teacher play the following roles effectively?	Always		Sometime		Rarely		Never	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%

1	State the reason for using cooperative learning	6	7	19	21	43	48	22	24.4
2	Give roles for each member cooperative learning	8	9	23	26	36	40	23	26
3	Explain cooperative learning tasks clearly with enough example	23	26	31	34.4	14	16	22	24.4
4	Request students to use English in cooperative learning discussion	31	34.4	36	40	17	19	6	7
5	Allocate sufficient time for cooperative learning	23	26	33	36	28	31	6	7
6	Provide extra materials	10	11.1	19	21.1	7	8	54	60
7	Rotate roles for each member of a cooperative learning	12	13.3	23	26	47	52.2	8	9

The results indicate in table 13 revealed that most of the respondents (48%) answered EFL teachers rarely told us the reason for using cooperative learning where as few respondents (9%) never rotate each member.

This is supported by three teachers on their interviews on the other hand, the reply shown in second item of table 13 suggested that, majority of respondents (52.2%) responded EFL teacher rarely a gave us roles for each member of cooperative learning.

Whereas some respondents told their EFL teachers never gave roles for each member of cooperative learning. Teachers assured in their words, they didn't give any role for every one because one or two students were active participants that if a teacher changed role from time to time the group would not be active participant therefore, once they choice , it continued until the semester ended up.

An item 6 in table 13 concerned with in explaining cooperative tasks. Their EFL teachers (34.4%) sometimes explained thoroughly about the task of cooperative learning while other respondents indicated EFL teachers (24.4%) never explained about cooperative learning.

As illustrated in item 7 table 13, most students (40%) answered their EFL teacher sometimes requested them to use the target language where as a few students (34.4%) responded EFL teachers always requested students to speak English language. But few students (7%) were not satisfied by their EFL teachers' to use their language in cooperative learning.

The data in items & table 13 suggested most respondents (36%) responded their EFL teacher allocated sufficient time for cooperative learning , on the other hand a few respondents (31%) gave sufficient time in cooperative learning and (26%) of students suggested our EFL teachers gave enough time for cooperative work. Those students (7%) blamed their EFL teacher for not giving proportional time for discussion.

As the literature (see teachers' role, 2.10) indicates one of the roles of EFL teachers is provide extra learning materials so as to encourage and motivate students active involvement in cooperative learning similarly results in item of in the above table reveal that most respondents (60%) suggested their EFL teachers provide extra material for cooperative learning task, on the contrary (21%) of respondents never provide extra material but few students (11.1%) and (8%) got extra materials from their EFL teachers. Teachers during the interview admitted to students comment.

The last item on table 13 presents the greatest number of respondents (52.2%) declared their EFL teachers sometimes rotate roles for each member of cooperative learning. On the other hand, some students (26%) responded their EFL teachers rarely rotate roles for each member of the cooperation.

In contrast (13.3%) respondents suggested that their EFL teachers always rotate roles for each member.

Table 14. The teachers' activities during monitoring and intervening session

No		Always	Sometime	Rarely	Never
----	--	--------	----------	--------	-------

	How often does your English teacher play the following roles effectively?	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Monitor cooperative learning activities and engagement of every students in task doing	4	4.4	19	21.1	36	40	31	34.4
2	Intervene when needed to improve task work and team work	38	42.2	22	24.4	4	4.4	26	29
3	Ask questions for members to check their active involvement in the discussion	26	29	36	40	6	6.6	22	24.4

The results in table 14 reveal students responses to roles of their EFL teachers in third session (monitoring and intervening) of cooperative learning tasks. The large number of students (40%) rarely had shown that their EFL teacher able to monitor and engage their cooperative learning tasks, similarly (34%) of respondents never monitor by their EFL teachers. Whereas respondents (4.4%) always monitored and (21.1%) sometimes monitored by their EFL teachers. Concerning item 12 in the above table 14, more than half of the subjects of the present study (88%) responded that their EFL teachers sometimes or never intervene when needed to improve task work and team work. On the other hand, number of students (38%) did not satisfy by teacher's intervention when needed to improve task work and team work. Teachers in the interview said, "I observed and check students whether they are doing task or not " As the last item of table 14 shows that the respondents (40%) of them confirmed their EFL teachers sometimes ask questions for member to check their engagement and (29%) of respondents assured their EFL teachers always check the work of students , on the country (6.6%) of respondents rarely checked by EFL teachers .

Table 15. The teacher's activities in closing up lessons

No		Always	Sometime	Rarely	Never
----	--	--------	----------	--------	-------

	How often does your English teacher play the following roles effectively?	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Ask students to report on their discussion	36	40	36	40	12	13.3	6	7
2	Give marks for students on the base of their participation in their cooperative task	19	21.1	43	48	14	16	14	16
3	Give feedback for students	14	16	40	44.4	14	16	22	24.4
4	Summarize student discussions	19	21.1	43	47.7	14	16	14	16

The initial item in the above table 15 depicts that most respondents of the researcher (40%) answered as their EFL teacher always or sometimes ask them to report results of their group discussion. This implies that as for as students do not present their end product of cooperative work, it is difficult for teachers to make assessment, to evaluate the quality and quantity of their work and to give feedback on their “performance” by monitoring some mistakes that were over heard and ask to improve as do better in the future. Similarly , in the second item of the above table 15, more than two third of the students (48%) responded that their EFL teachers sometimes give them marks on base of their participation in cooperative learning tasks. Even not least number of students (21.1%) replied teachers always give marks rely on their roles. This shows personal involvement of students do not relate to their achievement. In the third item which says ”EFL teachers give feedback for students after cooperative learning work “ , more respondents (44.4%) reported us their teachers sometimes give them feedback on the cooperative learning discussion, where as large number of students (24.4%) said that teachers never give feedback for their work. Based on the relevant responses, it is possible to say that students face difficulties to distinguish their success and failures in one to five cooperative learning.

4.3.2. Students’ roles

In interactive classrooms, students play crucial roles for the teaching and learning process of English as a foreign language (see 2.11). They play great contribution in developing their communicative competence by interacting with their teachers and peers. They work together in

small cooperative learning up. In cooperative learning, students learn one another, tutor their friends, contribute their share to accomplish cooperative learning task, monitor and assess their learning process. This part presents data which were collected so as to get information the kind of roles EFL students play in one to five cooperative learning structures. As well, responses of subject were analyzed and interpreted as follows.

Table 16. Student's roles when they are in EFL classrooms.

No	When you are in English language classroom, how often you play the following roles?	Always		Sometime		Rarely		Never	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sit on their own cooperative learning group	1	1.1	23	26	52	58	14	16
2	Care others' learning	19	21.1	45	50	12	13.3	14	16
3	Responsible for their own learning	12	13.3	22	24.4	54	60	2	2.2
4	Ask for help	33	36	30	33	12	13.3	15	17
5	Use English in cooperative learning discussion	38	42	38	42	4	4.4	10	11.1
6	Everyone contributes his/her share for the success of cooperative learning	28	31.1	36	40	13	14.4	13	14.4
7	Evaluate their working together	23	25.5	31	34.4	22	24.4	14	16

In first item of the above table 16, large number of participants (58%) responded that they rarely sit in their own proper place. While students (1.1%) in number confirmed as they always sit in their cooperative learning groups. From this point, it is clear that there are students who do not take parts in there cooperative tasks.

As the second item in table 16 reveals half of the participants (50%) believed that they sometimes care about others learning whereas (21.1%) of respondents always care their group mates learning.

Still there are students (16%) and (13.3%) who rarely or never care others learning on the base of this finding we can say students' team work or social skills are not in a good condition.

On the other hand, results in item table 16 demonstrate most students (60%) said they are rarely responsible for their own learning.

The forth item which says "Ask for help" shows that large of the participants of this study (36%) responded as they always or sometimes ask for help.

Which more than one third of the respondents admitted that they sometimes ask for help. The finding in item 5 table 16, depicts that great number of subjects (42%) replied as or they always or sometimes use English language in cooperative learning discussion. Whilst more than one third of the students (33%) confirmed they rarely use English language in cooperative learning discussion.

At the sometimes, the sixty item in table 16 reveals more than two third of the respondents (40%) supposed to everyone sometimes contributes his/her share for the success of the cooperative learning. Despite the fact that not small number of students (31.1%) answered as everyone always contributes his/her shares for the success of cooperative learning. Regarding this point, teachers in the interview said, "they didn't play properly". Few active learners do cooperative learning tasks but the rest simply write their names". There is no interaction or communication.

The last item in the above table presents participants, responses to their role in one to five cooperative learning. Half of the respondents (34.4%) reported as sometimes they evaluate their working together. As the sometime, equally important number of students answered that they always or rarely evaluate their working together.

4.4. EFL teachers' and students perception towards advantage of one to five cooperative learning.

As the literature (see 2.4) demonstrates that in situations like Ethiopia, where EFL learners don't have access to practice the language outside class-room.

Classroom interaction is very pertinent interaction b/n students and teachers and among students themselves is realized and manifested through using cooperative learning.

In more general sense, cooperative learning work benefits EFL students in three areas of language development (1) offers learners exposure to a range language items and language functions in which cooperative mates provide an extra input source, in addition to teachers and instructional materials.

(2) in areas students talk in the target language and enables them to learn/recognize that speaking skill is developed through speaking or oral practice and(3) encourage peer interaction for communication and for meaning negotiation.

Here, endeavors were made together data from the participants this research to explore advantages of one to five cooperative learning structure in EFL classrooms. Data are presented and analysis below

4.4.1. General academic advantages

Table 17. Academic benefits that students obtain from using one to five cooperative learning

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Group learning foresters exchange of knowledge information and experiences	43	48	36	40	11	12.2	-	-
2	Make problem solving easier	34	38	36	40	10	11.1	10	11.1
3	In cooperative earning students great responsibility for their own and for their cooperative group	20	22	45	50	21	23.3	4	4.4
4	Enables learners to help weaker students in cooperative learning	17	19	38	42	33	36	2	2.2
5	Learners actively participate in the teaching/ learning process	19	21	43	47.7	14	16	14	16
6	Cooperative learning stimulates metical thing	36	40	38	42	14	16	2	2.2

7	In cooperative learning, students receive useful/helpful feedback from their partners	12	13.3	54	60	12	13.3	12	13.3
---	---	----	------	----	----	----	------	----	------

The findings in the first item of table 17 reveal that most of the subjects of the current study (48%) strongly agreed as one to five cooperative learning fosters exchange of knowledge, information and experiences.

Interview results show that “members can exchange ideas. They help each other’s particularly, weaker students learn more from cooperative mates”

Similarly, in the second item of the above table, large number of students (40%) agreed or strongly agreed (38%) on one to five cooperative learning made problems - so using easier.

On the other hand, in item three of the above table, more than half of the respondents (50%) agreed and some respondents (23.3%) disagreed working in one to five cooperative learning enables students to great responsibility for their own and for their cooperative learning. While a few respondents (22%) strongly agreed and few respondents strongly disagreed with the statement say “working in one to five cooperative learning structures enable student’s great responsibility for one to five cooperative learning.

As item four in table 17 demonstrates majority of respondents (42%) agreed and disagreed as working in one to five cooperative learning enable students to help weaker learners in cooperative learning./ still small number of students(2.2%) strongly disagreed with the idea in which one to five cooperative learning enables learners to help weaker students.

Likewise, item five in the above table presents the responses of participants in the work of finding. More than half of the respondents (48%) agreed and some respondents (21.1) strongly agreed, but the two respondents responded on the same level (16%) disagreed or strongly disagreed about one to five cooperative learning actively participates in the teaching learning process.

The results in the sixthly item show that more than two third of the subjects (42%) and (40%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed about cooperative learning stimulates critical thinking.

Whereas the a few respondents (16%) disagreed and few respondents (2.2%) of them strongly disagreed about the stimulation of critical thinking.

The last item of 17 presents that greater part of respondents (60%) agreed while the rest of respondents (13.3) equally strongly agreed disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

4.4.2. Advantage Related EFL Learning and Teaching

Table 18

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Cooperative learning makes students to stay on tasks	17	19	31	34.4	40	44	2	2.2
2	One to five cooperative learning enables students to practice English language	14	16	26	29	33	36	17	19
3	Cooperative learning improves language performance	22	24.4	33	36	23	26	12	13.3
4	Cooperative learning enhance communicative skills	28	31.1	45	50	12	13.3	5	6
5	Cooperative learning increase students motivate to learn English	26	29	43	48	4	4.4	17	19

The first item of table 18 reveals that majority respondents (44%) disagreed and some of respondents (34.41) agreed as one to five cooperative learning made students to stay on their task in EFL class-room. Where as participants that less number of respondents (19%) strongly agreed and respondents (2.2%) strongly disagreed respectively.

Results in the second item show that nearly the same number of respondents (36%) disagreed and(29%) agreed respectively as cooperative learning enabling students to practice English language where as a few respondents (19%) strongly disagreed and the respondents (16%) agreed about one to five cooperative learning enabled learners to practice their language.

In the third item of the above table 18, majority of respondents (36%) agreed while nearly the same number of respondents (26%) and (24%) disagreed and strongly agreed respectively an cooperative learning improve language performance but the respondents (13.3%) strongly disagreed the role of cooperative learning to improve language performance.

The finding in the forth item of tale 18 presents students view towards one to five cooperative learning structures. Accordingly, large number of respondents (50%) agreed and some of respondents (31.1%) strongly agreed cooperative learning enhance communicative skills and a few of them (13.3%) disagreed and the least respondents (6%) strongly disagreed about cooperative learning enhance communicative skills.

The last item of table 18 shown the respondents (48%) agreed or some respondents (29%) strongly agreed and a few subjects (19%) strongly disagreed and respondents (4.4%) disagreed about cooperative learning strategy enhance students' motivate to learn English.

4.4.3. Improves the Learning Environment

Table 19. One To Five Cooperative Learning Is Interesting

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	One to five cooperative learning is fun	14	16	59	66	10	11.1	7	8
2	Makes classroom interesting environment for learning	23	26	28	31	28	31	1	1.1

The result in the first item of the above table demonstrate that very great number of respondents of the present research endeavors (66%) agreed with statement which says “one to five cooperative learning is fun. On the base of these findings we can say in one to five cooperative learning students feel relaxation and enjoyment.

In the same way, result recorded in item two table 19 suggest that huge number of respondents (31%) agreed or disagreed with the idea that says “one to five cooperative learning makes classroom interesting environment for learning” we can under stand that from this point to students are either happy or unhappy with being one to five cooperative learning.

4.4.4. Social Benefits

Table 20. Social benefits that students get from participating in one to five cooperative learning

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Cooperative learning enables to make new friends	28	31.1	36	40	17	19	9	10
2	Cooperative learning fosters team spirit	26	29	28	31	26	29	10	11.1

The first item in the above table 20 reveals respondents' view about social benefits of learning in one to five cooperative learning. As one can say from the table, large number of students (40%) witnessed agreed as one to five cooperative learning enables to make new friends. Some respondents (31.1%) strongly agreed about one to five cooperative learning enabled them to make new friends. A few respondents (19%) disagreed and (10%) of respondents strongly disagreed respectively about one to five cooperative learning enabled them to make new friends.

Similarly, results in the second item table 20 described more than two third of respondents in this study (31%) agreed and respondents (29%) strongly agreed or disagreed about cooperative learning foster team spirit.

4.5. EFL teachers' and students perception towards disadvantage of one to five cooperative learning structures

In this section, effort was made to explore some information that could depict whether EFL teachers' and students' have negative perception towards of one to five cooperative learning or not.

Table 21. Negative out look of students and teachers

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
----	---	----------------	-------	----------	-------------------

		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	In one to five cooperative learning , weaker become more weaker	17	19	28	31.1	28	31.1	17	19
2	One to five cooperative learning creates dependence	33	36	33	36	6	7	19	21.1
3	Cooperative leaders are over loaded in one to five cooperative learning	24	27	28	31.1	27	30	11	12.2
4	One to five cooperative learning is waste's of time	17	19	28	31.1	38	42	7	8
5	Members are free from works in cooperative learning	17	19	38	42	13	14.4	22	24.4
6	Even if members don't participate in cooperative works, their name will be written on assignment papers.	31	34.4	26	29	23	26	10	11.1

With regard to the first item of the above table 21, more two third of respondents of the research (31.1%) disagreed or agreed with statement which says “in one to five cooperative learning structures, weaker become more weaker” on the other hand, a few respondents (19%) strongly agreed or strongly disagreed about one to five cooperative learning weaker become more weaker.

Teachers in the interview said, “only active learners dominate the classroom. Weak students didn't have opportunities to practice the target language.

The finding the second item of table 21 show the half of the respondents (36%) strongly agreed or agreed to the statement “one to five cooperative learning creates dependence” on the other hand a few members of respondents(21.1%) strongly disagreed and few of them(7%) disagreed on one to five cooperative enabled students to become dependence in their learning .

At the same time, results in item three table 21 present respondents' responses. Accordingly large number of respondents (31%) and (30%) agreed or disagreed about cooperative leaders are over loaded in one to five cooperative learning.

Some respondents (27%) strongly agreed about cooperative leaders are over loaded in one to five cooperative learning are over loaded in one to five cooperative learning where as few respondents (12.2%) strongly disagreed about it. However, more than two third of respondents witnessed that cooperative leaders are over loaded in one to five cooperative learning. Interview results deep-rooted that;” the cooperative leaders do all tasks of the group. He/she is over loaded. The rest members didn’t taking part in activities.

According to item 4 in the above table 21, greater number of respondents in the presents research work (42%) replied disagreed about one to five cooperative learning is a waste of time . on the other hand, respondents (31.1%) agreed and a few respondents(19%) strongly agreed on one to five cooperative was nothing apart from west of time and lastly almost more respondents (8%) strongly disagree about one to five cooperative learning is west of time.

Regarding in the fifth item of table 21, indicate that a larger number of respondents (423%) agreed and some of the (24.4%) strongly disagreed about the members of cooperative learning were free from works.

Almost similar number of respondents (19%) and (14.4%) were strongly agreed or disagreed on the case of cooperative members were free from works respectively.

In the last item of the above 21, greater number of respondents in the study (34.4%) strongly agreed, and nearly the same respondents (29%) and (26%) were agreed or disagreed, even though the group members didn’t participate in cooperative works the name of students would be written an assignment paper. Teachers in the interview admitted that “few active learners (possibly group leaders) do group tasks and the rest simply write their names the product.

4.6. General view of EFL teachers and students to wards one to five cooperative learning structures

Table:- 22. The effectiveness of one to five cooperative learning

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	One to five cooperative learning is effective in learning and teaching EFL	23	26	36	40	17	19	4	4.1

Table 22 presents general perception of respondents towards in one to five cooperative learning in EFL classrooms. Accordingly majority of respondents (40%) agreed and a few respondents (26%) were agreed or strongly agreed about one to five cooperative learning was effective in learning and teaching EFL. Interview results confirmed this finding that they can't say it was effective in learning and teaching because they didn't practice English language, instead they used their vernacular language.

4.7 factors that affect student's participant on in one to five cooperative learning

In this section, an effort was made to assess whether some personal and situational factors that could affect the implementation of one to five cooperative learning in preparatory school EFL classroom or not. The data obtained from respondents were presented and discussed below in table 23 and 24

4.7.1. Personal factors

Table 23. Factors related in individual personality

No	Personal factors	To high extent	Some extent	Little effect	No effect
----	------------------	----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------

		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Lack of language proficiency	40	44.4	36	40	7	8	7	8
2	Anxiety	38	42	28	31.1	14	16	10	11.1
3	Leadership problem	23	26	33	36	22	24.4	12	13.3
4	Lack of cooperative experience	40	44.4	26	29	17	19	7	8
5	Lack of self-esteem	22	24.4	31	34.4	26	29	11	12.2

Law English language proficiency was one of the reasons that lead to non participant in cooperative activities.

As illustrated in item 1 table 23, more than two thirds of respondents (44.4%) and the respondents (40%) were lack language proficiency in high extent and some extent respectively. Similarly the reaming respondents registered the same reply (8%) were little effect or no effect on language proficiency. At the same time, three teachers at interview, agreed about poor English language competence. Besides, in the second item of the above 23, two thirds of respondents of the study (42%) and (31.1%) were admitted that high extent or at some extent anxiety affect their participation in cooperative learning discussion.

As the results indicated in the third item table 23, depict large number of students (36%) leadership problem in cooperative learning affected income extent whole other respondent (26%) influenced by leadership problem in high extent in cooperative learning. On the contrary, a few respondents (24.4%) were little effect on leadership problem where as respondents (13.3%) were no effects on leadership problems in cooperative learning.

On the other hand, lack of group experience is another problem that affects student's involvement in cooperative learning discussion. According to item in the above table 23, maximum number of respondents (44.4%) had poor experience at high extent in cooperative learning. Besides to that the respondents (29%), (19%) and (8%) had poor experience in some extent or little effect or no affect in cooperative learning respectively.

The last item 5 of the above table 23 demonstrated that great number of subjects in the study (34.4%) had lack of self –esteem in some extent in cooperative learning. Whereas a few

respondents nearly the same (24.4%) and (29%) in high extent or little effect in constructing self-esteem in cooperative learning.

4.7.2. Factors related situations

Table :- 24. Situational factors

No	Situational factors	To high extent		Some extent		Little effect		No effect	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Group size	19	21.1	36	40	13	14.4	22	24.4
2	Group composition	19	21.1	33	36	16	18	22	14.4
3	Group cohesiveness	22	24.4	31	34.4	15	17	22	24.4
4	Nature of one to five cooperative learning	26	29	22	24.4	14	16	28	31

Classroom arrangement was one of the factors mentioned as influencing students' participation in one o five cooperative learning. As indicated in the first item of table 24, larger number of respondents (40%) admitted that group size to some extent affected their engagement in cooperative work.

This implied that being six or more than that had a negative impact on student's active involvement in cooperative tasks.

Findings, in the second item of the above table, show that number of students (36%) largely affected to some extent in group composition where as respondents (21.1%) and (18%) were affected to high extent or little effect on group compost ion in cooperative learning respectively. On the other hand, respondents (24.4%) confirmed group composition had no effect in cooperative learning.

At the same time, in the third item of table 24, great number of respondents (34.4%) were affected by group cohesiveness to some extent whereas, the same number of respondents replied (24.4%) were influenced by group cohesiveness to high extent or no effect in cooperative learning. On the contrary, few respondents (17%) were affected by group cohesiveness at little effect in cooperative

learning. At the end in item 4 on the above table shown that large numbers of respondents (31%) were influenced by the nature of one to five cooperative learning with no effect. Whereas, a few respondents (29%) at high extent affected by nature of one to five cooperative learning. According to results, seating arrangement was a problem in interactive EFL classrooms.

As illustrated in the forth item class rooms arrangement affect engagement in one to five cooperative learning. During classroom observation, the researcher observed classrooms were crowded by combined desks and students sit in rows.

4.8. Classroom Observation

The primary role of classroom observation in this study was to see what both teachers and students faced problems when using one to five cooperative learning. It was intended to address the first broad question raised under the objective of the study. To investigate problems that teachers and students face when using one to five cooperative learning. That means it was designed to observe whether or not teachers and students faced problems in one to five cooperative learning.

The observation was also used to get some insights in to the absence or presence of teacher's and student's problem faced in one to five cooperative learning.

The secondary role of classroom observation was together supporting data for the information obtained through the questionnaires. In other words, the observation was made to parity the response of subjects through questionnaires. That means do teachers and students exercise their roles to reduce learning problems. There were six sections in grade 11, two sections were randomly observed two times and the following analysis were written below.

4.8.1. Observation analysis

Table -25 Student related problems

No		Respondent's responses			
		Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Do students seat on their assigned cooperative learning group?	-	-	3	100

2	Do all students actively participated on the present lesson?	1	33.3	2	66.6
3	Do you usually support or motivate students to perform their activities			3	100
4	Do you students are satisfied (interested) with activities given?	1	33.3	2	66.6

Based on prepared checklist both teachers and students related problems were obtained during observation.

4.8.2. Teachers related problems

An observation analysis indicated that one to five cooperative members were not sat on their assigned place. This showed that students were not interested in their one to five cooperative groups. On the other hand, more than half percent of students were not actively participated in their cooperative members and didn't motivate students to perform the activities. This motion indicated that teachers were less attitude to implement one to five cooperative learning and also hard little enthusiasm to wards one to five cooperative learning.

4.8.3. Student related problems

Table -26 Teacher related problems

No		Respondent's responses			
		Yes		No	
		No	%	No	%
1	Are you interested with your one to five cooperative group formation?	10	11.1	80	88.8
2	Do your teacher motivate you to perform the activities	20	22.2	70	77.7
3	Do you receive useful /helpful/ feed back from one to five cooperative mates	30	33.3	60	66.6
4	Do you utilize your roles effectively?	10	11.1	80	88.8

With respect to observation analysis on students problem implied that majority of students more not interested with their cooperative mate's formation.

In additions, teachers were not motivate students while the discussion was in progress. Besides, more than half of students didn't give feed back and also were not kept their role expected from them. The above information indicated as students were negative attitude to wards one to five cooperative learning.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study. Firstly, a summary of the study and the major findings are made secondly, conclusion of the fundamental findings are drawn. Finally some possible recommendations are launched on the basis of the findings of the study.

5.1. Summary

The objective of this study was to assess the implementation of one to five cooperative learning and the attitudes of teachers and students towards it in Negelle Preparatory School.

So as to achieve this objective, the following research questions were raised in the study.

1. What problems do teachers and students face when using one to five cooperative learning in EFL?
2. What do preparatory school teachers and students play their expected roles in implementing one to five cooperative learning not?
3. How do teachers and students of preparatory school perceive one to five cooperative learning?
4. What are the positive effects of one to five cooperative learning on preparatory school language performance?

In order to answer the research questions indicated above, the researcher employed different research instruments. EFL teachers and students of these schools were the subjects of the study.

Essential sampling technique was used to select students and these students were selected using simple random sampling techniques. And all EFL teachers were selected. Accordingly, three teachers and three hundred number of students were selected in a given sample school, out of these, ninety students from grade eleven were embedded to the study through simple random sampling technique. The data were gathered mainly through questionnaire, observation and interview. The data collected through questionnaire, observation and interview check list was analyzed using

simple descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage. Finally based on the analyzed data, the following findings were obtained.

Major findings:

Knowledge and attitude of teachers and students to wards cooperative learning.

- It was found that all teachers and majority of students didn't know the essential elements of one to five cooperative learning
- It was also found that teachers seem to have a favorable attitude towards one to five cooperative learning
- It was found that students have less attitude to wards one to five cooperative learning.

Practices of one to five cooperative learning:

The analysis of the data gained through questionnaire, interview and observation ascertained that:

1. The extent of the practice of one to five cooperative learning was found to be low. This was confirmed by the following findings:
 - Teachers didn't assign individual responsibility (responsibility were not equally shared among students)
 - Cooperative activities were dominated by few students (almost none) This was one of the problem faced by teachers.
 - Cooperative group were not proportional in terms of their size.
 - Teachers didn't take prior training about one to five cooperative learning. This resulted in negative attitudes towards one to five cooperative learning.
 - Almost all teachers gave great emphasis to teachers centered method. Low perception about one to five cooperative learning.
 - Cooperative group were formed based on students' seats (different ability grouping was not imagined) classroom conditions

The result of the study shows that the arrangement of seats and the background of classroom of the school being observed were not supportive for practice of one to five cooperative learning. It was also found that teachers didn't arrange seats in the way to implement one to five cooperative learning.(This is the problem faced when implementing one to five cooperative learning.)

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. With regard to the attitude of teachers and students towards one to five cooperative learning. The finding of the study revealed that teachers and students didn't practice in the actual classrooms; their attitudes seem to be negative. Therefore it can be concluded that teachers and students didn't implement one to five cooperative learning, their attitude towards one to five cooperative learning seem to be negative.
2. The analysis of the questionnaire items filled by students indicates that the majority of the participants didn't seem to have a clear view point (perception) about one to five cooperative learning.

However, the data collected through interview and some open ended questionnaires from teachers indicates that almost all participants known why and how to implement cooperative learning in classroom instructions.

Thus, it can be possible to conclude that teachers seem have basic knowledge cooperative learning.

3. Regarding problems of teachers and students facing in using one to five cooperative learning (class-room condition) i.e. arrangement of seats and class size. The result of the study showed that the size of the cooperative group were not supportive for one to five cooperative learning implementation.
4. During one to five cooperative learning teachers and students were not plays their expected roles with following points. (missed point)
 - Sharing cooperative tasks equally
 - Making all students equally active
 - Making cooperative groups proportional in terms of size.

From this, one can conclude that teachers and students lack the necessary skills or procedures of cooperative learning implementation.

5. With regard to training, it was founded that teachers did not get any training about cooperative learning as a result their knowledge and practice has been, greatly affected.

Therefore, it can be concluded that, because of lack of training on cooperative learning, teachers appeared to have inadequate knowledge of cooperative learning.

5.3 recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher would like to forward the following recommendations for the implementation of one to five cooperative learning.

1. Implementation of one to five cooperative learning has been found low and how students and teachers perceive one another and interact each other is a forgotten aspect of instruction. For this reason the researcher believe unless teachers get training it face problem for them to be equipped with the necessary assumptions of cooperative learning that enable them implement cooperative learning effectively consequently, adequate training time should be devoted to familiarize teachers with how and when to effectively implement cooperative learning in classroom instructions.
2. It is recommended that students need to be taught the appropriate interactional skills. Knowing how to work effectively in a cooperative team is not something that comes naturally to anyone. Therefore, teachers must help students to be aware the necessary skills for successful one to five cooperative learning tasks. Like other skills, cooperative learning skills need to be taught.
3. It is also suggested teachers should make lessons and tasks need to be well organized and assign roles for every individual to discourage free-riding. Besides, make the one to five cooperative tasks to have some parts that cannot be performed by one or two students rather need participation to all members.
4. The classroom condition was not arranged in the way to facilitate one to five cooperative learning. It was also observed teachers formed cooperative learning groups based on students' seats.

This affects the assumption of one to five cooperative learning. For instance, it affects students' academic achievement and social skills. Hence, teacher should be aware of the impact of classroom conditions and grouping mechanisms on students' meaningful learning.

Therefore, the first or learning should be arranging classroom conditions in the way suitable to implement different kind of one to five cooperative learning and forming diverse ability grouping should also be given due emphasis.

5. More importantly, officials and concerned bodies are recommended to improve some natures of one to five cooperative learning and to match with pedagogical science. It should be flexible in (1) grouping only achievement (2) determining group size (3) selection of members.
6. The focus of this paper was delimited only assign and implementing of one to five cooperative learning and attitude of teachers and students towards it. Therefore, the researcher would like to suggest that future research should be undertaken with regard to the attitude of parent and factors that affects the implementation of one to five cooperative in the sample schools.

REFERENCES

- Adem Mohammed (2007). Challenges and Opportunities of using group work in EFL classes. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa.AUU
- Alamirew G/Mariam (1992). "The applicability of group work in learning English" (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa: AAU.
- Atkins, J.,Hailom B and Nuru M. (1996). Skills development methodology (part II). Addis Ababa university press.
- Baines,E., Blatchford ,P., and Kutnick, P. (2003) Changes in grouping practices over primary and secondary school. *International Journal of educational Research*, 39, 9-34.
- Baloche, L (1998) the cooperative learning classroom: empowering learning. Prentice Hall New Jersey.
- Bejarano, Y. (1987). A cooperative small group methodology in the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (3) 483-504.
- Birhanu Bogale (2000). "The verbal participation behavior of first year students at Addis Ababa University." (Unpublished PHD Dissertation) Addis Ababa: AAU
- Brown, D.(2001). Teaching by principle: an interactive approach to language pedagogy. 2nd Ed, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown D. (2007). The principle of language learning and teaching (5thed.). White plains, NY: long man.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. Englewood cliffs, NJ: prentice Hall Regents.
- Cameroon, J. and Dodd. W.(1970) society, schools and progress in Tanzania 1919 – 19970. London; jammed Currey
- Catherine Twomey Fosnot (2005) Vol. 16. No.1 City college of New York.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell,. S. (1995). Communicative competence: a pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-335.
- Cohen, E.G. (1994). Designing group work: strategies for the Heterogeneous classroom. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

- Cowie, H. and J.Rudduck. (1990). Learning from one another: The challenge in children helping children, ed H.C.Foot, M.J. Morgan and R.H. Shute. Chichester, England: John Wiley.
- Cross, D. 1992. A Practical Handbook of Language Teaching. London; Prentice Hall Int. Ltd.
- Doff, A. (1998) "Teach English. A. Training Course For Teachers" Cambridge University Press.
- Dornyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual difference in second language acquisition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Freeman, L., and, and Greenacres, L. (2011). An examination of socially destructive behaviors on group work. Journal of marketing Education, 33 (1) P.5-17. Graduate outlook survey (2010). University of Canterbury. Retrieved on 30 March 2015 from [http://www. Graduate opportunities.com%2f](http://www.Graduateopportunities.com%2f).
- Freiberg, H.J. & Driscoll, A. (1992). Universal Teaching Strategies. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gillies, R. (2008). The effects of cooperative learning on junior or high school students' behaviors, discourse and learning during a sciences – based learning activity. School psychology of international, 29, 328-347.
- Gillies, R.(2003b),structuring cooperative group work in classroom. International journal of educational research, 39, 35-49.
- Glanz, J. (2004). Teaching 101: classroom strategies for the beginning teacher. Thousand Oaks, CA: Crowin Press.
- Gower, R. & Walters, S. 1983. Teaching Practice Handbook. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Harmer J.(1991). The Practice of English Language Teaching. Longman.
- Harmer J.(2001). The practice of English Language Teaching (3rd ed.), Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- Jacobs, G.M., Crokall, D. & Thiyaragarajali, R. (1997). The evolution of group activities in ELT course books. Folio, 4(2), 21-24.
- Johnson, D., and Ahlgren, A. (1976). Relationship between attitudes about cooperation and competition and attitudes towards schooling, Journal of Education/Psychology, 68, 92-1.
- Johnson, D.W, and Johnson, F(2009) Joining together: Group theory and group skills (10th ed). Boston; Allyn and Bacon.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., and Smith, K.A. (1991). Active learning: Cooperation in the college classroom. Edina, MN: Interaction.

- Jonson, D., Johnson, R. and Holubec, E. (1998). Cooperation in the classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bocon.: Document Reproduction service No. ED 382-035
- Jonson, D.W., and Johnson, R. (1994). Leading The cooperative School (2nd Edition). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Jonson, D.W., Jonson, R.T. and Smith, K.A. (1991). Cooperative learning: increasin collage faculty instructional productivity ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.NO. 4, G Washington university.
- Jonson, D.W; and Johnson, R.T. (1989), Cooperation and competition: Theory and Accussition. " TESOL quarterly, 1912: 207-227
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T \$ Stanne, M.B. (2000). Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta Analysis. Retrieved March 13,2015. From [http://www.clcrc.com/](http://www.clcrc.com/pages/cl-methods.html) pages/cl-methods.html
- Jump to: a b c Johnson, D.W. (2009)."An Educational Psychology success story: social interdependence theory and cooperative learning, "Educational Researcher 38 (5): 365-379.
- Kagan S. (1989). The structural approach to cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 47 (4). Pp. 12-15.
- Kagan, S. (1995). We can talk; cooperative learning in the elementary ESL class-room (ERIC) Document reproduction service no. (ED 382035).
- Kohn,A. (1992).Resistance to cooperative learning: making sense of its deletion and dilution. Journal of Education, 174, 38-55.
- Kramsch, C. (1992). Interactive discourse in small and large groups. In .W..Rivers (Ed.) Interactive Language Teaching. New York: Cambridge University press. 17-30.
- Krashen, S. (1982), The input hypothesis is. NEWYORK, NY: pergamon.
- Leo Jones (2007). The student-centered classroom. Cambridge University preens. Retrieved on Feb.2015 <http://www.combridge.org>
- Lesley, T and Ornstein, a (2000). Strategies for effective teaching 4th Ed, Mc Graw Hill: New York.
- Long, Michael H and Porter, P.A (1985). Group work, Inter language talks, and seconda language acquisition. TESOL, 1912, 207 - 228
- MC. Donell, W., (1992), "The role of the teacher in the cooperative learning classroom ",In C.

- Nation, P(1994) Group work and Language Learning. English Teaching Forum 27, 2:20-24.
- National Training Laboratories in Maine, USA (1996). Retrived on 4/17/2015 from practiquetst.http:// www.com/page_id=120
- Nyerere J.K (2009a) education for self reliance in Hinzen, Hand Hundsd or fer , VH (Eds) education for liberation and development . The Tanzania Experience Hamburg and Evan.
- Nyerere, J.K (1975) education never ends, the 1969 and 1970 new years eve address to the nation in NAEAT Adult Education and Development in Tanzania. Dar-es –Sa laam.
- Opitz, C. (2008). SEL Overall plan. Retrived 14, 2008 from [http:// www. Edutopia.org/pdfs/Coop – math – bowman/ bowman –se/ –overall- plan, pdf.](http://www.Edutopia.org/pdfs/Coop-math-bowman/bowman-se/-overall-plan.pdf)
- Mulat Adane (2007). An exploration of teachers’ roles in implementing group work with particular reference to Debbre Berhan College of teachers’ education. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Anana: AAU.
- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers,TS.(2001).Approaches and methods in language teaching Cambridge: Cup.
- Richards J.C. (2002). 30 years of TEFL/TESL: A personal Reflection. SEAMEO Regional Language Center, Singapore. Retrieved on 29 Oct/2014 from <http://www.ret.sagepub.com/conten/33/2/1.res>
- Sharan, S. (1986). Cooperative learning: (Problems and promise. The international association for the study of cooperation in education news letter of (5 and 6): 3-4.
- Sharan, S. (Ed.) (1994). Hand book of cooperative learning methods. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Shehadeh, A. (2001). Self-and other-initiated modified output during task-base instruction. TESOL Quarterly, 35, 744-747.
- Slavin, R.E. (1984). Students motivating students to excel: Cooperative incentives, cooperative tasks, and Students achievement. The Elementary School Journal .85, 53-63. Retrieved from [http://www. Journals. Uchicago. eSSdu/ toc/aje/ current.](http://www.Journals.Uchicago.eSSdu/toc/aje/current)
- Slavin, R, E, (1991). Are cooperative learning and untracking harmful to the gifted? Educational leadership, 48(6), 68-71.
- Stevens, R.J., Slavin, R.E. (1995). Cooperative elementary school: Effect on students’ achievements, attitudes, and social relations. American Education Research Journal, 32, 321-351.doi;10..310210028312032002321..[http://ezpolson.nmu.edu:5558/itx/start..do?](http://ezpolson.nmu.edu:5558/itx/start..do?prodid=ITOF)

- Swain, M.(2005). The output hypotheses; theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed). Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning (pp. 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Theory and practice in language studies, Vol.1, No.6, pp.622-629, June 2011. Finland; ACADEMY PUBLISHER manufactured. Retrieved on February 23/2015 from <http://www.doi:10.4304/tpls.1.6.622-629>.
- Tannen, K., Chatman, L., Allen, D. (2003). Approaches to Cell Biology Teaching: Cooperative Learning in the science class room- Beyond Students working in Groups. Cell Biology Education, 2(1), 1-5.
- Tesfamichael Getu(2011). A survey of wolda higher education preparatory secondary school eleventh grade students reading comprehension performance (unpublished masters thesis).
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978).Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard university press.
- Webb, N. (1992). Testing a theoretical model of students interaction and learning in small groups. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, and. N. Miller (Eds.), interaction in cooperative groups (pp. 102-119).Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University press.
- Weber, W.A. 1994. Classroom management. In J ..M .Cooper(Ed). Classroom teaching skills, Lexington, MA: D.C Heath and Co.pp. 234-269.
- Williams, R.B.(2002). Cooperative learning: A standard high achievement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Crowin Press.
- Wondosen Tesfamichael (2008) assessment of the oral group Lessons in English for Ethiopian grade seven in promoting cooperative learning (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa University , Addis Ababa.
- Yu,G.(1995). Implementing cooperative learning approach in an EFL class in secondary schools in Taiwan. Journal of Kaohsiung Normal University, 4,210-229.
- Zuckerman, G., Chudinova, E., and kavkin, E.(1998). Inquiry as a pivotal element of knowledge acquisition within the Vygtskian paradigm: building science curriculum for the elementary school. Cognition and Instruction, 16(2), 201-233.

APPENDIX-I
ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Questionnaire for students

Dear students:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about one to five cooperative learning in preparatory school English language classrooms. Your genuine answers will help the researcher to know how one to five cooperative learning is implemented and its effectiveness in English language. Hence, you are kindly requested to response to all questions carefully and honestly according to the instructions give to each question. Your information will be used only for the research purpose and will be kept confidential.

Note: You need not to write our name. Choose the answer which you believe it express your idea.

Thanks for your cooperation

Part 1. One to five cooperative group formations

The following information is related to one to five cooperative answer and indicate it by circling.

1. Is there one to five cooperative group learning strategy in your classroom?
A. Yes B. No
2. Are you a member of one to five cooperative group learning?
A. yes B. No
3. Who construct cooperative groups in your classroom?
A. Home teacher B. English teacher C Ours
4. How many students are there in your cooperative group?
A. 6 B. 5 C. 4 D. 7 and more than 7
5. In your cooperative group-----are there.
A .only girls B. Only boys' C .Both boys and girls
6. Is there a problem faced in constructing one to five cooperative group?
A. Yes B. No
7. Do you feel positively about one to five cooperative group learning?

A. Yes B. No

8. Who select the group leader in your group?

A. Our homeroom teacher B. Our English teacher C. We, members

9. In your group , the role group leading is changed from one member to another time to time

A. No B. Yes

10. How are students grouped in to different groups? Based on their

A. Age B. Attainments C. Interest D. Mixed achievement E. Gender

11. In your group _____ students are there.

A. Low achiever B. High achiever C. Medium D. All times of achievers

12. In your group the group leaders is _____

A. Low achiever B. High achiever C. Medium achiever

13. How often does your EFL teacher use one to five group learning in the classroom?

A. Always B. Sometimes C. Rarely D. Never

14. List some other views you have about one to five cooperative learning

Part II. Perception about one to five cooperative learning

15. How much do you agree to the following ideas? Please indicate your answers by putting a tick (✓)

In the table according to the response scales given underneath.

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

No	Working in one to five cooperative learning				
1	In one to five cooperative learning, the weaker become more weaker				
2	Cooperative learning foster exchange of knowledge, information and experiences				
3	Make problem solving easier				
4	One to five cooperative learning creates dependence				
5	Cooperative learning increase students' motivation to learn English				
6	In cooperative learning students receive useful/ helpful feedback from their partners				
7	Cooperative group leaders are overloaded in cooperative group learning				
8	In cooperative learning students create responsibility for myself and the group				
9	Enables learners to help weaker learners in the cooperative group				
10	Cooperative learning enhances communication skills				
11	Cooperative learning improve language performance by giving opportunities for practice				
12	Learners actively participate in the teaching/learning process				

13	Cooperative learning is fun				
14	Cooperative learning makes new friends				
15	One to five cooperative learning is wressts of time				
16	One to five cooperative learning enables students to practice English language				
17	Cooperative learning makes students to stay on tasks				
18	Members are free from works in cooperative learning				
19	Cooperative learning stimulates critical thinking				
20	Cooperative learning fosters team sprits				
21	Even if members do not participate in cooperative learning works, their name will be written on assignment papers				
22	One to five cooperative learning is effective in learning and teaching EFL				
23	Makes classrooms interesting environment for learning				

16. List some other roles your English teacher play_____

Part III. Teachers' Role

15 .When you are in English language classroom, how often does your English teacher play the following roles effectively? Make a tick (✓) in the table below.

No	Teacher' roles	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Arrange the classroom into different cooperative groups				
2	State the reason for using cooperative learning				
3	Structure cooperative tasks				
4	Give roles for each members of cooperative group				
5	Explain cooperative group tasks with enough example				
6	Request students to use English in cooperative group discussion				
7	Ask question for members to check their active involvement in the discussion				
8	Allocate sufficient time for group discussion				
9	Monitor cooperative group activities and engagement of every student in task doing				
10	Increase when needed to improve task work and team work				
11	Give marks for students based on their participation in cooperative group discussion				
12	Summarize students discussion				

13	Ask students to report on their discussion				
14	Rotate roles for each member of a cooperative group				
15	Give feedback for students				
16	Teach students about cooperative learning, its benefits and skills of working together				
17	Provide extra materials				

17. List some other roles your English teacher play_____

Part IV. Students' Roles

18. When you are in English language classroom, how often you play the following roles? Please indicate your answer by putting a tick (✓) in the table.

No	Students' roles	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Sit in own group				
2	Care others' learning				
3	Responsible for own learning				
4	Ask for help				
5	Use English in cooperative learning discussion				
6					
7	Evaluate their working together				

19. List some other roles you play_____

Part V .Possible factors affecting your participation

20. To what extent the following factors affect your participation during cooperative group discussion? Put a tick (✓) according to the response scale given in the table.

No	Factors	To high extent	Some extent	Little extent	No effect
1	Lack of language proficiency				
2	Anxiety				
3	Leadership problem				
4	Lack of cooperative group experience				
5	Lack of self –esteem				
6	Group size				
7	Group composition				
8	Group cohesiveness				
9	Seating arrangement				
10	Nature of one to five cooperative group				

THE END

THANK YOU VERY MUCH INDEED!!

APPENDIX-II
ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear teachers:-

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information about one to five group learning in preparatory school English language classroom. Your precise answers will help the researcher to know how one to five cooperative group learning is assessed and its effectiveness in English language. Hence, you are kindly requested to respond to all the questions carefully and honestly according to the instructions given to each question. Your information will be used only for the research purpose and will be kept confidential.

Note:- you need not write your name

Choose the answer which you believe is your idea.

Thanks for your cooperation!

Part I: - The following information is related to one to five cooperative learning.

Please choose an appropriate answer and indicate it by circling.

1. Is there one to five cooperative groups in your teaching class-room?
A. Yes B. No
2. Is there any problem encountered constructing one to five cooperative learning?
A. Yes B. No

If yes; what are those problems?

3. Is there positive effect in implementing one to five cooperative learning?
A. Yes B. No

If yes; what are those positive effects?

4. Is there any role played by teachers in implementing one to five cooperative group learning?

A. Yes

B. No

If yes; what are the expected role?

How often do you use one to five cooperative group learning?

A. Always

B. Rarely

C. Sometimes

D. Never

Part II: - views about one to five cooperative learning

5. How much do you agree to the following ideas? Please indicate your answers by putting a tick (✓) in the table according to the response scales given below

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

1	Cooperative group learning fosters exchange of knowledge, information and experiences				
2	Cooperative group learning increases students motivation to learn English				
3	In cooperative group learning, students receive helpful feed back from their partners				
4	Cooperative group learning fosters team spirit				
5	No problem is faced when implementing one to five cooperative learning				
6	Cooperative learning enhances language proficiency				
7	Teaching students in one to five cooperative group is advantageous				
8	Teachers play a crucial role in implementing one to five cooperative learning				
9	One to five cooperative learning is a best method of learning				

APPENDIX-III
ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Interview for Teacher

1. How often do you use one to five cooperative group strategies in your EFL classroom?
Why?
2. Do you assign different roles for cooperative group members?
3. Do you rotate these roles from one to another, so as to enable learners to develop various social skills?
4. Do you think that students play their roles properly? If not, what happens?
5. What do you think the advantages of one to five cooperative group work learning over whole class instruction?
6. What about disadvantage?
7. Do you think that a group should have a permanent leader? If yes why?
8. Do you provide extra learning materials rather than students' textbook for students?
9. Do you allow them sufficient time for group discussion?
10. How do you like the seating arrangement of students to be during cooperative group discussion?
11. What factors do you usually affect cooperative group discussion in your EFL classroom?
12. What roles do you play during cooperative work discussion?
13. Do you get ongoing support from the school or any other?
14. Do you think that one to five cooperative group learning is effective in learning English language?

APPENDIX-III

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Class Room Observation

Student related problems			
		Yes	No
1	Do students seat on their assigned cooperative learning group?		
2	Do all students actively participated on the present lesson?		
3	Do you usually support or motivate students to perform their activities		
4	Do you students are satisfied (interested) with activities given?		
Teacher related problems			
		Yes	No
1	Are you interested with your one to five cooperative group formation?		
2	Do your teacher motivate you to perform the activities		
3	Do you receive useful /helpful/ feedback from one to five cooperative mates		
4	Do you utilize your roles effectively?		