



ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

(POST GRADUATE PROGRAM)

**AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE PRACTICES OF COOPERATIVE
LANGUAGE LEARNING: THE CASE OF ENANGO AND DONGORO JUNIOR
SECONDARY SCHOOLS, GRADE 9 IN FOCUS**

BY

SOLOMON BEKELE ONCHO

SEPTEMBER, 2017

ADAMA, ETHIOPIA

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

MA THESIS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

(POST GRADUATE PROGRAM)

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**

SOLOMON BEKELE ONCHO

ADVISOR: TESHOME TOLA (PHD)

SEPTEMBER, 2017

ADAMA, ETHIOPIA

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE PRACTICES OF COOPERATIVE
LANGUAGE LEARNING: ENANGO AND DONGORO SECONDARY SCHOOL

BY

SOLOMON BEKELE ONCHO

APPROVAL OF THE EXAMINATION BOARD

NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE
<u>Dr- Teshame Tekle</u>	<u></u>	<u>01/10/2017</u>
ADVISOR		
<u>Mengistu Dinato</u>	<u></u>	<u>30/09/2017</u>
EXTERNAL EXAMINER		
<u>emechise Meudida (PhD)</u>	<u></u>	<u>5/10/17</u>
INTERNAL EXAMINER		

DECLARATION

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

Name: Solomon Bekele

Signature: _____

Place: Adama Science and Technology University, School of Humanities and Law,
Department of English

Date of Submission: September 14, 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Teshome Tola, for his invaluable and constructive comments, suggestions and feedback. Without his constructive comments and suggestions, this study would not have been successful. I am very much indebted to the kindness, patience and warm-welcome he has shown me in the course of time. Above all, his unreserved guidance and professional advice throughout the entire course of the thesis was significant that I have really no words to thank him.

I would like to extend my thanks to the EFL teachers, principals of the schools and others who participated and contributed a lot for the success of the study either in filling in the questionnaire, participated in the classroom observations or/and in interviews. Special thanks go to the following teachers for their sustained cooperation during data gathering processes and lots of contributions: Gaddisa Kanaa, Getachew Fikadu, Tsega Megersa, and Tamene Dibessa.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank my life partner, Nardos Kidanu, for being such a dedicated person in providing all her support and love during the course of my studies despite a number of prevailing challenges. All others who offered their support in one way or the other are also acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning (CLL) of grade 9 students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes in Enango and Dongoro Junior Secondary schools. In this regard, the study examined the contributing factors in relation to classroom setting, role of the teacher and students in EFL classes during the practices of cooperative learning (CL) in English classes. The research design fitted into the descriptive paradigm involving a mixed methodology-both quantitative and qualitative. In order to achieve the research objectives, the study, therefore, used both quantitative and qualitative data gathering tools which are questionnaire, classroom observation, and interview. As indicated above, the study was conducted in two Junior Secondary schools by administering questionnaire for 210 students, conducting six classroom observations, and interviews with EFL teachers. The data gathered through questionnaire, classroom observation, and interview were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. As such, frequency, percentage, and mean scores were used to analyze the quantitative data. The data collected through classroom observation and interview were described qualitatively and analyzed using protocols of content analysis. The results of the study indicated that classroom setting or organization, with the exception of group formation which is heterogeneous, was not appropriate and conducive for cooperative learning practices. The findings of the study also revealed that students' lack of motivation, their reluctance, and resistance to participate in cooperative activities were the impeding factors hindering the cooperative learning practices. Hence, the English language teaching practices, in the observed classes, in general were characterized by teacher-centered approach wherein teacher-led instructions than students-to-students interactions were evident, and teachers controlled the classroom instructional practices in most of the classroom activities. With regard to teacher's role, lack of establishing clear guidelines that facilitate positive interdependence and individual accountability, and promote harmony, absence of assignment of complementary roles for learners, lack of monitoring students' learning, and lack of using different CL techniques were teacher-related factors affecting successful CL practices not to take place in classrooms. Thus, the findings revealed that the practices of cooperative language learning were affected by classroom setting, teacher- and student- related factors. Thus, based on the findings of the study, conclusions, some educational implications were drawn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Pages
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	8
1.3.1 General Objective.....	8
1.3.2 Specific Objectives.....	8
1.4 Research Questions.....	8
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	8
1.6 Scope of the Study.....	9
1.7 Limitations of the Study.....	9
1.8 Definitions of Key Terms.....	10
1.9 Organization of the Study.....	11
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	12
2.1 Overview of Cooperative Learning.....	12
2.2 Theoretical Perspectives Underlying Cooperative Learning.....	13
2.3 Cooperative Learning and Language Acquisition.....	14
2.3.1 Input.....	14
2.3.2 Output.....	15
2.3.3 Context.....	16
2.4 Cooperative Learning Group versus Traditional Learning Group.....	16
2.5 Cooperation versus Competition versus Individualization.....	17
2.6 Some Considerations for the Success of Cooperative Learning.....	18
2.6.1 Composition of the Group and its Size.....	18
2.6.2 The Structure of the Elements of Cooperative Learning.....	20

2.6.3 Teacher as a Facilitator	23
2.6.4 Assignment of Complementary Roles for Learners	24
2.6.5 Individual and Group Assessment	24
2.7 Cooperative learning Methods to be used in the EFL classroom.....	25
2.7.1 Jigsaw, Jigsaw II and Reverse Jigsaw	25
2.7.2 Think – pair – share	26
2.7.3 Round Table	26
2.7.4 Inside-Outside Circle (IOC)	27
2.7.5 Student – Team – Achievement Division (STAD).....	27
2.7.6 Teams-Games – Tournament (TGT)	28
2.7.7 Reciprocal Teaching	28
2.7.8 Learning Together	28
2.7.9 Group Investigation	28
3.1 Research Design.....	31
3.2 Description of the Study Area.....	32
3.3 Population of the Study	32
3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques	32
3.5 Data Collection Instruments.....	33
3.5.1 Questionnaire.....	33
3.5.2 Classroom Observation.....	33
3.5.3 Interview	34
3.6 Data Collection Procedures	34
3.7 The pilot study.....	36
3.8 Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation	36
3.9 Reliability and Validity	37
3.10 Triangulation	38
3.11 Research Ethics	38
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	40
4.1 Analysis of Data on Group Size, Classroom Arrangement and Aiding Materials...40	
4.1.1 Data from Students’ Questionnaire	40

4.1.2 Classroom Observation Results on Group Size, Classroom Organization and aiding Materials for the Practice of CL Activities.....	42
4.1.3 EFL Teachers' Interview Results on Group Size, Classroom Arrangement and Instructional Materials	44
4.2 Analysis of Data on Teacher's Role in Classroom Practices	45
4.2.1 Data from Students' Questionnaire	45
4.2.2 Teachers' Interview Results on Teacher's Role in Classroom Practice	49
4.2.3 Classroom Observation Results on Teacher's Role in Classroom Practices.....	50
4.3 Analysis of Data on Students' Roles in Cooperative Learning Practices	52
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	56
5.1 Summary	56
5.2 Conclusions	57
5.3 Recommendations	58
References.....	60
Appendices.....	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2. 1: Modern Methods of cooperative learning.....	29
Table 3.1 Alpha Coefficient of Instrument Reliability.....	38
Table 4. 1: Students' Responses on Group size, Classroom Arrangement and Aiding Materials	40
Table 4. 2: Classroom Observation Results on Classroom Organization and Aiding Materials	43
Table 4. 3: Responses of Students on Teacher's Roles in Classroom Practices of CL	46
Table 4. 4: Classroom Observation Results on EFL Teacher's Roles in Classroom Practices	50
Table 4. 5: Students' Responses on Roles of Students in Cooperative Learning Practices	53

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- CL: Cooperative Learning
- CLL: Cooperative Language Learning
- EFL: English as a Foreign Language
- ESL: English as a Second Language
- ELT: English Language Teaching

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the general context of the study and provides the overall introduction of the study. First, an attempt has been made to introduce the background of the study. Next, the research problem is stated and then objectives, research questions and significance of the study are identified. Finally, scope, limitations and organization of the study are described subsequently.

1.1 Background of the Study

The history of English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching had become very closely associated with different methods within which it seemed each one replaced the one before (Howatt and Smith, (ND)). Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2001) state that English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and learning has its own historical emergence and began with different methods and approaches that have been introduced through times.

In an address to the 2012 conference of the Institute of International Education for ‘Enhancing the Quality of English Language Education in Ethiopia’, Tamene suggested that dissatisfaction with one teaching method has led to the emergence of another method. As a result, a wide range of methods have come into and gone out of the language teaching profession. As suggested by Tamene, according to relevant sources in the area of language teaching profession, the adoption of grammar-based teaching methods — more commonly known as “grammar translation”, or the “structural approach”, or “situational language teaching” (in the UK), and “audio-lingual” method (in the US) — marks a decisive stage in the history of the development of language teaching. As Tamene suggested (as cited in Institute of International Education, 2012), these language teaching methods largely dominated language teaching education in Europe and North America in the years prior to the 1970s.

The teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Ethiopian educational settings has some historical attachment with the introduction of modern education in the country in the early 20th century. In Ethiopia when modern education was introduced at the turn of the 20th century and officially commenced in 1908 with the opening of Menelik II School in Addis Ababa after a long history of church education, English, along with other foreign

languages such as French, Italian and Arabic, was one of the languages used as a medium of instruction. The history of English as a foreign language in Ethiopia, therefore, is traced back to early 20th century (Diribsa, 1999; Alemayehu, 2012, as cited in Beyene, 2016).

In a discussion at the same conference of the Institute of International Education [IIE], Tesfaye stated his belief that with the coming of Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE) in 1991, a new education and training policy (ETP) was published in 1994. According to Tesfaye, the policy made a radical overhaul in education, including school structure, teacher training, and curriculum. The policy also stipulated that English would be taught as a subject starting from grade one, and would be the medium of instruction for secondary and higher education. It is the view of Tesfaye that the policy prescribed student-centered education, and consistent with that, English for new Ethiopia was replaced by English for Ethiopia, which is said to be communicative, learner-centered, realistic and meaningful. In conclusion, Tesfaye suggested that our country Ethiopia is following the communicative approach to language teaching and this methodology demands various pre- requisites, such as small class sizes, pair and group work. And these and some other positive steps have been taken to improve the quality of English language teaching (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2012).

Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups in which students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1999:68). According to Slavin (2011:344) as cited in Tran (2013:101), cooperative learning is still defined as "Instructional methods in which teachers organize students into small groups, which then they work together to help one another learn academic content." Although researchers have not used the same official definition of cooperative learning, all of them refer to cooperative learning as a set of methods in which students work together in small groups and help one another to achieve learning objectives. In other words, cooperative learning is the pedagogy with in which students are active constructors of knowledge in the learning process instead of passive receivers of any given knowledge (Liang, 2002) as cited in Tran (2013:101).

Historically, the concept of cooperative learning was first introduced in the United Kingdom in the 1800s, which later on spread to the United States of America in 1906, Canada in 1957, and Australia in 1962(Wessels, (ND) as cited in Bee, 2011). In some

African countries, as suggested by Wessels, cooperative learning was introduced during the colonial administration while in others it was introduced by independent governments. As Wessels, in many cases, the process of introducing cooperative learning in Africa received numerous donors support.

In the 1930s, social theorists such as Alport, Watson, Shaw and Mead began establishing cooperative learning theory after finding that group work was more effective and efficient in quantity, quality and overall productivity when compared to working alone(Gillies and Adrian, 2003, as cited in “*cooperative Learning*”(ND). Furthermore, in the 1930s and 1940s, philosophers and psychologists, such as John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Morton Deutsh also influenced the cooperative learning being practiced today (Sharan,2010, as cited in “*Cooperative Learning*, (ND).

David Johnson and Roger Johnson have been actively contributing to the cooperative learning theory. In 1975, they identified that cooperative learning promoted productivity and achievement, better communication, high acceptance and support, psychological health and social competence, as well as demonstrated an increase in a variety of thinking strategies among individuals in the group (“*Cooperative Learning*”, (ND)).

Theoretical models to explain the effectiveness of cooperative learning include the social interdependence theory, the cognitive perspective, and the social learning theory, all of which contribute the theory of learning known as constructivism (Tran, 2013:101). These theories underpinning cooperative learning, which deserved better recognition, came from at least three nations: Vygotsky from Russia, Piaget from France, and Bandura from USA (Tsailing, 2002).

Conceptually, cooperative learning is rooted within social interdependence theory and its basic premise that ‘the way in which social interdependence is structured determines how individuals interact with the situation which, in turn, affects outcomes’ (Johnson and Johnson, 1989:5, as cited in Herrmann, 2013:175-176). According to this theory, cooperation is most effective when students perceive that they share similar goals and when individual members’ goals are positively dependent on the actions of the group. Such positive interdependence is assumed to enhance promotive interaction that is students encourage and help each other to reach their goals, give each other feedback, challenge each other’s conclusions and reasoning, and take the perspectives of others to

better explore different points of view. Promotive interaction, in turn, is expected to lead to higher academic achievement (Johnson and Johnson, 1989, 2009) as cited in Herrmann (2013:177).

In contrary to the above views or suppositions about the significance of cooperative learning and its positive effects on students' academic achievement and overall productivity, grade 9 students of Enango and Dongoro high schools show or reflect disengagement and passivity in practicing cooperative learning in EFL classes. It is with this understanding that the researcher was interested in conducting a research on factors affecting the practices of cooperative learning in EFL classes at the schools.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Placing students in groups and expecting them to work together will not necessarily promote cooperation. Group members often struggle with what to do and discord can occur as members grapple with the demands of the task as well as managing the processes involved in learning such as dealing with conflicts among members or with students who essentially loaf and contribute little to the group's goal (Johnson and Johnson, 1990, cited in Gillies, 2016:40).

Cooperation exists when individuals work together in order to promote both their individual learning out comes and the learning out comes of their peers (Johnson and Johnson, 1989, as cited in Herrmann, 2013:175). Cooperative learning is concerned with framing students' interaction in ways that are likely to raise positive interdependence and individual accountability (Johnson et al., 2000, as cited in Herrmann, 2013).

Positive interdependence means that group members should perceive that the collective effort of the group is essential in order for the individual learners to achieve their goals. On the other hand, individual accountability is that in order to prevent social loafing , the students should be assessed by their individual learning out comes. Thus, while working within a group, the student might still pursue individual goals and be assessed as an individual (Johnson and Johnson, 2009, cited in Herrmann, 2013:177). This perspective holds that each group member of the group is accountable for his or her learning and work, and 'social loafing' can be eliminated.

Cooperative learning approach demands teacher-guided facilitation of students' interaction in cooperative learning. In this way, students' ability to retain information through social interaction is strengthened as they engage in cooperative learning with peers (Bandura, 1977, as cited in Nsamenang and Tchombe, 2011:184).

It is the view of Piaget that to facilitate cooperative learning, the learning environment must be organized in a way that will allow students to develop concepts and skills themselves at their own pace according to their individual aptitude. Engagement in such active learning processes leads to deep structured learning. To address deep structured learning, the teacher's role is of special significance (Nsamenang and Tchombe, 2011:185).

Cooperative learning has a strong foundation in research. Many studies across a wide range of subject areas and age groups have been conducted. According to Johnson's and Johnson's meta-analysis, students in cooperative learning settings, compared to those in individualistic or competitive learning settings, achieve more, reason better, gain high self-esteem, like class mates and the learning tasks more, and have more perceived social support (Johnson, 2009:365).

Findings from research by Johnson and Johnson (1989) show that considerably greater performance is promoted by cooperation than by competitive or individualistic efforts. In cooperative situation, as suggested by Johnson and Johnson, performance has been constructed in terms of achievement and productivity, long-term retention, on-task behavior, use of higher-level reasoning strategies, generation of new ideas and solutions, motivation to learn, and positive attitude towards learning and school (Johnson and Johnson, 2008, cited in Tran, 2013:14).

Johnson et al. (2002) found that cooperative learning conditions result in greater achievement than competitive or individualistic conditions. In addition to achievement, positive relationships among individuals are more strongly promoted by cooperation (Johnson and Johnson, 2002, as cited in Tran, 2013:14).

Similarly, in our country, Ethiopia some researches have been conducted in the area of cooperative learning. Among the researches conducted, Mohammed (2012), Alamum (2014), Yeabsira (2015), Zeleke, (2015), and Tadesse (2015) can be mentioned. The

study by Mohammed (2012) focused on Cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University to identify the current status of cooperative learning practices and to find alternative strategies used to improve the cooperative learning practices in higher education. The findings show that cooperative learning has benefits for students in which it develops positive interdependence and team spirit among students, critical thinking skills and reasoning skills, self-esteem of group members and the ability to work with diversified people. The findings also depicts that cooperative learning improves communication and interpersonal skills.

Alamawum (2014) also attempted to conduct a research on ‘Evaluation of the design of the Speaking lessons in Grade 11 English text book in terms of promoting cooperative learning in Jigjiga Preparatory School. His findings made it clear that teachers consider using cooperative learning method is time-consuming. And Students’ lack of interest in doing within a group was also the result found by this study.

Yeabsira (2015) studied problems affecting the implementation of cooperative learning of grade 8 students in Tigil Lenetsanet Primary School in Addis Ababa. The findings of the study demonstrated that both teachers and students perceive cooperative learning approach positively and have good attitude towards the approach. However, teaches’ lack of opportunities to get training on cooperative learning approach and lack of enough support from school administration in providing students with aiding instructional materials were raised as the problems hindering the practices of cooperative language learning. The findings also demonstrated that although students have positive attitude towards cooperative learning, they failed to practice cooperative learning activities in classroom and students’ roles like doing cooperatively, taking responsibility, individual accountability and positive interdependence were unobserved activities during classroom observation.

Findings from research by Tadesse (2015) on ‘Nurturing cooperative learning pedagogies in higher education classrooms at Jimma University supported that cooperative learning intervention would help to improve the quality of teaching and learning. In addition, the findings suggest that an aspect of cooperative learning intervention predicts learning satisfaction gains for students who attended classroom instruction via cooperative learning pedagogies. The findings of this study reinforce the fact that cooperative learning approach has a major impact in transforming the quality of teaching and learning by

refocusing teachers' attention on the pedagogical changes that are powerful to improve the quality of learning.

Zelege (2015) conducted a research on assessment of EFL learners' attitude towards cooperative language learning (CLL) in Limu preparatory School in west wollega Zone. As the study showed, the students' prior knowledge of English language determines their learning. As such, high achievers are relatively familiar to interaction during the lesson and also they have positive attitude towards learning the target language cooperatively, whereas low achievers are passive and have negative attitude towards the learning of language in cooperation. The findings of the study also revealed that students have roles of contributing to the group's efforts, encouraging their fellow group members to contribute, working towards their shared goals, keeping each other on task, treating each other with care and directing their own learning through developing the skills of planning, monitoring and evaluating their own learning.

Although all the above researches with their findings are worthy base and promising to be studied, they did not focus on junior secondary school (grades 9 and 10) learners' practices of cooperative language learning. From the researches mentioned above, the study by Yeabsira (2015) focused on primary school, grade 8 in focus. Researches by Alamawum (2014) and Zelege, (2015) focused on preparatory school. Mohammed (2012), and Tefera (2015) put their emphasis on higher education and studied the practices of cooperative learning (CL) and its pedagogies in Universities.

Therefore, the researcher viewed as Junior secondary school (grades 9 and 10) learners' practices of cooperative language learning needs further investigation as it may differ from the above researches reviewed in setting, age groups, intellectual level and the extent of their participation in their own age groups (Ary, Jacobs & Sorensen, 2010:47).

Generally speaking, although most research findings demonstrated the positive effects of cooperative learning on academic achievement and productivity, grade 9 students in Enango and Dongoro high schools are not actively engaged in cooperative language learning and its practices. As far as the researcher's experience is concerned, students demonstrate passiveness or submissiveness to work with others when they are given opportunity to work in groups on given tasks or activities. The researcher's experience shows that students' disengagement in cooperative learning practices in EFL classes is a

big challenge during the lesson in EFL classes. Thus, the general aim of this study in recognition of the seriousness of the problem is to explore factors affecting the practices of cooperative learning (CL) in EFL classes in the schools.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The general objective of the study was to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning in EFL classes.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The study was also guided by the following specific objectives:

- a) To assess the extent to which the teacher uses cooperative learning methods during the lesson in classroom teaching;
- b) To assess the extent to which students are engaged in cooperative learning activities; and
- c) To assess if the classroom condition is supportive to promote the practices of CL in EFL classes.

1.4 Research Questions

To achieve the objectives of the study, the following specific questions were posed:

What are the teacher's roles in engaging students in CL activities?

- b) What are the roles of students during the practices of CL in EFL classes?
- c) Is the classroom setting or conditions appropriate to promote CL of students in EFL classes?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study was aimed to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning in EFL classes. Therefore, the findings (end results) of the study were expected to yield informative insight, regarding the future EFL teaching, to EFL teachers, school administrators, and researchers.

Most importantly, this study is expected to provide insights and information which are helpful for EFL teachers to CL methods that cater for communicative interactions. This study may also help EFL teachers to reconsider their classroom instructional practices of CL whether or not they are in line with the CL methods in in EFL classes, and to adjust their teaching strategies to the emerging context of CL. It is also hoped that the research findings will help the school administrators gain better understanding of CL with reference to the challenges that EFL teachers at this level have been facing. As such, the findings are expected to help school administrators to be informed on how to help classroom teachers in meeting their responsibilities for teaching and learning of the target language in CL classes. Finally, the findings of the study are expected to invite interested researchers for further study on the topic in the future. The researcher offered the schools the free copies of the theses of his research to be on public display (e.g., library) and read by EFL teachers, school administrators, or anyone who is interested to conduct a research in the area of cooperative language learning (CLL).

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study, as indicated earlier, was concerned to address only Enango and Dongoro high schools EFL learners' practices of CL. These two government schools are situated or found in Lalo Assabi District, West Wollega Zone. In this regard, students are the influential resources in the learning process. They are, therefore, expected to be active participants in their learning. On the other hand, teachers are considered responsible for the classroom interactions. Therefore, the study mainly focused on EFL teachers and learners, giving attention to teacher's and students' roles, and classroom organization that can influence the practices of CL in EFL classes. Since the study dealt with factors affecting the practices of Cooperative language learning (CLL) pertinent to only Enango and Dongoro Junior Secondary Schools (grade 9), the conclusions drawn from the study will not be extended beyond this grade level.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

This study is believed to have some limitations. Primarily, it should be kept in mind that the sample size of the study was limited to only 210 students from 840 students and 10 EFL teachers were selected from the two government schools. Due to the fact that the study was based on small sample size, the conclusions and the generalizability of the

findings should be treated with more caution. It would have been better and more effective if larger sample of the schools was included in the study to gather sufficient information and to obtain more reliable conclusions and better results.

The researcher also felt that demonstrating all aspects of CLL could not be carried out within a short period of time, and it will require an intensive study which reflects all aspects of CL approach. Data gathering tools were, therefore, limited to raise only some features of CL approach in which teacher's roles, learners' roles, and classroom organization were given special emphasis. Finally, some delay on the part of the participants in completing and returning back of the questionnaires was also encountered during the process of the study.

Despite all the above identified limitations to this study, the triangulation, verification, and rich description of the data enhance the validity of the analysis that was carried out and make it possible for others to judge the extent to which the findings may be applicable to their own contexts.

1.8 Definitions of Key Terms

- *Cooperative learning* - is a student-centered approach, or instructional use of small groups in which students are active agents in the process of learning and they work together to maximize their own and each other's learning.
- *Cooperative learning group* - is learning group in which students work together cooperatively to achieve or accomplish shared goals.
- *Traditional learning group* - is a learning group in which students are assigned to work together and accept that they have to do so regardless of their interest, preferences of learning styles, academic performance and achievement, etc.
- *Heterogeneous group* - is group formation in which students of different age, sex, educational back ground, learning styles, academic achievement, etc. are placed in learning teams to work together in cooperation.
- *Social Skills* - are basic learning skills such as listening attentively to each other, negotiating respectfully, commenting constructively on others' ideas, accepting responsibility for one's behavior, making decisions democratically, sharing resources, etc. in cooperative learning.

- *Positive interdependence* - is component of cooperative learning in which all group members understand that they are linked together to learn and achieve success together.
- *Individual accountability* - is one's responsibility in completing and ensuring that he/she completes his/her share of the work while also ensuring that others complete theirs.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This thesis consists of five chapters that collectively describe the research conducted. Chapter one presents the general context of the study and provides the overall introduction of the study. Chapter two reviews relevant literature and provides a theoretical rationale for the present study. Chapter three is on methodology and the results ensued are presented in chapter four. The last chapter of this thesis contains summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews relevant literature and provides a theoretical rationale for the present study. It begins with discussion of the concepts and perspectives of cooperative learning, such as, the overview of cooperative learning (CL), theoretical perspectives underlying CL, CL and language acquisition, CL groups versus traditional learning group, cooperation versus competition versus individualization, some considerations for the success of CL, types of CL, and CL methods.

2.1 Overview of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning (CL) is a student-centered, instructor-facilitated instructional strategy in which a small group of students is responsible for its own learning and the learning of all group members (Li and Lam, 2013:1). As Li and Lam, students interact with each other in the same group to acquire and practice the elements of a subject matter in order to solve a problem, complete a task, or achieve a goal.

According to Johnson and Johnson (2009, as cited in Tran, 2013:101), the way we teach and learn in modern educational environment has been transformed through the advent of CL. Different researchers have different definitions of CL. For example, Johnson and Johnson (1990c:69, as cited in Tran, 2013:101) define CL as “The instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning.” On the other hand, Sharan (1994:336, as cited in Tran, 2013:101) defines CL as, “A group- centered and group-centered approach to classroom teaching and learning.” Slavin (2011:344, cited in Tran, 2013:101) states the meaning of CL as “Instructional methods in which teachers organize students in to small groups, which then work together to help one another learn academic content.”

Although the researchers above have not used the same official definitions of CL, all of them refer to CL as a set of methods, or an approach or instructional strategy within which students are active constructors of knowledge in the learning process instead of passive receivers of any given knowledge(Liang,2002,cited in Tran,2013:101). It is the view of Kagan(1989, cited in Li and Lam, 2013:1) that in CL classes, the teacher maintains control of learning environment, designs learning activities, and structures work teams.

Mechemer and Crawford (2007:11, cited in Herrmann, 2013:175) state that, “While active learning is doing, CL is doing with others, and therefore, CL is one way of promoting student engagement.” Nsamenang and Tchombe (2011:197) summarizes that “to work together in harmony towards a shared goal is the dynamic relationship that enables individuals to pool their efforts for the benefit of a group. And without such organized, goal-directed liaison or relationship, a social group is unable to rise above the parallels lives of a set of individuals.”

2.2 Theoretical Perspectives Underlying Cooperative Learning

Theoretical model that underpins the application and effectiveness of CL in classroom is the social interdependence theory (Tran, 2013:101). Social interdependence exists when the outcomes of individuals are affected by their own and others’ actions (Johnson and Johnson, 1989, as cited in “*Cooperative Learning*, (ND)). According to Johnson and Johnson (2005, as cited in Tran, 2013:105), social interdependence is relevant when each individual’s goals are accomplished under the influence of the actions of others. This perspective holds that students help each other learn because they care about the group and its members, and come to derive self-identity benefits from group membership (Slavin, 2011, as cited in Tran, 2013:105).

As Deutsch (1949, cited in Tran, 2013), there are two types of social interdependence: positive and negative. Positive interdependence exists when there is a positive correlation among individuals’ goal attainments. In this regard, individuals perceive that they can attain their goal if and only if the other individuals with whom they are cooperatively linked attain their goal. On the other hand, negative interdependence exists when there is a negative correlation among individuals’ goal achievements, and individuals compete to claim who attained the goals. In this case, individuals perceive that they can obtain their goals if the other individuals with whom they competitively like fail to obtain their goals. Generally, when positive interdependence results in promotive interaction, negative interdependence results in oppositional or content interaction. Johnson and Johnson (2005, cited in Tran, 2013:105) concludes that a strong relationship has been found between CL and social interdependence theory, and the basic premise of social interdependence theory is that ‘how participants’ goals are structured determines the way they interact and the interaction pattern determines the outcomes of the situation (Deutsch, 1949 and 1962, as cited in “*Cooperative Learning*”, [ND]).

2.3 Cooperative Learning and Language Acquisition

Cooperative learning (CL) is claimed by scholars abroad and at home as an effective teaching method in foreign or second language education. As such, further examinations on CL and language acquisition could be inspected through three vital variables of input, output and context, which contribute to language acquisition to a great extent (Tsailing, 2002).

Kagan (1995), Krashen (1995), McGroarty (1989) and Swain (1985) as cited in Tsailing (2002) describe the three typical variables (input, output and context) contributing to language acquisition as follows:

2.3.1 Input

Language acquisition is fostered by input that is comprehensible, developmentally appropriate, redundant and accurate (Krashen, 1985, as cited in Tsailing, 2002). As Krashen suggested, to facilitate language acquisition, input must be comprehended, and students working in CL need to make themselves understood so they naturally adjust their input to make it comprehensible. It is the view of Kagan (1995, cited in Tsailing, 2002) that small group setting allows a far higher proportion of comprehensible input, because the speaker has the luxury of adjusting speech to the level appropriate to the listener to negotiate meaning. Kagan also added that learning with comprehensible input needs to be within the Zone of proximal development (ZPD) in order for the language to be comprehended and to stimulate the next step in the language acquisition (Kagan, 1995, cited in Tsailing, 2002).

The difference between the developmental level and the proximal level is called the zone of proximal development, and the nature of CL group focuses input in the zone of proximal development, stimulating development to the next stage of language development (Vygotsky, 1978, as cited in Nsamenang & Tchombe, 2011:186; Kagan, 1995, cited in Tsailing, 2002:21).

Furthermore, Kagan (1995, cited in Tsailing, 2002) claimed that a student might receive comprehensible input in the zone of proximal development, but that would not ensure language acquisition unless the input is received repeatedly from a variety of sources. To

Kagan, CL group is a natural source of redundant communication among a variety of sources in which comprehensible input is received.

On the other hand, McGoarty (1989, cited in Tsailing, 2002:22) also found the evidence that students gain both comprehension and production of English as a foreign/second language (EFL/ESL) through CL. McGroarty found that tasks used in CL foster many different types of verbal exchange. To McGroarty, there are more possibilities for fluent speakers to tailor speech and interactions so that they could be understood by the less proficient speakers. As suggested by McGroarty, even when all the students in a group lacked fluency in English, the students would correct each other and attempt to fill in the gaps of their understanding by repairing and rephrasing what their partners say in order to come to agreement (McGroarty, 1989, cited in Tsailing, 2002:22).

2.3.2 Output

Many researchers in second language acquisition argued that successful language learning does not only require input, but also comprehensible output. With CL, students' language output could be enhanced while decreasing the amount of teacher talk. Although teacher's talk in the target language could be a source of comprehensible for the learners, too much talk would deprive the learners not only of their opportunities and access to output in the target language, but also their attention and finally their motivation (Kagan, 1995, cited in Tsailing, 2002:23).

According to Kagan (1995), the single greatest advantage of CL over traditional classroom organization for the acquisition of language is the amount of language output allowed per student. The amount of student talk could be maximized through activities that involve pair work (Talk-pair) and group work (Inside-Outside Circle) as these would engage all students in speaking. Kagan also added that further interaction occurred in group discussion and peer checking of worksheets since students exchange ideas and make corrections or improvements in collaboration instead of individual learning.

It is the view of Swain (1985, cited in Tsailing, 2002) that language acquisition is fostered by output that is functional and communicative, frequent, redundant, and consistent with the identity of the speaker. Swain also suggests that the more opportunities for the students to employ the target language to negotiate meaning, the more they are expected

to acquire communicative competence through active participation in real communication that is of interest to those learners (Kagan, 1995; Krashen, 1977; and Swain, 1985, as cited in Tsailing, 2002:24). In conclusion, from these view points, it is comprehensible that output is just as important as input since most students learn how to speak a foreign language by actually speaking that language.

2.3.3 Context

Language acquisition is still fostered if it is put in a context that is supportive, friendly, motivating, communicative, developmentally appropriate, and feedback rich (Kagan, 1995, as cited in Tsailing, 2002:25). As Kagan, as the examination on how CL transforms input, output and context variables in the direction of facilitating language acquisition, it is not hard to draw the conclusion that communicative language teaching could be best enacted in EFL classroom through CL.

2.4 Cooperative Learning Group versus Traditional Learning Group

Not all groups are cooperative. Some kinds of learning groups facilitate student learning and increase the quality of life in the classroom, whereas other types of learning groups hinder student learning and create disharmony and dissatisfaction (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 1998b, cited in Johnson and Johnson, 1999:68).

In traditional classroom learning group, students are assigned to work together and accept that they have to do so. In this regard, assignments are structured so that students are evaluated and rewarded as individuals, not as members of the group. Students seek each other's information but have no motivation to teach what they know to group mates. In this type of learning group, some students seek a free ride on the efforts of group-mates, who feel exploited and do less. The result is that the sum of the whole is more than the potential of some of the members, but the more hard working and conscientious students would perform higher if they worked alone (Johnson and Johnson, 1999:68).

Unlike traditional classroom learning group, in cooperative learning group, students work together to accomplish shared goals. In this type of learning group, students seek outcomes that are beneficial to all, and they discuss material with each other, help one another understand it and encourage each other to work hard (Johnson and Johnson, 1999:68). Johnson and Johnson also suggest that in cooperative learning, individual

performance is checked regularly to ensure that all students are contributing and learning. In addition, the result is that the group is more than a sum of its parts, and all students perform higher academically than they would if they worked alone (Johnson and Johnson, 1999:68).

2.5 Cooperation versus Competition versus Individualization

According to Deutsch(1949, cited in Li and Lam, 2013:5), the effort of a student to reach his/her goal has a supportive effect in the cooperative case, an obstructive effect in the competitive case, and a neutral effect in the individualistic case on the other students. Deutsch identified three windows through which students can view their peers__ individual, competitive and cooperative. As Deutsch, students can compete to see who is “best”. They work individually toward a goal without paying attention to other students, or they can work cooperatively with a vested interest in each other’s learning as well as their own.

As Johnson and Johnson(1991, as cited in Li and Lam, 2013:6), cooperation, from the three interaction patterns above, is a learning group in which students celebrate each other’s success, encourage each other to do homework, and learn to work together regardless of ethnic backgrounds or whether they are male or female, bright or struggling, disabled or not. Researches on cooperative efforts clearly indicate that cooperation, compared with competitive and individualistic efforts, typically results in higher achievement and productivity, more caring supportive, and committed relationships, and greater psychological health, social competence, and self-esteem (Li and Lam, 2013:6).

In contrary to cooperative situations, competitive situations are ones in which students work against each other to achieve a goal that only one or a few can attain. In competition, there is a negative interdependence among goal achievements; students perceive that they can attain their goals if and only if the other students in in the class fail to attain their goals (Deutsch, 1962; Johnson and Johnson, 1989, cited in Li and Lam, 2013:6).

In competitive efforts, norm-referenced evaluation of achievement occurs and the result is that students either work hard to do better than their classmates, or they take it easy because they do not believe they have to win (Deutsch, 1962; Johnson and Johnson, 1989,

cited in Li and Lam, 2013:7). On the other hand, in individualistic situations, students work alone to accomplish goals unrelated to those of classmates and are evaluated on a criterion-referenced basis. Students' goal achievements are independent. Consequently, students perceive that the achievement of their learning goals is unrelated to what other students do, and the result is to focus on self-interest and personal success by ignoring the success and failures of others as irrelevant (Johnson and Johnson, 1989, cited in Li and Lam, 2013:7).

Generally, apart from cooperative efforts on the learning of students, a highly individualistic and competitive environment may lead to an inability to get along or manage conflicts constructively. Therefore, cooperation, compared to competition and individualization, has positive effects on so many important outcomes and is made one of the most valuable tools educators have.

2.6 Some Considerations for the Success of Cooperative Learning

Johnson and Johnson (1990, as cited in Gullies, 2016:40) suggest that placing students in groups and expecting them to work together may not necessarily promote cooperation. In pseudo learning group, for example, students are assigned to work together but they have no interest in doing so and believe they will be evaluated by being ranked from the highest to the lowest performer (Johnson and Johnson, 1999:68). Johnson and Johnson also added that in such type of learning group, students hide information from each other, attempt to mislead, confuse and distrust each other. The following requirements or issues stand in need of the success of cooperative learning.

2.6.1 Composition of the Group and its Size

Composition of the group and its size is the main issue to be considered to make cooperative learning (CL) work. According to Joe (ND), it is recommended that the teacher should intentionally or purposefully decide on who works with whom, using either homogeneous or heterogeneous group formation strategies (p.4).

Heterogeneous group formation, as suggested by Joe (ND), is an effective strategy in which students are placed in learning teams with others who are different or diverse with respect to certain educationally meaningful characteristics. To Joe, teams may be deliberately formed to maximize heterogeneity and diversity of perspectives by grouping

students of different (a) gender, (b) racial, ethnic, or cultural background, (c) age, (d) levels of prior academic achievement, (d) learning style, and so on.

Furthermore, Joe (ND) points out that forming heterogeneous learning groups in which students experience diverse perspectives and different cognitive styles would be effective for promoting critical thinking and appreciation of diversity (p.4).

The study by Lou, Abrami, Spencer, Paulsen, Chambers, and d'Apollonia(1996, as cited in Gillies, 2016:42) on the effects of establishing small groups in classes on student achievement at elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels demonstrated that students achieved higher outcomes when they worked in small cooperative groups than when they were not grouped, such as in traditional whole class settings. The study also showed that students worked better and achieved more when they worked in groups of 3 to 4 members than in groups of 5 to 7 members, possibly because the latter arrangement was closer to whole class teaching where information was transmitted rather than constructed (Lou et al., 1996, cited in Gillies, 2016:42).

Advocates of cooperative learning agree that groups should be kept relatively small. Some recommend groups of 3 to 4 members, saying it is better for students' achievement (Lou, Abrami and d'Apollonia, 2001; Caulfield and Percel, 2006, cited in Enu, Asominuwa and Obeng, 2015:59), while others recommend 3 to 5(Oakley et al. , 2004, cited in Enu, Asominuwa & Obeng, 2015:59). Kagan(1993, cited in Enu et al. , 2015) points out that group sizes of 4 to 5 are best for small group CL. Kagan also asserted that the numbers of learners in group will determine the number of lines of communication in the group.

Moreover, most practitioners use small learning groups ranging in size from 3 to 4 students to ensure closer proximity among group members, enabling them to work “knee to knee” with more face to face interactions. Such physical proximity and eye contact are likely to lead to a heightened sense of intimacy among group members and a feeling of greater personal responsibility to teammates (Joe, (ND), and p.5). According to Joe (ND), another factor to consider when making decisions about group size is whether the total number of group members should be odd or even. As suggested by Joe, some practitioners of CL argue that an even number of group members provides greater

flexibility for creating equal-sized sub-groups within a team and for allowing teammates to work in pairs (p. 5)

2.6.2 The Structure of the Elements of Cooperative Learning

Johnson and Johnson (2009, cited in Gillies, 2016:41) propose that groups need to be established so that the five key elements or components of successful cooperative learning are established in their structure. These elements of CL are described below.

A) Positive Interdependence

Successful cooperative learning involves structuring positive interdependence within the learning situation so all group members understand that they are linked together in such a way that one cannot achieve success unless they all do, and they must learn to synchronize their efforts to ensure this occurs (Johnson and Johnson, 2009, cited in Gillies, 2016:41).

According to Deutsch (1949, cited in Gillies, 2016:41), positive interdependence is established in groups when students understand that they are each responsible for a part of the task which, in turn, all must achieve in order for the group to complete its goal. In the process, students must be responsible for their own learning and for the success of other group members' learning (Slavin, 2011, cited in Tran, 2013:102). In other words, students must ensure that other members in their group complete the tasks and achieve the academic outcomes.

B) Face-to- face Promotive Interaction

Face to face promotive interaction occurs as individuals encourage and facilitate other's efforts to accomplish the group's goals. In CL groups, students are required to interact verbally with one another on learning tasks, exchange opinions, explain things, teach others and present their understanding (Johnson and Johnson, 2008; Ballantine and Larres, 2007, as cited in Tran, 2013:102).

According to Johnson and Johnson (1989) and Slavin (2011) as cited in Tran(2013, the quality of interaction depends on the group size, frequency of students' cooperation on their learning, the academic level of all members in the group, and learning environment in which students in cooperative group work and learn together effectively.

Johnson and Johnson (1990), cited in Gillies (2016:41) noted that promotive interaction is characterized by students providing each other with the help they need, sharing needed resources, providing effective feedback to group members on their performances on specific tasks, challenging other's conclusions and reasoning in order to promote clearer insights into the problematic issue, and working together constructively to attain mutual goals.

In conclusion, promotive interaction or the willingness of group members to encourage and facilitate each other's efforts to complete their tasks and achieve their goal is the key component for successful cooperation. In the same manner, the willingness to cooperate with others not only benefits recipients but also helpers as giving help encourages helpers to recognize and restructure the information in their own minds. So, they, in turn, develop clearer and more elaborate cognitive understanding than they held previously (Webb and Mastergeorge, 2003, as cited in Gillies, 2016:41).

C) Individual Accountability

Individual accountability or one's responsibility in ensuring that he or she completes his or her share of the work while also ensuring that others complete theirs is another key component for successful cooperation (Johnson and Johnson, 1990, as cited in Gillies, 2016:41). Johnson and Johnson (2008, as cited in Gillies, 2016:41) suggest that positive interdependence is recognized to create "responsibility forces" that increase the individual accountability of group members for accomplishing shared work and facilitating other group member's work. As Johnson and Johnson, individual accountability is concerned as the degree to which the achievement of the group is dependent on the individual learning of all group members. This shows that the achievement of the group depends on the individual learning of each group member, then group members are motivated to ensure that all group members master the material being studied. On the other hand, if there is no individual accountability, one or two group members do all the work while others do nothing (Slavin, 1996, as cited in Giliies, 2916:41).

Furthermore, Johnson and Johnson (2008, cited in Gillies, 2016:41) state that when group accountability and individual accountability exist in the group, the responsibility forces increase. To Johnson and Johnson, group accountability exists when the overall performance of the group is assessed and the results are given back to all group members.

On the other hand, individual accountability exists when the performance of each individual member is assessed and the result is given back to the individual. Consequently, group member is held responsible for contributing his or her fair share to group's success.

D) Interpersonal and Social Skills

It is the view of Johnson and Johnson (2006, as cited in Tran, 2013:103) that students cannot work effectively if socially unskilled students are arranged into one group. In addition, if basic learning skills on cooperative interaction are not taught, group members cannot work together effectively to finish their tasks (Sharan, 1990, cited in Tran, 2013:103).

As suggested by Ballantine and Larres (2007, cited in Tran, 2013:103), cooperative learning requires students to engage in learning tasks and work together. Therefore, interpersonal and social skills, such as listening attentively to each other, questioning cooperatively, negotiating respectfully, commenting constructively on other's ideas, accepting responsibility for one's behavior, making decision democratically, and sharing ideas and resources are essentially important to help students work together cooperatively in groups (Gillies, 2016:42).

According to Johnson and Johnson (2009, cited in Gillies, 2016:42), students need to be taught social skills needed for high quality cooperation and they must be motivated to use them if they are to facilitate learning in themselves and others. Furthermore, as Johnson and Johnson, providing students with feedback on how they use these skills not only help to create more positive relationships among group members, but it also helps to increase students' achievement.

Eventually, in a series of studies that investigated the effects of structured and unstructured cooperative groups on students' behaviors and interactions, Gillies (2003b, 2004, 2006, 2008) and Gillies and Sharan (1996, 1998) as cited in Gillies (2016:41) have consistently found that students who were trained to cooperate and help each other are more inclusive of others; respectful and considerate of other's contributions; and provide more detailed explanations to assist each other's learning than students who have not participated in this training.

E) Group Processing

In successful cooperative learning, group processing involves students reflecting on their progress and their working relationships. Therefore, group processing is defined as reflecting on a group session to help students: (1) describe what member actions were helpful and not helpful; and (2) make decisions about what actions to continue or change (Johnson et al., 1994:33, cited in Tran, 2013:104).

Yamaric (2007, cited in Tran, 2013:104) claims that group processing helps to improve the effectiveness of the members in contributing to the shared efforts to achieve the group's goals via reflection on the learning process; examine the group's tasks and give students feedback on their participation; examine students' knowledge on their own learning parts; and to enable cooperative groups to maintain good relationships among group members.

2.6.3 Teacher as a Facilitator

In a cooperative learning class, teachers are facilitators who should guide their learners on how best to achieve educational objectives (Zhang, 2010, as cited in West East Institute [WEI], 2014). Moreover, Johnson and Johnson (1999) Gillies (2003a, b, and Johnson and Johnson (1990, cited in Gillies, 2016:41) make lists of the following teacher's roles in cooperative learning classes:

- Specifying the objectives for the lesson and deciding on the size of the group and strategies
- Specifying the positive interdependence and individual accountability
- Giving the criteria for success
- Explaining the social skills to be used
- Monitoring students' learning
- Intervening within the groups to provide task assistance in completing the task accurately and in working together effectively
- Assessing students' learning carefully and evaluating their performance
- Facilitating interaction in groups when they ensure students sit in close proximity to other group members so they can hear what is being discussed, see each other's faces, and participate in the group discussion

2.6.4 Assignment of Complementary Roles for Learners

Independent or complementary roles are assumed by each member of the group. True team work is much more likely to occur when there are independent responsibilities performed by group members because each member has a unique and indispensable contribution to make during the learning process (Joe, (ND), and p.5). In this fashion, as suggested by Joe, each group member feels that he/she is an integral part of a team and is responsible for successful completion of the team task. To him, performance of different roles serves to “stretch” the student to learn new skills and encourages the development of skills that, otherwise, might never be exercised. As suggested by Joe, some students, for example, may never opt or choose to speak publicly in class unless they are required to assume the role of “spokesperson.” In such cases, it may be necessary for the teacher to assign specific roles to students rather than allowing them to self-select roles so as to ensure that students diversify their contributions to group work and develop a wide range of team work skills. Similarly, ensuring that each student in the learning group has an explicit and well differentiated role or responsibility to play throughout the learning process is an effective way to increase individual accountability. Moreover, complementary roles enhance positive interdependence and collective responsibility among teammates. In this regard, assumption of complementary roles encourages students to develop responsibility for themselves and for others (Joe, (ND), PP. 5-7).

As stated by Jacob (2006, cited in West East Institute (WEI), 2014), there are five roles which EFL learners have to perform during a cooperative learning activity. These roles are: (a) *facilitator* – who coordinates the group’s work; (b) *recorder* – who records what the group has accomplished; (c) *reporter* – who tells others about the group’s work; (d) *time keeper* - who helps the group be aware of time constraints, keeps the groups on tasks and fills in for missing group members; (e) *Observer* - who checks if group members are using a particular collaborative skill deemed important to the groups interaction (West East Institute [WEI], 2014:96).

2.6.5 Individual and Group Assessment

In successful cooperative learning, EFL students’ performance should be assessed to be able to judge the effectiveness of the applied cooperative learning method. Johnson and Johnson (1999:2, cited in West East Institute 2014:96) define *assessment* as “to judge the

quality and quantity of learning and award grades.” *Assessment* helps to achieve the purposes like diagnosing students’ present level of knowledge and skills; and monitoring students’ progress toward learning goals to help form the instructional program and provide data to judge the final level of students’ learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1999:2, as cited in West East Institute, 2014:96).

2.7 Cooperative learning Methods to be used in the EFL classroom

There are several cooperative learning methods to be applied in the EFL classroom to encourage learners to work together, share their ideas, and help each other. Each cooperative learning method has its own characteristics and applicability to different English language teaching (ELT) areas (Slavin, 1995, cited in West East Institute [WEI], 2014:94). Slavin also suggests that EFL teachers choose the appropriate cooperative learning method to apply it in their classroom to get the most out of it.

The various cooperative learning methods that have been developed over the years by different scholars and put into actual practice in the classroom are described below.

2.7.1 Jigsaw, Jigsaw II and Reverse Jigsaw

In Jigsaw learning technique, students are members of two groups: home group and expert group. In the heterogeneous home group, students are each assigned a different topic. Once a topic has been identified, students leave the home group, and group with the other students with their assigned topic. In the new group, students learn the material together before returning to their home group. Once back in their home group, each student is accountable for teaching his/her assigned topic (Schul, 2011, as cited in “*cooperative learning*” (ND)).

Jigsaw II is Robert Slavin’s (1980) Variation of Jigsaw in which members of the home group are assigned the same material, but focus on separate portion of the material. Each member must become an “expert” on his/her assigned portion and teach the other members of the home group (Schul, 2011, as cited in “*cooperative learning*”, (ND)).

Reverse Jigsaw was created by Timothy Hedeem and it differs from the original Jigsaw during the teaching portion of the activity (Hedeem, 2003, cited in “*cooperative learning*”, (ND)). In the Reverse Jigsaw technique, as suggested by Hedeem, students in the expert

groups teach the whole class rather than returning to their home groups to teach the content.

2.7.2 Think – pair – share

Think-pair-share was originally developed by Frank T. Lyman and it allows for students to contemplate a posed question or problem silently (Lyman, 1981, as cited in “*cooperative learning*”, (ND)). As Lyman suggested, student may write down thoughts or simply just brainstorm in his or her head. When prompted, the student pairs up with a peer and discusses his/her ideals and then listens to the ideas of his/her partner. Following pair dialogue, the teacher solicits responses from the whole group (Schul, 2011, cited in “*cooperative learning*”, (ND)). As Schul, when teachers use this technique, they don’t have to worry about student not volunteering because each student already had an idea in their heads. Therefore, the teacher can call on any one and increase discussion productivity.

Generally, after suggesting that ‘Think-pair-share’ method could encourage students to communicate with others using the target language and develop thinking skill, Lyman (1981, cited in West East Institute [WEI], 2014) points out the following steps in think-pair-share” method of cooperative learning:

1. The teacher poses a discussion topic or an open-ended question;
2. The teacher gives students the “think-time” to think on their own;
3. After thing, student work in pairs to share their ideas with each other; and
4. Students share their responses with other partners or with the rest of the class (WEI, 2014:95).

2.7.3 Round Table

Round table can be used for brainstorming, reviewing, or practicing. In this method, each group member has a designated turn to participate and make a written contribution to the group’s project (Kagan, 1994, as cited in West East Institute [WEI], 2014:94). As Kagan, ‘round table’ consists of the following steps:

1. The teacher asks a question which has multiple answers, then each student writes a response or a portion of response

2. After writing their response, students pass the paper to the next person.
3. Round table can be down with one piece of paper per group or with one piece of paper per group members.
4. Finally, one group member may be asked to share with the whole lass what their

group has written down (Kagan, 1994, cited in WEI, 2014:94).

2.7.4 Inside-Outside Circle (IOC)

According to Gayle and Lin (2005, cited in “*cooperative learning*”, (ND)), ‘Inside-outside circle’ is a cooperative learning strategy in which students form two concentric circles and take tums on rotation to face new partners to answer or discuss the teacher’s questions. Gayle and Lin also suggest that the ‘Inside-outside circle’ method can be used to gather variety of information, generate new ideas and solve problems.

2.7.5 Student – Team – Achievement Division (STAD)

Kevin and Rosemany (2009) as cited in “*Cooperative learning*” (ND) state that in Student Team – Achievement Division method, students are placed in small groups (or team), and the class in its entirety is presented with a lesson and students are subsequently tested. According to Kevin and Rosemary, tests are taken individually and individuals are graded on the team’s performance though students are encouraged to work together to improve the overall performance of the group.

According to Slavin (1995, cited Li and Lam, 2013:15), STAD consists of the following steps:

1. The whole class presentation of materials by the teacher;
2. Group discussion-in which heterogeneous teams are formed to study the materials and do the activities together.
3. All students take individual test or quiz, which may be in the form of multiple-choice questions
4. Group recognition-is the step at which team scores are formed, and the group with the highest average group improvement score receives a group a ward (p.15).

2.7.6 Teams-Games – Tournament (TGT)

Teams- Games Tournament method uses the teacher’s presentation, team work, and tournament game (Li and Lam, 2013:17). According to Li and Lam (2013:17), students are placed into small groups to study and prepare for a trivia game (tournament game). This gives students incentive to learn and have some fun of learning the material.

2.7.7 Reciprocal Teaching

Brown and Paliscar (1982) developed reciprocal teaching which allows for students to participate in a dialogue about text. In reciprocal teaching method, as suggested by Brown and Paliscar, partners take turns reading and asking questions of each other, receiving immediate feedback. In addition, such a method allows for students to use important Meta-cognitive techniques such as clarifying, questioning, predicting and summarizing. Moreover, reciprocal teaching embraces the idea that students can effectively learn from each other (Brown and Paliscar, 1982, cited in “*cooperative learning*”, (ND)).

2.7.8 Learning Together

The learning together method of cooperative learning is characterized by the five elements of cooperative learning: positive interdependence, individual and group accountability, face-to-face promotive interaction, interpersonal and social skills, and group processing (Johnson and Johnson, 1998, cited in Li and Lam, 2013:24). This method, as Johnson and Johnson, emphasizes team-building activities before students begin working together and regular discussions with in groups about how well they are working together. Afterwards, in the model, students work on assignments sheet, etc. being in four or five members of heterogeneous groups, and receive praise or rewards based on the group product (Li and Lam, 2013:25).

2.7.9 Group Investigation

Group investigation method was developed by Shlomo Sharan and Yael Sharan in 1992 and it is a general classroom Organization plan in which students work in small groups using cooperative inquiry, group discussion and cooperative planning and projects (Sharan and Sharan, 1994, as cited in Li and Lam, 2013:26).

Moreover, group investigation method is said to be one of the most student-centered methods as students have much freedom to choose their topics of interest for investigation, plan and carry it out, present and evaluate the results. Similarly, as group investigation is most suited for investigating problems which can have different solutions, it helps to develop students' higher order thinking skills. In this regard, group investigation is often used in doing group projects in various key learning areas.

Eventually, according to Sharan and Sharan (1994, cited in Li and Lam, 2013), the implementation of group investigation has the following six stages:

1. Determining sub-topics and organizing students into groups
2. Planning investigation
3. Carrying out investigation
4. Planning a presentation
5. Giving a presentation
6. Evaluating achievement (p.26).

The following table presents the various cooperative learning models, their history, developers and possible primary application in the EFL classroom

Table 2.1: Modern Methods of cooperative learning

Research developer	Date	Method	EFL/ESL primary application
Johnson & Johnson	Mid 1970s	Learning Together	Reading, writing, speaking, culture
Devries & Edward	Early 1970	Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT)	Language rules and mechanics
Sharan & Sharan	Mid 1970s	Group Investigation	Writing, culture
Johnson & Johnson	Late 1970s	Constructive controversy (CC)	Culture
Aronson, Blaney, sikes, Stephen and Stephan; slavin	Late 1970s	Jigsaw procedure	Reading, literature
Slavin	Late 1970s	Student Teams-Achievement-Division (STAD)	Language Rules and Mechanics
Cohen	Early 1980s	Complex Instruction (CI)	Social skills, culture, reading, writing, language Rules and mechanics

Lyman	Early 1981	Think – pair – share	Aural communication develop thinking skills
Slavin, Leavey, and Madden	Mid 1980s	Team- Accelerated Instruction (TAI)	None
Kagan	Mid 1980s	Cooperative learning structures	Speaking, listening, Reading, writing
Stevens, madden, Slavin, & Franish	Mid 1980s	Curriculum packages: cooperative Integrated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading and Composition - Reading, writing, spelling, vocabulary, literature

Adopted from Johnson, Johnson and Sstanne (2000, cited in the West East Institute [WEI], 2014:95).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides information about the design of the study, description of the study area, population of the study, sample and sampling techniques, data collection instruments (questionnaire, classroom observation and interview), the pilot study, reliability and validity for the pilot study, triangulation, data collection procedures, method of data collection and interpretation, and research ethics.

3.1 Research Design

As indicated in the previous chapters, the aim of this study was to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning in EFL classes. Teacher's classroom practices of cooperative learning, students' engagement in cooperative learning activities and classroom organization during the practices of cooperative learning were the major points of focus.

The research design is the researcher's plan for the study, which includes the method to be used, what data will be gathered, where, how and from whom (Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen, 2010:32). The research methods we use say something about our views on what qualifies as valuable knowledge and our perspective on the nature reality (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992, as cited in Ary, Jacobs & Sorensen, 2010: 419).

The research design fitted into the descriptive paradigm involving a mixed methodology- both quantitative and qualitative. Descriptive research design was chosen as it helps to describe what the current situation of the subjects of the study is, and as descriptive design uses systematic procedures to discover the relationship between the existing variables (Cohen and Manon, 1994). In this study, both quantitative and qualitative approach (mixed approach) was used. It was believed that this approach was appropriate in order to achieve the research objectives and to answer the research questions posed. In this regard, quantitative method was used for the data collected via questionnaire in which numerical data was collected while qualitative method was used for the data collected through interview and classroom observation.

3.2 Description of the Study Area

Enango and Dongoro junior secondary schools are the areas of the study. These two schools are found in Lalo Assabi District west Wollega Zone. Gimbi is the town of west Wollega Zone which is situated at 440km from the capital city of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa. The study areas (Enango and Dongoro high schools) are located at 23km from Gimbi town to the west.

3.3 Population of the Study

The general objective of the study was to investigate factors affecting the practices cooperative learning in EFL classes. To achieve this objective, grade 9 students and English language teachers of Enango and Dongoro high schools were taken as population of the study. There were 12 grade 9 sections in the schools and the total number of grade 9 students of the two schools were 840. There were 10 EFL teachers teaching in grade 9 in Enango and Dongoro high schools.

3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques

The researcher intended to select the sample that would represent the entire population of the study. There were 10 EFL teachers teaching in grade 9 in the schools. All the EFL teachers of the two schools were selected by using purposive/ comprehensive sampling technique. The rationale behind this is that the EFL teachers were considered to be rich source of data, and to provide maximum insight and understanding of what the researcher is studying.

In addition to EFL teachers of the schools, grade 9 students were also taken as the other source of data to obtain information pertaining to the practices of cooperative language learning in EFL classrooms. From all the 840 students, 210 (25%) students were selected as sample by using simple random sampling, lottery technique. The rationale behind is that in simple random sampling technique, all members of the population have an equal and independent chance of being included in the sample (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007:110). Totally, 220 participants (210 students and 10 EFL teachers) participated in the present study.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

Investigating factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning is the general objective of this study. To achieve this objective, the following data collection instruments were used.

3.5.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting information, providing structured, often numerical data (Wilson and McLean, 1994, cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007:317). The researcher adapted the questionnaire and prepared it for students. The questionnaire was adapted from Furtwangler (1992); Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998) and Muhammed (2012).

The questionnaire for students consists of 28 items. The items were composed of Likert type closed-ended and structured questions. Therefore, the basic variables were itemized in a Likert scale with five options (prescribed range of responses) ranging as “Strongly agree” (SA), “Agree” (A), “Undecided” (U), “Disagree” (D) and “Strongly disagree” (SD). The Likert type items were given numerical scores. For example, strongly agree =5, agree =4, undecided =3, disagree =2, and strongly disagree =1. Closed-ended questions are useful in that they can generate frequencies of response amenable to statistical treatment and analysis (Oppenheim, 1992, cited in Cohen, Mannion and Morrison, 2007:321). In addition, closed questions are quicker to code up and analyze (Bailey, 1994, cited in Cohen. et al., 2007:321).

3.5.2 Classroom Observation

In conducting the study, classroom observation was made to see the actual classroom practices of cooperative learning in EFL classes. As suggested by Ary, Jacobs and Sorensen (2010:415), observation offers an investigator the opportunity to gather *live* data from naturally social situations. In this way, the researcher can look directly what is taking place in *situ* (in the original or correct place) rather than relying on second-hand accounts.

In conducting classroom Observation, structured observation was made because the researcher pre-determined what to look for in class context. The classroom observation was made based on a check list adapted from Furtwangler (1992), which focused on

teacher's roles in classroom instructional practices, students' engagement in cooperative learning activities and classroom organization for enhancing cooperative learning. The check list for the classroom observation was verified by the respective advisor and put into effect after the approval.

3.5.3 Interview

In addition to questionnaire and classroom Observation, data was also gathered through interview. The rationale behind is that interview enables more to be said about the problem of the study being investigated (Oppenheim, 1992, cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007). Moreover, if the researcher does his job well (establishes rapport, asks questions in an acceptable manner, etc.), and if the respondent is sincere and well-motivated, accurate data can be obtained through interview (Kitwood, 1977, cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007: 349). To obtain a greater depth of information, free and flexible responses which were not possible through questionnaire and classroom observation, semi-structured interview that consisted of 6 open-ended questions was conducted with EFL teachers teaching in grade 9. For its validity, the interview items were given to three EFL teachers (who were not included in the main study) and the advisor for their comments for its verification.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

This section offers explanations about the procedures followed in collecting data for the study. It presents the way by which data was collected using the three data collection instruments: questionnaire, classroom observation and interview.

Questionnaire was the first data collection instrument used in this study. Collecting data using questionnaire was carried out in June, 2017. Distributing the questionnaire started immediately after the permission for entering the schools was obtained from the schools' principals as of 6th and 7th June, 2017. The director and/or vice director assisted the researcher to contact the department heads so that they would facilitate the ways to contact EFL teachers and administer the questionnaire. All the head teachers and EFL teachers were helpful, supportive and cooperative in support of the researcher.

The researcher described about the purpose of the study and the procedures related to the questionnaire for the participants. As such, for students' questionnaire, attempts have

been made to make the questionnaire clear and make each item easily understood by the students based on the comments provided by the advisor and colleagues. The questionnaire was translated into Afan Oromo language for making it easily understood by the students. The items were designed in line with the literature review, and they were developed primarily to meet the objectives of the study. After the constructive comments from the advisor and the colleagues on the validity of the items, the researcher made the necessary modification for the items in need of modification. To correct unclear and misleading questions, and to develop appropriate instrument for the main study, in 4th week of May, 2017, the researcher administered a pilot study to 50 students (at the same school and grade level), but these students were not included in the main study. Then, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was checked using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the calculated Cronback alpha revealed an acceptable reliability of 0.73.

After verification of the questionnaire, the researcher met the student participants and made a general explanation about the purpose of the study and the way they should respond their answers to the questions. Finally, the questionnaires were distributed to 210 students in the presence of the researcher in the schools' compound. All the 210 copies of the questionnaires were returned back completed.

The participants for the classroom observation were selected based on their willingness to be observed while formal classroom was going on. Classroom observations were conducted during the 9th June to 17th June, 2017. Six classroom observations were made. The researcher took field notes with tick descriptions and used video recorder during the observations. The researcher asked the participants for their permission to audio/video record the lesson for the purpose of data transcription and data analysis. However, three of the participants were not volunteers for Video record of the lesson though they were willing to be observed. Generally, six EFL teachers were observed. With each period lasting for 40 minutes, this came to a total of 240 minutes or four (4) hours of observation time spread across the six classrooms.

The interview was conducted after the classroom observation. The interview comprised of semi-structured questions that consisted of a series of pre-planned open-ended questions and that provided opportunities for the interviewer and the interviewees to delve (probe or search) into same topics in more detail based on the issue under investigation. The

researcher conducted interviews with three (3) EFL teachers who were selected based on their interest to be interviewed. The number of participants for the interviews was limited to three (3) to avoid redundancy of information. The interview took place at a mutually agreed-upon location and outside of the instructional time (when the teachers were free from classes). The interviewees were asked for permission to video/audio record of the interviews for the purpose of data transcription and data analysis, and recorded accordingly.

3.7 The pilot study

Piloting is concerned with assessing (testing) the quality of the instruments in order to revise and improve them before they are used with the subjects (participants) in the main study (Dawson, 2002:95). In this study, the very purpose of the pilot study, therefore, is to assess and confirm the practicability of the research instruments (questionnaire, classroom observation and interview) to investigate the problem under consideration.

To recruit respondents for the questionnaire, the researcher visited Enango High school and obtained permission for the pilot study from the school principal. The researcher then met grade 9 students of the school, explained them the aim of the pilot study and the procedures related to the questionnaire for the pilot study. In this way, 50 students were recruited randomly (but they were not included in the main study). The questionnaire items were composed of closed and structured items that consisted of 28 items in which a Likert-scale with range of responses were prescribed. The pilot testing of the questionnaire was conducted during 29th to 30th May, 2017. The questionnaire was completed by grade 9 students of the school. It took two days to distribute and get back the questionnaire copies in the school. The researcher facilitated the distribution and collection of the copies of the questionnaire by himself.

3.8 Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data gathered through questionnaire, classroom observations and interviews were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively in order of their time of collection. As such, frequency, percentage, and mean scores were used to analyze the quantitative data. On the other hand, information generated from interview and classroom observation was described qualitatively and analyzed using protocols of content analysis.

The data analysis procedures consisted of Likert-type items analysis for all specific objectives of the study and research questions. Likert assigned numerical values to responses and the numerical representation (the coding) of the items went through ‘Strongly agree’ = 5; ‘Agree’ = (4), ‘Undecided’ = 3; ‘Disagree’ = 2; and ‘Strongly disagree’ = 1 (Toylor (1973), as cited in Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007:326).

To analyze the responses of questionnaire, the raw data entered into computer to be analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). The tables were presented before the analysis and interpretation. After that, the data was first presented in frequency, percentage, and the mean was calculated. Finally, based on the percentage and mean value, each item was presented, analyzed and interpreted. Thus, the higher mean value are meant to indicate greater practice, and lower mean value indicates lower practice towards the item. To make the discussion easier, the items of the responses were categorized into three sub-parts based on the specific objectives of the study. They are:

- Questions on classroom conditions and organization for the practice of cooperative language learning;
- Questions on roles of the teacher in classroom practices of cooperative learning, and
- Questions related to the students’ engagement in cooperative learning activities in EFL classes.

3.9 Reliability and Validity

Research instruments play a significant role in determining the quality of research in which the strengths and weaknesses of a research are assessed. Therefore, research instruments have to be of the desired quality in order to achieve the intended objective and assume quality research (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007:133). If instruments need to meet the desired quality, as suggested by Cohen, Manion and Morrison, they have to fulfill the attributes associated to quality research instruments – reliability and validity.

In order to check the reliability (the overall internal consistency) of the questionnaire, Cronbach alpha Coefficient was calculated. Based on the data gathered, the average reliability which was computed using split- half method was found to be 0.73. The table below shows the calculated alpha coefficient value of the instrument reliability.

Table 3.1 Alpha Coefficient of Instrument Reliability

No.	Domains	P – value
1	Items related to Classroom arrangement, group composition and aiding materials	0.69
2	Items related to teacher’s classroom practice and management	0.71
3	Items related to learners’ roles in CL practices	0.79
	Average	0.73

To maintain the validity of the research instruments, the items in the research instruments were prepared by adapting questions or statements used by other scholars on similar topic and reflecting the literature in a way that they would meet the intended objectives of the study. Then, the instruments were submitted to three MA degree holders in TEFL for the depth, richness, dependability, content, and internal validity of the instruments. Those EFL teachers were asked to review and judge the questions or statements in the questionnaire and to determine if they adequately sampled the domain of interest. Finally, the tools were approved by the advisor and were put into effect.

3.10 Triangulation

Triangulation is the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspects of human behavior (Lin, 1976, cited in Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007:141). Therefore, triangulation is characterized by a multi-method approach to a problem in contrast to a single method approach. The study used mixed approach (quantitative and qualitative approach). Triangulation, in the present study, was employed using data collection instruments which are questionnaire, classroom observation and interview. The results obtained through quantitative data were cross-checked with the results obtained via qualitative data. As a result, the disadvantages of each particular data collection tool in the study are overcome by data triangulation.

3.11 Research Ethics

In conducting the research, the researcher treated both the participants and the information they provided with honesty and respect. He did his best to ensure anonymity and confidentiality about the research participants and he confirmed that the information being provided is only for research purpose. The researcher was also open and honest

about his name, job, place of work, and the formation about the research (subject and purpose). Finally, the researcher guaranteed that he will not use any names and addresses in the final report, or store or categorize information using names and addresses. He thanked the participants in advance for their cooperation.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In order to achieve the objectives of the study and seek answers to the research questions, the data were gathered through data collection instruments. The findings of this study, therefore, were guided by the data obtained through questionnaire, classroom observation and interview. This chapter consists of the study variables followed by the presentation of the statistical results obtained with illustrated tables and analysis of the results obtained through questionnaire for students, classroom observation and interview.

4.1 Analysis of Data on Group Size, Classroom Arrangement and Aiding Materials

The presentation and analysis of the data in the following sections is based on the theme generated with reference to the research questions. These sections present and analyze students' responses, classroom observation results, and EFL teachers' interview results to the statements that deal with group size /composition, classroom arrangement and aiding materials or resources for the practices of CL activities

4.1.1 Data from Students' Questionnaire

This section presents information about the students' responses to the statements related to group size or composition, room arrangement, and aiding materials. The analysis of the students' responses to the statements was made using descriptive method. Therefore, the results obtained from student's responses with reference to group size, room arrangement and aiding materials for the practices of cooperative learning were discussed referring to table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Students' Responses on Group size, Classroom Arrangement and Aiding Materials

Scale value			SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	Mean
Items	Statements		5	4	3	2	1		
1	The group matches the cooperative learning model that the teacher uses	fr	11	32	2	131	3	210	2.31
		%	5.24	15.24	0.95	62.38	16.19	100	
2	The group size is appropriate to the assigned task	fr	18	31	3	123	35	210	2.40
		%	8.57	14.76	1.43	58.57	16.67	100	
3	The group composition is heterogeneous	fr	28	139	-	38	5	210	3.70
		%	13.33	66.19	-	18.10	2.38	100	
4	Desks and chairs are arranged so that all group members can see and hear one another	fr	7	20	2	114	67	210	1.98
		%	3.33	9.52	0.96	54.29	31.90	100	
5	There is adequate space for each group	Fr	10	19	2	122	57	210	2.06
		%	4.76	9.05	0.95	58.10	27.14	100	
6	The aiding materials are available to promote cooperative learning activities.	fr	8	20	-	118	64	210	2.00
		%	3.81	9.52	-	56.19	30.8	100	

Key: SA= strongly agree; A=Agree; U=Undecided; D=Disagree; SD= strongly disagree

Table 4.1 above depicts students' agreement on the heterogeneity of group composition. For example, majority (79.52%) of the student respondents agreed that group composition is heterogeneous. However, some portion (20.48%) of the respondents showed their disagreement to the statement implying that they did not support or side with the heterogeneity of group composition. It is indicated that the mean value of the statement (item 3) is found to be 3.70. This shows that greater number of the respondents assented that group composition for cooperative learning is heterogeneous (see item 3).

Regarding the statements that were designed to explore the students' opinion about the group size, classroom arrangement and availability of aiding materials to facilitate cooperative learning activities, majority of the respondents expressed their disagreement to the statements (see items 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6). It is indicated that the mean values of the statements are found to be between 2 and 2.4. The average percentage of the respondents showing disagreement to the items 1,2,4,5, & 6 is 82.38%. This indicates that they were not in support of the appropriateness and suitability of group size for the practices of

cooperative learning activities, classroom setting and space, and availability of aiding materials for enhancing cooperative learning activities. The implication is that the group size does not fit/match the cooperative learning model or technique to be used by the teacher and is not appropriate to the assigned cooperative learning tasks. In addition, desks and chairs for students to work together cooperatively are not arranged in such a way that students can see and hear one another during the practices of cooperative learning activities.

However, some portion (16.76%) of the respondents expressed their agreement to the statements related to group size, classroom arrangement and aiding materials for the practices of cooperative learning activities.

The remaining 0.86% remained uncertain to decide whether to agree or disagree to the statements. As indicated above, it was found that majority (82.38%) of the student respondents with an aggregate mean value of 2.41 did not assent or were not in support of the statements dealing with group size, classroom arrangement and aiding materials, except heterogeneity of group composition (see table 4.1). Accordingly, the overall result obtained through student questionnaire, teacher interview and classroom observation does not go in line with literature as indicated by piaget (2008, as cited in Nsamenang and Tchombe, 2011: 184) who stated that to facilitate learning, the learning environment must be organized in a way that will allow students to be engaged in active learning process that leads to deep structured learning. On the other hand, Joe (ND), p.4) suggests that composition of the group and its size is the main issue to be considered for the success of cooperative learning.

4.1.2 Classroom Observation Results on Group Size, Classroom Organization and aiding Materials for the Practice of CL Activities

In addition to the above students' questionnaire results, classroom observation results in relation to group size, classroom organization and aiding materials were also made referring to table 4.2 below. In this section, the results of the classroom observation analysis are presented. The classroom observation results for each class are presented in a tabular form. The heading, as category of the classroom observation scheme used in this section, is classroom organization and aiding materials for the practices of CL activities.

Table 4.2: Classroom Observation Results on Classroom Organization and Aiding Materials

Item	Statements	Availability on the lesson		
		Yes	No	Total
1	The group size is appropriate for cooperative learning activities	-	6	6
2	Classroom setting or condition is conducive for cooperative learning of students	-	6	6
3	There is adequate space each group in which group members can see and hear one another when working together	-	6	6
4	There are aiding materials (suggested in students textbook or teacher guide) to facilitate cooperative learning activities.	-	6	6

As shown in the above table 4.2, the classroom condition to practice cooperative learning activities is not conducive. The average number of students in each class was 70 and it is very difficult to ménage. Because of large number of students in classroom and no enough space, students sit and work in groups of 7 to 8. This group arrangement does not go in line with the literature as indicated by Kagan (1993, cited in Enu et al., 2013:59) who suggests that group sizes of 4-5 are best to ensure closer proximity among group members, enabling them to work “knee to knee” with more face to face into reactions; and such physical proximity and eye contact are likely to lead to a heightened sense of intimacy among group members and a feeling of greater personal responsibility to teammates (Joe, (ND), p. 5).

There was greater problem concerning classroom condition. The students were unable to move round to each other because the desks and chairs were not easily movable. Therefore, the students did not comfortably do the activities cooperatively since there is no enough space for interactions in groups and the chairs are immovable.

The observed teachers spent 40 minutes of the class time for teaching/learning processes. In this regard, no teacher was observed to use audio/video materials, print texts, or any other instructional materials as aiding and/or authentic materials to facilitate cooperative learning activities. Class time was spent on using blackboard for explanation or note giving. Even majority of students came into the class without their English text book.

However, Nunan (1988:99) claimed that authentic materials are essential in order to prepare students for the kind of discourse they will encounter outside the classroom and

the materials should also foster independent learning by raising the consciousness of the learners and making them more aware of the learning process. In addition, individual learns through the manipulation of materials in his or her physical environment in terms of developmental stages and learning styles (Nsamenang & Tchombe, 2011:183).

Generally, the results of classroom observation revealed that there were occasions when the teachers used no materials that can aid and facilitate cooperative activities practiced. Classroom organization and large class size were also the core challenges for the successful cooperative learning of students in EFL classes.

4.1.3 EFL Teachers' Interview Results on Group Size, Classroom Arrangement and Instructional Materials

In addition to the result obtained through student questionnaire and classroom observation on the statements related to group size, classroom arrangement and aiding materials, three EFL teachers were interviewed and their responses (opinions) are presented below.

Teacher one (T-1) was interviewed regarding the items 1 and 2 about the appropriateness and suitability of group size to the assigned cooperative activities or tasks and the techniques used by the teacher. The teacher replied, "According to education and training policy designed by Ministry of Education (MOE), 1-5 group size is inclined to be used in cooperative learning approach. Regarding classroom condition or setting, the teacher said that problems of sitting arrangement and large class size are the wide spread problems hindering the practices of cooperative learning activities.

Teacher two (T-2) provided his answers to the questions asked on group size, room arrangement and aiding materials as follows. For the question about group size, the teacher replied, "I use 1 – 5 team work strategy to get students being involved in group discussion and other tasks requiring cooperation. The teacher also suggested that there are problems in terms of classroom condition which makes cooperative learning not to be carried out effectively. For example, the students' sitting arrangement is not suitable for group discussion; and since there are about 70 students in one class, it is inaccessible for the teacher to manage and get around easily.

Teacher three (T-3) gave his answers to the same questions asked on group size, room arrangement and aiding materials for making cooperative learning work. For the question

pertinent to group size, the teacher answered that he arranges students into groups of 5/6. Concerning the classroom condition, the teacher said that the sitting arrangement of students is not suitable for the practice of cooperative learning activities, and the large number of students in a class makes cooperative learning activities difficult to practice. Regarding the aiding materials which facilitate cooperative learning activities in EFL classes, aiding materials and authentic materials are not available in classrooms to help the effectiveness of CL practices. He also added that even majority of students do not come up with their text book as the textbook is not portable.

As noticed from interview, classroom arrangement and large class size are the main issues repeatedly raised by the interviewees as big challenges. Further, the interviewees also expressed that students are sometimes asked to sit and work in groups of 7 or 8 because of large class size and space although there is 1 – 5 student network in the school. This implies that large class size which has a negative impact on group size for cooperative learning, sitting disarrangement of students in classroom and unavailability of aiding materials and resources are the leading problems that reflect assumed factors hindering successful cooperative learning not to take place.

4.2 Analysis of Data on Teacher's Role in Classroom Practices

The presentation and analysis of the following data is based on the theme, 'teacher's roles in classroom instructional practices' which was generated with reference to the research questions. Therefore, the following sections present and analyze the students' responses, classroom observation results, and teachers' interview results to the statements related to teacher's roles in classroom instructional practice.

4.2.1 Data from Students' Questionnaire

This section presents information about the students' responses to the statements related to teacher's roles in classroom instructional practices of cooperative learning in EFL classes. The analysis of the students' responses to the statements was made using descriptive method. Therefore, the results obtained from students' responses with reference to teacher's roles were discussed below referring to table 4.4.

Table 4.3: Responses of Students on Teacher's Roles in Classroom Practices of CL

No	Statements	Response							Mean
			SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	
			5	4	3	2	1		
1	The teacher specifies objectives of the lesson for students	fr	25	146	2	29	8	210	3.72
		%	11.9	69.52	0.96	13.81	3.81	100	
2	The teacher establishes a set of rules and procedures that govern the handling of routine during group activities	fr	4	10	1	102	93	210	1.71
		%	1.90	4.76	0.48	48.57	44.29	100	
3	The teacher monitors students' learning and intervenes within the group to provide task assistance	fr	6	11	-	84	109	210	1.67
		%	2.86	5.24	-	40	51.90	100	
4	The teacher establishes clear guidelines that facilitate positive inter dependence and promote harmony	fr	4	12	3	71	120	210	1.61
		%	1.90	5.71	1.43	33.82	57.14	100	
5	The teacher provides input and encourages group members to use the same strategies	fr	26	137	3	36	8	210	3.65
		%	12.38	65.24	1.43	17.14	3.81	100	
6	The teacher provides each member of the group with specific role	fr	12	16	2	95	85	210	1.93
		%	5.71	7.62	0.95	45.24	40.48	100	
7	The teacher establishes individual accountability among group members	fr	7	13	4	123	63	210	1.94
		%	3.33	6.19	1.90	58.58	30	100	
8	The teacher uses different methods that allow students to engage in group activities	fr	9	2	-	135	45	210	2.11
		%	4.29	10	-	64.29	21.42	100	
9	The teacher assists students in completing the task and working together effectively	fr	18	31	3	123	35	210	2.40
		%	8.57	14.76	1.43	58.57	16.67	100	
10	The teacher assesses students' learning and evaluates their performance	fr	18	54	3	33	102	210	2.30
		%	8.57	25.71	1.42	15.71	48.58	100	
11	The teacher gives relevant feedback timely	fr	8	14	-	112	76	210	1.88
		%	3.81	6.67	-	53.33	36.19	100	
12	If problems occur in group interaction or work process, the teacher resolves them constructively	fr	26	152	2	14	6	210	3.75
		%	12.38	72.38	0.95	6.67	7.62	100	
13	The teacher teaches the social skills (e.g. negotiating respectfully, commenting constructively on other's ideas, etc.) necessary to increase group cohesiveness and effectiveness	fr	14	20	3	38	135	210	1.76
		%	6.67	9.52	1.43	18.09	64.29	100	
14	The teacher is friendly and sympathetic to the students in all the ways of learning	fr	17	55	4	31	103	210	2.29
		%	8.09	26.19	1.90	14.77	49.05	100	
Total mean								2.34	

Key: SA= Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U= Undecided; D= Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree

The table 4.4 above shows the students' agreement on the statements that concern about the teacher's roles of specifying objectives of the lesson, providing input and encouraging Students to use the same strategies and solving problems that occur in group interaction or work process constructively. As such, majority (81.42%) of the respondents with the mean value 3.72 agreed that teacher specifies objectives of a lesson for students. However, some portion (17.62%) of the respondents showed their disagreement with the statement implying that they did not support the idea that the teacher specifies objectives of a lesson that needs to be achieved. And the remaining 0.96% remained uncertain to decide whether to agree or disagree to the statement (see table 4.4, item 1).

Concerning items 5 and 12 about the teacher's roles of providing input for the activity to be practiced and solving problems that occur in group interaction or work process, 79.62% and 84.76% of the respondents with the mean values of 3.65 and 3.75 agreed to the statements respectively (see table 4.4, items 5 and 12).

Accordingly, the result obtained from the items 1, 5, and 12 goes in line with the literature as stated by Johnson and Johnson (1999) that the teacher, as a facilitator, has many roles from which specifying objectives of a lesson, solving problems constructively, and providing input and encouraging students to use the same strategies in doing cooperative work are among other things.

Regarding the statements that were designed to explore the students' opinion about the teachers' roles of (1) establishing a set of rules and procedures that govern the students' discipline during the activities, (2) monitoring students' learning and intervening within the group to provide task assistance, (3) establishing clear guidelines that facilitate positive interdependence and promote harmony, (4) providing each member of the group with specific role, (4) establishing individual accountability among group members, (5) using different methods that allow students to engage in group activities, (6) assisting students in completing the tasks and working together effectively, (7) assisting students' learning and evaluating their performance, (8) giving relevant feedback timely, (9) teaching students the necessary social skills to increase group cohesiveness and effectiveness, and (10) being friendly and sympathetic to the students in all the ways of learning, majority of the respondents expressed their disagreement to the statements implying that the teacher is not seen to play these roles during the classroom instructional practices of cooperative learning. It is indicated that the mean values of the statements are

found to be between 1.61 and 2.4 with the average percentage of 82.82% of the respondents showing disagreement to the items 2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,13, &14 and the remaining 16.19% and 0.99% remained agreeing and uncertain about the statements respectively (see table 4.4). This indicates that majority (82.82%) of the respondents assented to the statements dealing with the roles of the teachers mentioned above getting done or played during the classroom instructional practices of cooperative learning although some portion (16.19%) of the respondents showed their agreement to the statements.

As indicated above, it was found that majority (82.8%) of the respondents with an aggregate mean value 2.34 were not agreeable about the roles of the teacher mentioned above getting done/played during the classroom instructional practices of cooperative learning. Accordingly, the result obtained through students' questionnaire, classroom observation and interview does not go in line with the literature. As suggested by Johnson and Johnson (2009,cited in Gillies, 2016:41), successful cooperative learning involves structuring the five key components of cooperative learning, namely positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal and social skills, and group processing within the learning situation so that all group members: (a) understand that they are linked together and they are each responsible for part of the task in order for the group to complete its goal; (b) encourage and facilitate each other's efforts to accomplish the group's goal; (c) understand individual and group accountability in which the accountability of the group is dependent on the individual learning of all group members; (d) are taught the social skills (e.g., listening attentively to each other, negotiating respectfully, commenting constructively on other's ideas, accepting responsibility for one's behavior respectfully, making decision democratically, and sharing ideas and resources needed for facilitation of cooperative learning and high quality cooperation; (e) reflect on the learning process to improve the effectiveness of the members in contributing to the shared efforts to achieve the group's goals; (f) are provided with specific role for a part of the task to accomplish the shared goal and achieve success; (g) are assisted by the teacher in working together effectively and completing the task accordingly; and (h) are assessed for their learning and performance, and given feedback timely. For students' engagement in this active learning process and to address deep structured learning, teacher-guided facilitation of students is highly demanded (Bandurea, 1977, cited in Nsamenang and Tchombe, 2011:182).

4.2.2 Teachers' Interview Results on Teacher's Role in Classroom Practice

In addition to the results obtained through the students' questionnaire on the statements related to the teachers' roles in classroom instructional practices of cooperative learning, interview findings obtained through interviews with three EFL teachers are presented and analyzed below.

As results of the interview with EFL teachers revealed, regarding their respective roles in classroom practices, the interviewees (EFL teachers) claimed that they implemented group heterogeneity and student interaction activities by assigning students in heterogeneous group and providing students with opportunity to interact with their peers to work together.

However, concerning assignment of complementary roles for learners, and structuring elements of cooperative learning, especially positive interdependence and individual and group accountability during cooperative activities, the interview participants suggested that they did not properly implement the mentioned roles during the practices of cooperative learning activities. With this regard, the teachers further explained that there are many problems that are constraints for them not to make effective use of cooperative learning in their classrooms. These problems, as mentioned by the teachers, include lack of students' motivation to work in group, poor coordination of group members' contributions, students' reluctance and resistance to participate in cooperative activities, large class size, and uncomfortable seating arrangement. Furthermore, the interviewed teachers also added that absence of clear procedures and guidelines for monitoring cooperative group work, lack of students' accountability for the learning of their group members, and teachers' lack of enough training about cooperative learning, teaching load in periods per week, and volume of the textbook (mismatched with the allocated number of periods per week) were also found significant obstacles for the teachers and halted them from translating the cooperative learning method they believed to be appropriate to EFL teaching.

In conclusion, the findings of the interview and students' questionnaire, triangulated with observational data, demonstrated that lack of students' motivation to work in group, poor coordination of group members' contributions to the assigned group tasks and their resistance to participate in cooperative activities were the serious problems that reflect

assumed factors confronting the teachers. Consequently, the teachers were forced to swift from using cooperative learning approach and inclined to employ teacher-led lessons (explanations or lecture method) just to go in line with the time pressure.

4.2.3 Classroom Observation Results on Teacher’s Role in Classroom Practices

In addition to the above students’ questionnaire and teachers’ interview results, classroom observation results in relation to teacher's roles in classroom instructional practices of cooperative learning were also made referring to table 4.5 below.

Table 4.4: Classroom Observation Results on EFL Teacher’s Roles in Classroom Practices

No.	Instructional Activity	Availability on the lesson		
		Yes	No	Total
	Teacher’s Roles			
1	Specifying objectives of the lesson	5	1	6
2	Arranging students in heterogeneous groups	6	-	6
3	Providing each member of the group with specific role depending on the nature of the task and the time necessary to complete it	-	6	6
4	Establishing clear guidelines that facilitate positive interdependence and promote harmony	-	6	6
5	Establishing individual accountability among group members	-	6	6
6	Providing an input and encouraging the group to use the	6	-	6
7	Facilitating the learning of students and interaction	2	4	6
8	Monitoring students’ learning and intervening with in the groups to provide task assistance	2	4	6
9	Using different CL techniques that allow students to engage in cooperative activities	-	6	6
10	Assessing students’ learning and evaluating their performance	2	4	6
11	Giving relevant feedback timely to the students’ work	1	5	6

As shown in the above table, almost all the observed teachers specified objectives of the lesson, arranged students in heterogeneous group, and provided an input and encouraged students to use the same strategy to do activities (see table 4.5). with this regard, the teacher’s roles of specifying objectives of the lesson, arranging students in heterogeneous group and providing an input and encouraging students to use the same strategy to do cooperative activities together in EFL classes go in line with literature as indicated by Jonson (1999) who suggest that a teacher, as a facilitator, specifies objectives of the lesson for students; and Joe(ND) who claims that heterogeneous group formation strategy

is an effective strategy in which students are placed in learning teams with others who are different with respect to sex, age, academic performance, etc. in which students experience diverse perspectives and different cognitive styles; and providing students with an input so that they can use the same strategy when working together in cooperative activities.

However, regarding the teacher's instructional activities or roles like providing each member of the group with specific role, establishing clear guidelines that facilitate positive interdependence, and establishing individual accountability among group members, no teacher was observed putting these roles into effect (see table 4.5, items 4.5 and 9) . Most of the observed teachers did not: (a) facilitate interaction among group members, (b) monitor students' learning; (c) provide task assistance intervening within the groups; (d) assess students' learning and evaluate their performance; and (e) give feedback to the students' work timely. On the part of the learners, no individuals were observed encouraging and facilitating each other's efforts to complete the assigned task; students did not show willingness to participate in cooperative activities; group members were not provided with specific role (share of the work or part of the task). This shows that individual accountability or group member's responsibility was not structured within the group, and therefore, only one or two group members did almost all the work while others did little or nothing.

Consistently, it was also observed that when the teacher gave students time for discussion and asked them to report what they have been discussing, few of the group members raised their hands to forward their ideas while other remained silent or indisposed to give their answers. So, there was no equal participation among group members although the teacher gave them chance to participate in cooperative activities.

The result obtained through classroom observation demonstrated that the teachers did not properly implement most of their roles of cooperative learning in classroom practice. Moreover, elements of cooperative learning, especially positive interdependence and individual accountability, which are the key components for successful cooperative learning were not structured within the learning situation during cooperative activities (see items 3, 4, 5 and 9). Accordingly, the result obtained through observation does not go in line with literature. Johnson and Johnson (1999:68-69), striving against the results obtained through classroom observation, state that in cooperative learning groups,

teachers specify positive interdependence and individual accountability, explain the social skills to be taught, monitor students' learning and intervene within the group to provide task assistance, and increase students interpersonal and group skills.

Furthermore, Bandura (1977) as cited in Nsamenang and Tchombe (2011: 182), in contrary to the results obtained through questionnaire and classroom observation, stated that teacher-guided facilitation of students' interaction in cooperative learning is highly demanded however. In addition, Johnson and Johnson (2009) as cited in Gillies (2016:41) also argue that successful cooperative learning involves structuring the five key components of cooperative learning: positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal and social skills and group processing within the learning situation. This helps group members to understand that they are linked together to work the assigned group task cooperatively & achieve its goal, encourage each other's efforts, understand group accountability in which they are provided with specific role to improve the effectiveness of the members in contributing to the shared efforts needed for the facilitation of cooperative learning.

4.3 Analysis of Data on Students' Roles in Cooperative Learning Practices

The presentation and analysis of the following data is based on the theme, 'students' roles in cooperative learning practices'. Therefore, the following section presents and analyzes the students' responses to the statements related to students' roles in cooperative learning practice in triangulation with classroom observational data and interview results. The analysis of the students' responses to the statements was made using descriptive statistics followed by textual discussion. Therefore, the results obtained from students' responses with reference to students' roles are discussed below referring to table 4.6.

Table 4.5: Students' Responses on Roles of Students in Cooperative Learning Practices

Items	Items Related to Students' Roles	Responses							
			SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	Mean
			5	4	3	2	1		
1	All group members know exactly what their role is during the activity	fr	10	32	0	137	31	210	2.3
		%	4.76	15.24	0	65.90	14.24	100	
2	Group members demonstrate motivation for the assigned task	fr	4	21	2	96	87	210	1.85
		%	1.90	10	0.96	45.71	41.43	100	
3	Students show mutual respect to each other when working together	fr	28	150	2	19	11	210	3.78
		%	13.33	71.43	0.95	9.05	5.24	100	
4	Students assist one another with understanding and completion of the task	fr	12	30	3	76	89	210	2.05
		%	5.71	14.29	1.43	36.19	42.38	100	
5	Group members promote each other's success by helping and encouraging one another	fr	7	15	0	93	95	210	1.79
		%	3.33	7.14	0	44.29	45.24	100	
6	Students who work productively in their groups are praised or rewarded	fr	24	130	7	48	1	210	3.61
		%	11.43	61.90	3.33	22.86	0.48	100	
7	Students exchange their ideas and make corrections or improvements in collaboration instead of individual learning	fr	6	13	3	106	82	210	1.83
		%	2.85	6.19	1.43	50.48	39.05	100	
8	There is enough time for completion of the group work	fr	5	14	1	101	89	210	1.79
		%	2.38	6.67	0.48	48.09	42.38	100	
	Average Mean								2.37

Key: SA= strongly agree; A= Agree; U=Undecided; D=Disagree; SD=strongly disagree

As can be seen from table 4.6 above, the responses made for items 3 and 6 indicate that students show mutual respect to each other when working together, and those who work productively in their group are given moral value for their motivation by their teacher. It is indicated that majority (84.76% and 82.38% respectively) of the respondents with the average mean value 3.69 showed their agreement to the mentioned statements implying that they have mutual respect to each other when working together and that their teacher praised or gave them moral when they work productively in their groups. However, some portion (average percentage of 30.96%) of the respondents disagreed about the mentioned statements (see items 3 & 6).

Regarding the statements 1,2,4,5,7 and 8 that deal with complementary role assignment, motivation for the assigned tasks, helping and encouraging each other in cooperative activities, and exchanging ideas and making corrections or improvements in collaboration instead of individual learning, majority (average percentage of 85.87%) of the respondents with the average mean value 1.93 showed their disagreement with the mentioned statements implying that the students don't (1) know exactly what their role is; (2) demonstrate motivation for the assigned tasks; (3) help and encourage one another with understanding and completion of the task, and promote each other's success; (4) exchange their ideas and make corrections or improvements in collaboration instead of

individual learning; and (5) they reported that the time allocated for the cooperative activities was not enough. However, some portion (average of 13.41%) of the respondents expressed their agreement to the statements; and the remaining 0.72% of them remained uncertain to decide whether to agree or disagree to the statements (see table 4.6).

Overall, the responses of the student respondents' in table 4.6 above with the total mean value 2.37 depicts that a great number of the respondents did not agree about the mentioned roles of students to be played or implemented during cooperative activities in English classes. Correspondingly, it was also confirmed that the interviews held with the EFL teachers and classroom observational data complemented the results obtained through students' responses on the role of students as indicated in table 4.6 (see items 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, & 8).

Regarding impacts of students' motivation on learning, Rhem (1995) as cited in International Journal of Science and Research [IJSR] (2012:3049) stated that deep learning in cooperative learning depends on motivational context, and students' motivation for learning by using cooperative learning approach improves the success of learners. However, the result found concerning students' motivation shows that students lack motivation to work in group. The implication is that students are not being in need to work in group during cooperative activities.

According to Webb and Mastergeorge (2003) as cited in Gillies (2016:41), promotive interaction or the willingness of group members to encourage and facilitate each other's efforts to complete their tasks and achieve their goal is the key component for successful cooperation. In the same manner, the willingness to cooperate with others not only benefits recipients but also helpers as giving help encourages helpers to recognize and restructure the information in their own minds. So, they, in turn, develop clearer and more elaborate cognitive understanding than they held previously (Webb and Mastergeorge, 2003, as cited in Gillies, 2016:41).

In conclusion, With regard to the students' roles in cooperative learning practices, the results of the questionnaire and interview data revealed that students' lack of motivation and poor coordination of group members' contributions to the assigned group tasks were identified as major factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning in EFL classes. Accordingly, the result obtained through interview with EFL teachers showed that students had no interest to work in group and there was poor coordination of group

members' contribution for the assigned task. In addition, the findings also demonstrated that unaccountability of students for the learning of their group members and absence of clear procedures and guidelines for monitoring cooperative group work were also part of the major factors that obstruct effective use of cooperative learning in classrooms. Correspondingly, it was also confirmed in the discussion held with the three interviewed teachers that students' reluctance and resistance (which can be attributed to some of them as inferred from the observational data) to participate in cooperative activities was found significant obstacle for the teachers and halted them from translating the cooperative learning method they believed to be appropriate to EFL teaching effectively.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results obtained through the questionnaire, classroom observation and interviews to achieve the specific objectives of the study and to answer the basic research questions were presented and analyzed in chapter four. Based on the findings of the study, the summary, conclusion and suggested recommendations are made in this chapter. Therefore, this chapter discusses the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

5.1 Summary

This study was designed to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning in EFL classes, and classroom setting or organization, teacher's and students' roles to make use of cooperative learning in classroom practices are given emphasis. Summary of the findings is made below.

The questionnaire, interview and observational data disclosed that the classroom sizes were generally large in the schools under investigation. The interviewed teachers expressed that though they enthusiastically desired to employ cooperative learning in their teaching, they were always impeded by the large class size which was reported to range between 70 and 80. Such fact was also evident during the classroom observation and analysis of questionnaire data. However, group composition /formation for cooperative learning was heterogeneous even though the group sizes does not fit/match the cooperative learning method to be used.

The study identified that lack of appropriate aiding materials and authentic materials (e.g., supplementary reference books, computer assisted materials, language laboratory, audio/video materials, etc.) were part of the factors hindering effective utilization of cooperative activities as reported by the three interview participants and the questionnaire respondents. Correspondingly, observational data also complemented the evidence.

According to the findings obtained through the questionnaire, classroom observation and interview, among many factors associated to the teacher's roles and identified to have influenced their effective language teaching were lack of students' motivation and their reluctance and resistance to participate in cooperative activities, large number of students in a class, and classroom conditions with regard to desks and chairs, etc. and lack of

enough training for better understanding of the approach to make use of it effectively in their teaching.

It was also confirmed that in the discussion or interview held with the interviewed teachers that the teachers in both schools identified that shortage of time was a key factor constrained them in utilizing CL in their classroom effectively. They felt that considerable time was required to effectively use CL approach and to cover the bulky portions (contents) of the textbook displayed in their large number of pages.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are made.

- The classroom setting did not seem to be conducive for the practices of cooperative learning. As the findings from the observational data suggested, the classroom organization was not fairly able to make the learning of students interactive and cooperative.
- The observed classrooms did not look or appear being equipped with the necessary instructional materials. As the findings from classroom observation, questionnaire and interview revealed, aiding materials and authentic materials that facilitate the teaching and learning of English in cooperative classes were not available.
- The teachers seemed to prefer teacher-centered approach and the classroom practices seemed to be shifting from learner-centered method to lecture method. Regarding this, the interviewed teachers were heard acknowledging the importance and effectiveness of CL to go in harmony with students' interest of classroom contexts. However, students' lack of motivation and their unwillingness to participate in cooperative activities, etc. were part of the major factors influenced the way they teach English now although they were aware of the current teaching method, cooperative learning.
- Students didn't seem to have great attention and concern for their learning. The results of the questionnaire and interview data triangulated by observational data revealed that students preferred individual learning rather than learning together in cooperation. As inferred from observational data, there was poor coordination of group members' contributions during cooperative activities.

5.3 Recommendations

The following suggested recommendations are forwarded based on the finding of the study.

- The knowledge, skills and experiences of teachers and students are of special significance for the effectiveness of cooperative learning practices. However, it was found that putting cooperative learning approach into effect is not up to the expectation. Therefore, it was suggested that continuous and relevant training needs to be given for both teachers and students on cooperative learning with regard to its principles, general concepts, students' learning perspectives, classroom instructional procedures and roles of the classroom teacher.
- The availability and accessibility of instructional materials (aiding materials and authentic materials) which CL approach demands are the mandatory for the success of cooperative learning in EFL classes. Therefore, the school administrators and other concerned stake holders need to give attention and properly identify and fulfill the necessary cooperative learning resources and facilities to maximize learning opportunities for students through cooperative learning approach.
- Students' motivation for learning by using cooperative learning approach improves the success of learners. However, this study demonstrated that students' motivation was less and below expected status. Therefore, strategies through which motivation of students will be improved for the betterment of their learning and performance are to be developed by teachers and school administrators.
- Teacher's follow-up and support for students enable the practices of cooperative learning more effective. However, the study found that teacher's follow-up and support for students was not satisfactory. Therefore, the teachers need to give more attention to providing the required support and follow-up for students to easily identify the gap and take remedial action for improvement.
- The strategies of instruction (pedagogy) promotes different cooperative learning techniques for teaching and learning of language in order to address differences in content, student's ability and interest, facilities and existing situations in the classrooms.

In spite of this fact, the study showed that teachers were not observed using cooperative learning principles and techniques or methods for successful cooperative learning. Therefore, Ministry of Education (MOE) in collaboration with Organizations hosting training, needs to give enough training on cooperative learning pedagogy that is best useful in transforming the quality of teaching and learning by refocusing teachers' attention on the pedagogical changes that are powerful to improve the quality of learning.

References

- Alamawum, Taye (2014). An Investigation of the Design of the speaking Lessons in Grade 11 English Textbook in Terms of Promoting Cooperative Learning: The Case of Jijiga Preparatory School. Master's Thesis, Haramaya University, Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. and Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction Research in Education* (8th Ed.). Singapore: WADSWORTH, CENGAGE Learning.
- Bee, k. (2011, August 24-27). Cooperative Education in Africa: Opportunities and Challenges. Paper Presented at the International Cooperative Alliance Global Research Conference, Mikkeli, Finland.
- Beyene, Gebru (2016). EFL Teachers' Instructional Practices in Relation to their Pedagogical Beliefs: The Case of College Preparatory School. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education* (4th Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th Ed.). London: Routledge
- Cooperative Learning (ND). Cooperative Learning. From <http://www.Wikipedia>
- Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical Research Methods: A Guide to Mastering Research Techniques and Projects*. United Kingdom: How to Books Ltd, 3 Newtec Place.
- Enu, J., Asominuwa, L. and Obeng, P. (2015). Effects of Group Size on Students Achievement in Small Group Settings. *British Journal of Education, vol.3, No.4, Pp.58-64.*
- Furtwangler, C. (1992). How to Observe Cooperative Learning Classrooms: Restructuring Schools as Caring Communities. New York: Columbia University.
- Gillies, R. (2016). Cooperative Learning: Review of Research and Practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39-54.*

- Herrmann, K. (2013). The Impact of Cooperative Learning on Student Engagement: Results from an Intervention. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, vol.14 (3), 175.
- Howatt, A. and Smith, R. (2014). The History of Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *Language and History*, vol.57 (1), 75-95.
- Institute of International Education [IIE] (2012), Enhancing the Quality of English Language Education in Ethiopia. Paper Presented at the Institute of the International Conference on Enhancing the Quality of English Language Education in Ethiopia. Ambo University, Ethiopia.
- International Journal of Science and Research [IJSR]* (2014). Cooperative Learning Practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia. vol.3 (11), November 2014. From www.ijsr.net
- Joe, C. (ND). Guidelines for Group Work. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
- Johnson, D. and Johnson, R. (1999). Making Cooperative Learning Work: Theory into Practices. *Building Community through Cooperative Learning*, vol.38, No.2, 67-73.
- Johnson, D. W. (2009). An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38 (5), 365-379.
- Kagan, S. (1995). We Can Talk: Cooperative Learning in the Elementary ESL Classroom. *Eric Clear house on Language and Linguistics*, ED382035.
- Li, M. and Lam, B. (2013). Cooperative Learning: The Active Classroom. The Hong Kong Institute of Education. From <http://www.ied.edu.hk/a class/>
- Nsamenang, A. and Tchombe, T. (2011). Theories of Learning. In *Handbook of African Educational Theories and Practices: A Teacher Education Curriculum* (pp.174-187). Bamenda: Press Universitaires d’Afrique (PUA).
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-Centered Curriculum*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Reston, V. (2006). Teaching Large Class Sizes in Physical Education: Guidelines and Strategies [Guidance Document].

- From www.aahperd.org/naspe1900Association Drive, 20191 (703), 476-3410.
- Richards, C.J. and Rodgers, S.T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tadesse, T. (2015). Nurturing Cooperative Learning Pedagogies in Higher Education Classrooms: Evidence of Instructional Reform and Potential Challenges. *Current Issues in Education*, 18 (2).
Retrieved from <http://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/1374>
- Tran, V. (2013). Theoretical Perspectives Underlying the Application of Cooperative Learning in Classrooms. *International Journal of Higher Education*, vol.2 (4), p.101.
- Tsailing, L. (2002). Implementing Cooperative Learning in EFL Teaching: Process and Effects. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.
- Tsay, M. and Brady, M. (June 2010). "A case Study of Cooperative Learning and Communication Pedagogy: Does working in Teams make a Difference?" *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10 (2); 78-89.
- West East Institute [WEI] (2014), Cooperative Learning in EFL Classroom. Paper Presented at the 2014 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings. Vienna, Austria.
- Yeabsira, Kefale (2015). Problems Affecting the Implementation of Cooperative Learning: Primary School in Focus. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Zelege, Teshome (2015). Assessment of EFL Learners' Attitude towards Cooperative Language Learning: Limu Preparatory School, East Wollega Zone in Focus. *Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal (STAR Journal)*, vol.4, No.3; 240-252. From <http://www.starjournal.org/>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX – A

Questionnaire for Students on Cooperative Learning (English Version)

Dear Student,

This questionnaire aims to collect information on ‘Factors Affecting the Practices of Cooperative Language Learning in grade 9 in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes.’ There are two parts in this questionnaire. Part I consists of personal information. Part II consists of the items that deal with class room organization and teachers’ and students’ roles in cooperative learning classes. Thus, the researcher kindly requests you to give the required information provided. The response scale is indicated for each part. Your contribution is highly important for the success of this study. The researcher would like to assure you that all the responses you give will be kept confidential and anonymous and used only for research purpose. As a further assurance, you do not need to write your name.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Part I: Personal Information

Instruction: Please give information about yourself using a tick (√) mark in the box provided.

1. Sex: Male Female

Part II Blow are items related to group size or composition, room arrangement and materials or resources. The items are accompanied with five responses which vary from ‘strongly agree’ to ‘strongly disagree’. Please use a tick (√) mark to give your response based on your understanding.

For this section, the following five responses are delivered:

Scale	Code	Mark
Strongly Agree	SA	=5
Agree	A	=4
Undecided	U	=3
Disagree	D	=2
Strongly Disagree	SD	=1

No.	Statements	Response				
		SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Item related to group size or composition, room arrangement and aiding materials or resources	5	4	3	2	1
1.1	The group size matches the cooperative learning model that the teacher uses					
1.2	The group size is appropriate to the assigned task					
1.3	The group composition is heterogeneous					
1.4	Desks and chairs are arranged so that all group members can see and hear one another					
1.5	There is adequate space for each group					
1.6	The aiding materials to promote cooperative learning activities are available					
2	Items related to teacher's roles in terms of class room management and procedures, and practice of cooperative learning activities					
2.1	The teacher establishes clear guidelines that facilitate positive interdependence and promote harmony					
2.2	The teacher establishes a set of rules and procedures that govern the handling of routine during group activities					
2.3	The teacher monitors students' learning and intervenes with in the groups to provide task assistance					
2.4	The teacher specifies objectives of the lesson for students					
2.5	The teacher provides input and encourages group members to use the same strategies					
2.6	The teacher provides each member of the group with specific role					
2.7	The teacher establishes individual accountability among group members					
2.8	The teacher uses different cooperative learning methods that allow students to engage in group activities					
2.9	The teacher assists students in completing the task and working together effectively					
2.10	The teacher assesses students' learning and evaluates their performance					
2.11	The gives relevant feedback timely					
2.12	If problems occur in group interaction or work process, the teacher resolves them constructively					
2.13	The teacher teaches the social skills necessary to increase group cohesiveness and effectiveness					
2.14	The teacher is friendly and sympathetic to the students in all the ways of learning					
3	Items Related to the Role of Students					
3.1	All group members know exactly what their role is during the activity					
3.2	Group members demonstrate motivation for the assigned task					
3.3	Students show mutual respect to each other when working together					
3.4	Students assist one another with understanding and completion of the task					
3.5	Group members promote each other's success by helping and encouraging one another					
3.6	Students who work productively in their groups are praised or rewarded					
3.7	Students exchange their ideas and make corrections or improvements in collaboration instead of individual learning					
3.8	There is enough time for completion of the group work					

Adapted from: Furtwangler (1992) and Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998)

APPENDIX-B: Gaafannoo Barattootaaf (Afan Oromo version)

Kabajamtoota Hirmaattotaa,

Kaayyoon qorannoo kanaa rakkoolee mala gareen qindaa’anii barachuu Afaan Ingilizii keessatti barattoota kutaa 9ffaa mudatan irratti odeeffannoo funaanuu irratti xiyyeeffata. Gaafannoon kun kutaa lama qaba. Kutaan jalqabaa odeeffannoo haala dhuunfaa qabata. Kutaan lammaffaan immoo gaaffilee qorannicha ilaalchisee dhiyaatan irratti xiyyeeffata. Kanaaf, gaafannoo dhiyaate kanaaf yaada ykn deebii keessan akka kennitaniif kabajaan gaaafatamti. Hirmaannaan keessan milkaa’ina qorannoo kanaaf gumaacha olaanaa qaba. Deebiin isin kennitan dhimma qorannoo kana qofaaf oola. Maqaa keessan barressuun barbaachisaa mti.

Hirmaannaa keessaniif guddaa galatoomaa.

Kutaa Tokko: Odeeffannoo Haala Dhuunfaa

Qajeelcha: Odeeffannoo haala dhuunfaa keetii saanduqa kenname keessatti mallattoo “√” fayyadamuun guuti.

1. Saala: Dhiira Dhalaa

Kutaa Lama

Qajeelcha: Gaaffileen(himootni himamsaa) armaan gadii baay’ina ijaarsa gareewwanii, qindaa’ina daree fi meeshaalee deggersaa irratti xiyyeeffatu. Deebii kee, deebiiwwan filannoof dhiyaatan: “*Cimseen waliigala*”, “*Waliigala*”, “*Hinmurteessine*”, “*Nanmorma*”, fi “*Cimseen morma*” jedhan keessaa filadhu.

Ibsa:

Safartuu	Koodii	Qabxii
Cimseen waliigala	CW	5
Waliigala	W	4
Hinmurteessine	H	3
Nanmorma	N	2
Cimseen morma	CM	1

1	Gaaffilee baay'ina ijaarsa garee, qindaa'ina garee, fi meeshaalee deggersaa irratti xiyyeeffatan	Deebii				
		CW	W	H	N	CM
		5	4	3	2	1
1.1	Baay'inni ijaara garee mala gareen qindaa'anii barachuu barsiisaan fayyadamuu waliin wal sima.					
1.2	Baay'inni ijaarsa garee hojii gareen hojjetamuuf mijataa dha.					
1.3	Ijaarsi gareewwanii barattoota umurii, saala fi dandeettii barachuu gara garaa qaban of keessatti hammata.					
1.4	Teessumni daree hojiiwwan barattooti gareen qindaa'anii waliin hijjetaniif mijataa dha.					
1.5	Baay'insi barattoota daree keessaa hojiiwwan gareen qindaa'anii hijjetaniif mijataa dha.					
1.6	Meeshaaleen deggersaa(kanneen kitaaba barataa ykn qajeelcha barsiisaa keessatti caqasaman) hojiilee qindoomina gareen hijjetaman tumsan daree keessa ni jiru.					
1	Gaaffilee ga'ee barsiisaan daree keessatti qabu irratti xiyyeeffatan(to'annaa daree, qajeeltoowwan baasuu, deggersa barattootaaf taasisuu fi k.k.f)					
2.1	Barattootni qindoomina garee qabaachuun waliin hojjetanii, waliin milkaa'uudhaan gammachuu akka qabaataniif, barsiisaan qajeeltoowwan ifa ta'an barattootaaf ni tuma.					
2.2	Barsiisaan seeroota fi dhaawwata naamusa barattootaa kabachiisu ni baasa.					
2.3	Barsiisaan barattoota gidduu adeemuun to'annaa fi deggersa barbaachisaa ni taasisa.					
2.4	Barsiisaan kaayyoo goree barnootichaa barattootaaf ifa ni taasisa					
2.5	Barsiisaan galtee hojii garee isaaniif fakkeenya ta'u kennuun waliin hojjechuu barattootaa ni jajjabeessa.					
2.6	Barsiisaan tokkoo tokkoo miseensa gareef gahee hojii ni kennaaf.					
2.7	Barsiisaan qooda fudhannaa dhuunfaa miseensi garee keessatti qabu ni ijaaraaf.					
2.8	Barsiisaan malleen gareen qinda'anii barachuu adda addaa fayyadamuun hirmaannaa barattootni garee keessatti taasisan ni jajjabeessa.					
2.9	Barsiisaan barattootni garee keessatti waliin qinda'anii hojii kennameef akka xumuraniif deggersa ni taasisa					
2.10	Barsiisaan barachuu barattootaa madaaluun hojii isaaniif firii ni kennaaf.					
2.11	Barsiisaan duub-deebii barbaachisu barattotaaf yerootti ni kennaaf.					

2.12	Barsiisaan walitti bu'insa garee keessatti umamu karaa nagaan ni fura.					
2.13	Barsiisaammn dandeettiiwwan hawaasummaa gareen barachuu fi hojjechuu barattootaa mirkaneessan barattoota ni barsiisa.					
2.14	Barsiisaan hariiroo barachuu barattootaaf gargaaru uumuun itti dhiyeenya barattootaaf qabu mul'isa.					
3	Gaaffilee gahee barattootaa gama shaakala qindoominaan barachuu isaanii irratti xiyyeeffatan.					
3.1	Miseensoti garee hunduu gahee hojii garee isaanii keessatti qaban ni beeku.					
3.2	Miseensoti garee hundi hojii garee keessatti waliin hojjetaniif fedhaa fi kaka'umsa qaban ni mul'isu.					
3.3	Barattootni walii isaaniif kabaja qabaachuun waliin ni hojjetu.					
3.4	Barattooti garee keessatti hubannoo walii uumuun, hojii kennameef milkaa'inaan akka xumuranitti deggersa walii walii isaaniif ni taasisu.					
3.5	Barattooti milkaa'ina walii isaaniif wal deggeru, akkasumas wal jajjabeessu.					
3.6	Barsiisaan barattoota garee keessatti hojii isaanii si'aa'inaan xumuraniif hamilee ykn jajjabina ni kenna.					
3.7	Barattooti yaada wal-jijjiiruu fi dogoggora waliin sirreessudhaan fooyya'iinsa waliin ni taasisu.					
3.8	Hojii garee barattooti qindoominaan hojjetaniif yeroon kennamu ga'aa dha.					

Furtuu: CW=Cimseen Waliigala; W=Waliigala; H=Hinmurteessine; N=Nanmorma; CM=Cimseen morma

APPEENDIX – C: Classroom Observation Checklist

Name of the School _____ Date _____

Class Observed _____ No. of Students _____

Observed Teacher _____ Time/Period _____

Day's Lesson/Topic _____ Unit _____

Skill taught _____ Unit topic _____

Pages _____

Major Activities: _____

Materials used: _____

Instruction: Tick 'Yes' if the activity is observed or 'No' if it is not observed.

No	Instructional Activity	Availability on the lesson		
		Yes	No	Total
I. Teacher's role				
1	Specifying objectives of the lesson			
2	Arranging students in heterogeneous group			
3	Providing each member of the group with specific role depending on the nature of the task and the time necessary to complete it			
4	Giving an input and encouraging the groups to use similar strategies			
5	Facilitating the learning of students and interaction among group members			
6	Monitoring students' learning and intervening within the group to provide task assistance			
7	Using different cooperative learning techniques that allow students to engage in group activities			
8	Assessing students' learning and evaluating their performance			
9	Giving relevant feedback timely to the students' work			
II. Learners' role				
1	All group members are aware of their role to play			
2	Each member of the learning team is actively involved in group work			
3	Students demonstrate motivation and work productively in their group			
4	Students exchange ideas and make improvements in collaboration			
5	Group members help and encourage each other to achieve the group goal			
6	Students have enough time for completion of the assigned task			

III Class room organization, management and materials				
1	The group size is appropriate for cooperative learning activities			
2	Class room setting or condition is conducive for cooperative learning of students			
3	There is adequate space for each group in which group members can see and hear one another			
4	There are aiding materials to practice cooperative learning techniques suggested in the text book or teacher guide			
5	Clear guide lines that facilitate positive interdependence and promote group harmony are established by the teacher			
6	Set of rules and procedures that govern the students' oral participation and movement are established			

Adapted from: Furtwangler (1992)

APPENDIX – D: Teachers’ Interview Protocol

Background Information of the Interviewees

No.	Group	Sex		Experience	Grade	Qualification	Periods per week
		M	F				
1	Teacher1	M		12	9	Degree	20
2	Teacher2	M		10	9	Degree	24
3	Teacher3	M		7	9	Degree	24
Total		3					

Guide Teacher’s Interview

Dear teacher,

I would like to say ‘thank you’ for your willingness to my interview. The objective of this interview is to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning (CLL) in grade 9 in EFL classes. Your ideas are highly important for the success of this study. Therefore, I kindly request you to listen to every question carefully and contribute your views on the question. In this respect, I want to tell you any information that you are going to give me will be kept confidential and used only for this study.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instruction: Please answer the following questions pertaining to affecting the practices of cooperative learning in EFL classes.

1. Do you use cooperative learning approach in your classrooms? If your answer is ‘yes’, what cooperative learning methods do you use?
2. Have you ever participated in seminars or workshops on cooperative learning? If your answer is ‘yes’, how did you find it?
3. What kinds of problems are there in terms of classroom conditions for the practice of CL?
4. What challenges or difficulties do you face on the part of students during the practice of cooperative activities?
5. Are there aiding materials and authentic materials (suggested in student textbook or teacher guide) that promote the practices of cooperative activities?
6. What other problems do you face in practicing CL activities? Please add your points if any.

APPENDIX-E

Sample Lesson Transcript and Sample Classroom Observation Notes

D) Sample Lesson Transcript

A) Teacher One (T-1) – Classroom Observation

Key: T = Teacher

Ss = Students

Date of Observation: Thursday, June 9, 2017

Skill taught: Grammar

School: Enango High School

Grade: 9A

Unit: 10

Unit topic: Newspaper and Magazines

Lesson topic: Language focus: Using all, every, no, none, both, neither, either

Pages: 179-180

Major activities: questions and answers

Materials used: Student textbook only

T – Good morning class

Ss – Good morning teacher

T – If you remember, yesterday we tried to see the meaning of the words all, every, no, none, both, neither, either. For example, ‘all’ means ‘all things’ or ‘the whole thing’. We can see some examples. Here, the teacher wrote the following examples on the black board (from the student textbook):

All and Every: Examples:

- All students feel nervous before exams.
- Every student feels nervous before exams

T – Again, in your text book we can also see many examples. They give us information about noun.

T – The words *all, every, no, none, both, neither, either* are called adjectives of quantity or quantifiers.

T – The teacher told the students to write down exercise one into their exercise book and to do it individually.

Ss – They started to do so.

At the end, the time was up and the bell was rung. The teacher again gave students exercises 2, 3, and 4 to do at home.

B) Sample Lesson Transcript

Teacher Two (T -2): Classroom Observation

Date of observation: Monday, June 13, 2017

Skill taught: Grammar

School: Dongoro High School

Grade: 9D

Unit: 11

Unit topic: Endangered Animals

Lesson topic: Relative Clauses

Pages: 202-207

Major activities: questions and answers, lecture, demonstration, and individual work

Materials used: student text book only

T – Good morning class

Ss – Good morning teacher

T – Ok, in our previous lesson we learnt how lion and Warthog became enemies. We read the text about lion and warthog, and we did a lot of exercises. Before we proceed to our today's topic...ehh...let us say a little on how to describe animals and their behavior by using adjectives. Ehh ...for example, if you want to describe the behavior of lion and warthog, ehh...you can use the adjectives like greedy, selfish, trusting, deceitful, etc. You can also use adjectives to describe the differences between objects, other animals, or persons.

T – When we come to our today's topic, the topic is about 'Relative clauses'. So, when we say a relative clause, it is a clause that usually begins with a relative pronoun. When we say relative pronouns, they are who...what are relative pronouns?

Ss – Which, that, whom, whose

T – Yes (Writing the students' answers on the black board)

T- These are all called relative pronouns

T – So, relative clause is a clause is a clause that always begins with a relative pronoun. The relative clause can be used ehh...either to give essential information, or information that is additional or extra. For example, let us take an example.

My brother lives in Nedjo. He is a doctor.

T – Here, we have two consecutive sentences.

T – Look, these sentences.

T – Now, we can join the two sentences by using a relative pronoun as a conjunction.

Ss – Who

T – Yes, it is a relative pronoun ‘who’.

T – We use the relative pronoun ‘who’ when the subject is person.

T – So, we can join the sentences above as:

My brother who lives in Nedjo is a doctor.

T – We use the relative pronoun ‘whose’ when eeh...when do we use ‘whose’?

Ss - ... (they couldn't answer)

T – We use ‘whose’ when something belongs to someone or something else.

T – For example, we can say,

Chaltu has a sister. Her name is Obse.

T – When we join these two sentences, it is...it is what?

Ss - ... (students didn't answer)

T – We can join these sentences by using the relative pronoun ‘whose’ and it becomes,

Chaltu has a sister whose name is Obse.

The teacher continued his teaching until the bell went off.

II) Sample Classroom Observation Notes

A) Teacher One (T-1): Classroom Observation Notes

Date of Observation: Thursday, June 9, 2017

Skill: Grammar

School: Dongoro

Grade: 9A

Unit: 10

Unit topic: Newspapers and Magazines

Lesson topic: 'Using all, every, both, no, none, neither, and either'

Pages: 179-180

Major activities: questions and answers, lecture, and individual work

Materials used: student text book only

The first class that was observed when T-1 was teaching was 'Grammar'. The day's lesson topic was '*Using all, every, no, none, both, neither, and either*'. The teacher began the class by introducing the day's lesson and writing the topic on the black board. He began by explaining the meaning of the adjectives of quantities – all, every, both, no, none, neither, and either. As identified in the excerpt, the teacher said:

'All' means, all things, or 'the whole thing'. We can see some examples from your text book (writing the examples on the black board)...

While the teacher was writing exemplary sentences on the black board (from the student text book), the students listened to him and wrote down the sentences into their exercise book. However, some students whispered and made noisy. This time, the teacher did not manage the class room and monitor their discipline. He didn't gave chance for students to make their own sentences individually based on the examples given. The teacher didn't also arrange students to work the activity in pairs or in small groups.

Having finished the explanation about adjectives of quantity with their exemplary sentences, the teacher moved to the exercise 1 to be done as class work. He told the students to do the exercises individually. Here, the teacher didn't specify the time allotted for the activity.

While the students were doing the exercise, the time was up and the bell was rung before the teacher finished up the day's lesson. At the end, he gave students exercises 2, 3, and 4 to do at home (as home work).

Teacher Two (T-2): Classroom Observation Notes

Date of Observation: Monday, June 13, 2017

Skill: Grammar

School: Enango

Grade: 9D

Unit: 11

Unit topic: Endangered Animals

Lesson topic: Relative Clauses

Pages: 202-207

Major activities: questions and answers, lecture, and individual work

Materials used: student text book only

The skill that was observed when the T-2 was teaching was again 'grammar'. The day's lesson topic was 'Relative Clauses'. After he revised the lesson that had been learnt in the previous lesson, the teacher now introduced the day's lesson – Relative clauses. Then, he wrote the day's lesson topic on the black board. While he was writing the students were fidgeting here and there in search of books. Here, the excerpt reads:

This time I could see that many students did not have the text book and even the available textbooks were so scarce that to see one book in a desk was a rare event. It seemed usual to rush here and there from desk to desk for search of books... however, the students who had books went on to turn their books on to page 202 when the teacher revising the previous lesson, and one book for five or more.

The teacher showed sign of anger but continued his teaching using explanation about the topic. In this case, the students were not given opportunities to work together and do the activity by their own. Instead, the teacher himself constructed his own sentences and wrote them on the black board for students. All the students were listening to him and answering the questions rumbled at once when the teacher pointed to them to answer the questions. However, some students didn't follow their teacher and they talked to each other during the lesson.

Now the teacher began to write questions on the black board. And the students continued to write until they were interrupted by the bell ringing before finished. The teacher, therefore, gave the activity to the students to do it as a home take assignment for the following day.

APPENDIX – F: Sample Interview Transcript

Key: R= Researcher (positing questions or transitional statements or remarks)

T= Teacher (Teacher's opinions or answers to the questions)

T-1 = Teacher One

T-2 = Teacher Two

T-3 = Teacher Three

R- To start my interview, I would like to thank you for your willingness to my interview. The objective of this interview is to investigate factors affecting the practices of cooperative language learning (CLL) of students in Grade 9 in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes. Your ideas are highly important for the success of this study. Therefore, I kindly request you to listen to every question carefully and contribute your views on the questions.

Question - 1

R: *Do you use cooperative learning approach in your classrooms? If your answer is 'yes', what cooperative leaning methods do you use?*

T-1: Actually yes, this is because now a days the Ministry of Education (MOE) designed the policy of education related to cooperative learning and the policy prescribed 1-5 team work in cooperative learning as a common method of CL. Therefore, the process of teaching and learning is inclined to be going on in this method.

T-2: Yes. I often use 1-5 team work, group discussions, etc.

T-3: Yes. By arranging their groups into 5 or 6 members of students. By selecting top learners from the class and assigning them as group leaders. Shifting their group members in two or three weeks. I also encourage group members to speak to each other what they feel concerning the topic.

Question - 2

R: *Have you ever participated in seminars or workshops on cooperative learning? If your answer is 'yes', how did you find it to help for making use of CL?*

T-1: No. This is a great problem on implementation of CL in classrooms. There is no continuous seminars or workshops provided for all teachers, which is to be considered by concerning bodies.

T-2: No, I have not. However, if there is training or workshops on this instructional approach, both teachers and students can get more understanding about cooperative learning and they can effectively use it in classrooms.

T-3: Yes. I participated in seminar which was prepared by Wollega University. I found it as it is very useful and informative. Particularly, I have understood as CL is better than individual work. This is because in CL, students learn better as they work together, they can share their experiences to each other, and learn social interactions.

Question – 3

R: That is interesting. *What kinds of problems are there in terms of classroom conditions for the practices of CL?*

T-1: Alright. In terms of classroom conditions for the practices of CL, problems of seating arrangement, and large class size are the wide spread problems that hinder the effective use CL in EFL classes.

T-2: Ok, there are some problems in terms of classroom conditions which make CL not to be carried out effectively or diligently. The students seating arrangement is not suitable for discussion during cooperative activities. In addition, since there are about 80 students in one class, it is inaccessible for the teacher to manage and get around easily.

T-3: Well. Seating arrangement of the classroom is not suitable for cooperative learning. The number of students (large class size) in classes also hinders cooperative learning practices during the lesson.

Question – 4

R: *What challenges or difficulties do you face on the part of the learners during the practices of cooperative activities?*

T-1: Ok, unwillingness of some learners to be in CL learning group and reluctance of the students are the major challenges faced during cooperative activities in English classes.

T-2: There are a lot of challenges during CL activities. These are students' lack of motivation to: (1) be involved in group activities; (2) to speak in English; (3) to immerse themselves in the given tasks to be practiced. Furthermore, students prefer to talk in their own language rather than the target language, English.

T-3: On the part of the learners, the challenges that usually happen in CL are that some students (those who are considered as top learners) show dominance over the students in group work and resistance of most students to participate in cooperative activities are big challenges during the practices of CL.

Question - 5

R: *What difficulties do you have in terms of aiding materials and authentic materials (suggested in student textbook or teacher guide) that promote cooperative activities?*

T-1: Materials which facilitate cooperative learning are not available in classrooms. These materials can be commercial or teacher-prepared materials. For example, computer, language laboratory, audio/video recorder, CD-ROM, etc.

T-2: Ok. The instructional materials that are best useful to facilitate cooperative learning of students are of special significance. For example, for students' listening skill and pronunciation, listening script by audio/video are essentially required. However, these materials are not existing in the school.

T-3: Actually, student's text book and teacher guide are nearly designed in the way to promote CL as the Ministry of Education (MOE) is to enhance this method. However, even students don't come up with their text books. In addition, even though aiding materials and authentic materials are highly important to facilitate CL, they are not available in the school.

Question - 6

R: *What other problems do you face in practicing CL activities? Please add your points if any.*

T-1: The other problems affecting CL practices could be shortage of periods allocated for English per week, and strategy of group composition currently happening is not based on techniques of CL to be employed in classrooms are also additional problems.

T-2: I have no more idea to add.

T-3: I have no other problems in my classroom about cooperative language learning.

R: Thank you in advance for your cooperation.