



ARBAMINCH UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE STUDIES

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE**

**TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS
COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN EFL CLASSES: FIVE
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF CHENA WOREDA IN FOCUS**

BY

ABIOT TEKALIGN

ADVISOR

ABATE D. (PhD)

AMU, ETHIOPIA

JUNE, 2016

TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' ATTITUDE
TOWARDS COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN EFL CLASSES:
FIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF CHENA WOREDA IN
FOCUS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (MA IN TEFL)

BY
ABIOT TEKALIGN

ADVISOR
ABATE D. (PhD)

AMU, ETHIOPIA
JUNE, 2016

Declaration

I, the under signed, declare that the thesis comprises of my own work. In compliance with internationally accepted practices; I have dully acknowledged and referenced all materials used in this work. I understand that non-adherence to the principles of academic honesty and integrity, misinterpretation/fabrication of idea/data/fact/source will constitute sufficient ground for disciplinary action by the university and can also evoke penal action from the sources which have not been properly acknowledged or cited.

Signature

SMA/004/05

JUNE, 2016

APPROVAL PAGE

ARBAMINCH UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF POST GRAGUATE STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS COOPERSTIVE
LEARNING IN EFL CLASSES: FIVE SECONDARY SCHOOS OF CHENA
WORDA IN FOCUS

BY

ABIOT TEKALIGN

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

NAME	SIGNATURE	DATE
1-----	-----	-----
2-----	-----	-----
3-----	-----	-----
4-----	-----	-----
5-----	-----	-----

Acknowledgements

I would like to forward my thanks to all those who assisted and contributed to the successful completion of this study. Without their support, this task could be very tough and it was impossible to reach at the desired goal.

First of all I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Abate Demissie who devoted his time and offered me an invaluable assistance and guidance while I was conducting the study.

My sincere gratitude is also extended to participant EFL teachers and students of the study from the selected five secondary schools. Without their participation, this study would not have been successful.

I am also indebted to my school principals and colleagues for their moral and encouragement. They supported me sharing the work load I had in the academic year.

My special thanks go to w/or Aster Woldegebreal , a secretary at Shishinda secondary school and my partner Mr. Teferi Mulugeta for their willingness to help me in writing, editing and checking formats of the paper.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my wife, Yetimwork Dereje& my son, Natinael Abiot for their understanding my burden and gave me untiring passion.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning at five secondary schools of Chena woreda. In the woreda, there are seven secondary schools. The researcher selected the sample schools through simple random sampling technique. In order to collect data, questionnaire and focus group discussions were used. Besides, EFL teachers and students were participants of the study. Regarding selection of the sample, purposive sampling was used to determine participant teachers. Meanwhile, systematic sampling was used to select the students. Accordingly, 21 teachers and 174 students were included as respondents of the study. With regard to research design, the researcher used descriptive survey. This method was preferably used to collect information from various participants. Moreover, to analyze data, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed. The study showed that both teachers and students had positive attitude towards cooperative learning. It was also found that there was an attitudinal link between teachers and students. Issues that were identified as hurdles to implement cooperative learning were commonly shared by both teachers and students. Based on the above findings, there were some recommendations forwarded. These were: there were some teachers who were not motivated to teach through cooperative learning. Therefore, concerned bodies like woreda education office along with supervisors should prepare trainings to provide these teachers with potential benefits of CL.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	VII
List of Tables	X
Abbreviations	XI
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2Statement of the Problem	3
1.3.1. General objective	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	6
1.4 Research questions	6
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.7 Limitation of the study	7
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	8
2.1 Definition and Concept of Cooperative Learning	8
2.2. Theoretical perspectives on Cooperative Learning	10
2.3. Essential Elements of Cooperative Learning.....	12
2.3.1. Positive Interdependence	12
2.3.2 Individual Accountability	13
2.3.3 Face to Face Promotive Interaction	13
2.3.4 Social Skills	14
2.3.5 Group Processing	14
2.4. Values of Cooperative Learning	15
2.5. Benefits of Cooperative Learning	17
2.5.1. Enhance Creativity	17
2.5.2 Psychological Benefits.....	18
2.5.3. The Social Benefit.....	18
2.5.4. Benefits for Teachers	18
2.6. Limitations of Cooperative Learning	19

2.7. Types of Cooperative Learning	21
2.7.1. Formal Cooperative Learning Groups	21
2.7.2. Informal Cooperative Learning Groups	21
2.7.3. Cooperative Base Groups.....	22
2.9. Characteristics of Cooperative Learning.....	24
2.9.1. Heterogeneity and Group Size	24
2.9.2 Assigning Roles	25
2.9.3. Sufficient Time	25
2.9.4 Clear Instructions	25
2.9.5 Clear Set of Specific Objectives	26
2.10 Attitude in Cooperative Learning Context	26
2.10.1 Definition and Concept about Attitude	26
2.10.2 Components of Attitude	27
2.10. 4. Forming and Changing Attitudes	28
2.10.6 Attitudes and Judgments	29
2.11 Previous Studies on Attitudes towards CL	30
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	34
3.1. Research Design.....	34
3.2. The Setting and Participants of the Study	34
3.2.1. The School and Grade.....	34
3.2.2. Teachers	34
3.2.3. Students.....	34
3.3. Data Gathering Tools	35
3.3.1. Questionnaire	35
3.3.1.1. Questionnaire for teachers	35
3.4 Pilot Testing	36
3.5. Data Organization and Analysis Procedures	37
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	38
4.1. Teachers' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning.....	38
4.2 Students' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning	42

4.3.1. Results of Teachers’ and Students’ Focus Group Discussion.....	48
APPENDICES	67
Appendix- B: Students’ Questionnaire	71
Appendix-C Focus Group Discussion Lead Questions for Teachers	73
Appendix-D: Focus Group Discussion Lead Questions for Students.....	74
Appendix- E Students’ Questionnaire in Amharic version	75
Appendix F: Students’ Questions for Focus Group Discussion in Amharic Version ..	77

List of Tables

Table 4.1	Distribution of teachers' attitude towards CL.....	44
Table 4.2	students' participation on cooperative learning.....	48
Table 4.6	Area/s where to participate in cooperative activities /assignment.....	48
Table 4.7	Typical group size of students.....	49
Table 4. 8	Distribution of values of cooperative learning and students' attitude.....	49

Abbreviations

CL: Cooperative Learning

ELT: English language Teaching

EFL: English as a foreign language

SNNP: South nation's nationalist people

STAD: Student Teams Achievement Division

TGT Student – Games- Tournaments

GI: Group Investigation

FGD: Focus Group Discussion

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Nowadays teaching English as a foreign language is becoming quite challenging. This is because majority of the students in secondary schools neither speak nor listen to English properly. The magnitude of this problem is very high in the areas where especially students' exposure to the language is restricted to the class room instruction. Therefore, cooperative learning is one of the strategies that communicative approach encompasses to create conducive environment to develop students' communicative competence. It requires the active involvement of students in the learning process. Moreover, language teachers are expected to play the role of facilitating the students' cooperation to share their experiences and develop the spirit of working together for the common goal.

Cooperative learning is believed to have a number of benefits in bringing about behavioral changes of the students. For example, learners become more confident in their learning, share duties to learn effectively and develop the sense of learner autonomy.

In line with this, Iyer (2013:2) states that "Cooperative learning can serve as one powerful tool in creating effective inclusive classrooms of diverse learners. Cooperative learning promotes greater efforts to achieve, more positive relationships, and greater psychological health than competitive and individualistic learning." This strategy also needs good school setting especially facilities that are supposed to be found adequately in the class room. For instance, seats, size of the class, manageable number of students, etc.

Furthermore, Johnson& Johnson (2009) added that cooperative learning promotes a situation in which students work together in small groups to maximize the learning of all members, sharing their resources, providing mutual support, and celebrating their joint success.

One of the greatest changes in foreign language pedagogy has been the shift from a teacher centered learning model to a learner-centered model. This shift signals a new era in which English language instruction must give a chance for students to express themselves in speaking the language. A promising method to traditional speaking

instruction is cooperative learning. It serves as an alternative way of teaching for promoting speaking and social interaction among students (Gomleksiz, 2007 cited in Atta Mimi, 2014).

Moreover, in educational settings teachers' and students' attitude determines the benefits of cooperative learning. As to Rani (2000) the study of attitude has been an important area of interest for psychologists. Educators have been interested in attitudes because of their possible impact on learning; they have long been considered an important component of positive educational outcomes. Attitudes are closely related to our beliefs and are based upon experiences. Thus, it is believed that effective language teaching strategies can encourage students to hold more positive attitudes towards the learning process in general and learning EFL in particular (Rani, 2000).

Similarly, it is viewed that a positive attitude towards cooperative learning facilitates foreign language learning while a negative attitude acts as a psychological barrier. Thus, attitudes ranging through negative, neutral, and positive states, determine a student's success or failure in his or her learning. This highlights the important role that a positive attitude towards the language being learned plays in learning a second/foreign language. In other words, maintaining positive or negative feelings towards a language may increase the ease or difficulty of learning, respectively (Dornyei & Csizer, 2002).

Thus, developing teachers' and students' attitudes towards cooperative learning is believed to be one of the important issues that should be considered when discussing about the hindrances for implementation of cooperative learning. This is because they are believed to be the main stake holders to apply the strategy in the class room. Besides, teachers and students in the secondary schools of the research setting were supposed to implement the strategy. However, the manner of implementation was not found on the way it could bring about improvement on the students' communicative competence.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The ultimate goal of language learning/teaching is for the purpose of interaction. For instance, in the school setting an act of interaction takes place between teachers and learners or among the learners themselves. Classroom interaction can be made through pair and group works. Thus, among the approaches that require classroom interaction, cooperative learning plays an indispensable role to practice the target language. Besides, forming the class to cooperative learning possibly changes the role of teachers from traditional method of teaching EFL to communicative approach.

Cooperative learning is one of the aspects of communicative approach where both teachers' and students' active involvement is needed. Although it has been a long time since the concept of communicative approach was introduced, large number of students in the secondary schools and higher institutions of Ethiopia is not good at communicating in English. This could be understood from studies that have been conducted on the area of CLT in the country.

Students in secondary schools could not make use of this strategy effectively. The researcher noticed this from the work experience he got and the conversation he made with secondary school teachers. The issues that contributed negatively for the implementation of cooperative learning should be identified and immediate intervention has to be made.

For this reason, studies have been conducted to come up with certain solutions to this challenge. Issues related to cooperative learning have been studied by both international and local researchers.

Among international studies, Suhendan and Bengu (2014) wanted to make an investigation on the university ELT students' attitudes towards cooperative learning through the descriptive research method. The findings of study indicated that most students preferred studying in cooperative learning environments to working individually.

Similarly, Farzaneh & Nejadansari (2014) conducted research to evaluate the students' attitude towards the cooperative learning through descriptive survey-based design. Thus, the results of this study indicated that the participants held generally a positive view of the implementation of cooperative strategies in teaching and learning context.

Besides, Liang (2002) conducted a research to investigate the effects of cooperative learning on EFL junior high school learners' language learning by using quasi-experimental research design. Therefore, the study suggested that cooperative learning helped significantly to enhance the junior high school learners' oral communicative competence and their motivation toward learning English.

Hijazi & Al-Natour (2012) wanted to investigate teachers' attitudes towards using cooperative learning for teaching English language in Jordanian schools. The researchers used experimental research method. The finding showed that there were statistically significant differences in the post-test between the control and experimental groups in favor of the experimental group and there were statistically significant differences in teachers' attitudes due to experience variable and educational level variable.

McLeish (2009) conducted research to determine the attitudes of students towards cooperative learning by employing descriptive research method. Thus, the finding indicated that students preferred to work on their own rather than within group due to various fears.

On the other hand, among the local researchers, Seid (2012) for instance, conducted a research to investigate the effects of cooperative learning on reading comprehension. He used an experimental research method for his purpose. Thus, the study revealed that students' achievement got better in reading comprehension when they were engaged in cooperative learning.

In addition, Berhanu (2013) conducted research to describe the knowledge, attitude and practice of teachers towards cooperative learning. The researcher used descriptive survey method. The study revealed that teachers did not know what cooperative learning really is, and it was found that teachers seemed to have a favorable attitude towards cooperative learning.

On the contrary, Muhammad (2012) conducted a research to investigate the current practice of cooperative learning using a descriptive survey method. The study showed that the current awareness of instructors and students towards cooperative learning in Haromaya University were not up to the expectation.

Implementing cooperative learning as a strategy to learn English as a foreign language in Ethiopia is encountering different views. There are some stake holders in the schools who have positive outlook and still there are some who blame this approach. But, what makes them similar is that they are forwarding their views intuitively. It is believed that problems related to cooperative learning were not properly investigated in Ethiopia.

Although the researcher's issue is somewhat related to certain international studies that are indicated above, the contexts where those researchers were found are absolutely different from the situation where this research has been conducted. Obviously different countries could be different politically (educational policy and philosophy), economically and socially. Thus, the findings and generalization those international researchers have made, cannot represent this study at all. Furthermore, some local works are experimental; some are on teachers/students and did not focus on both and/or did not show the link between teachers and students attitude towards cooperative learning.

There were a number of issues to be studied about cooperative learning. The researcher confirmed this from his work experience, the discussions he made with colleagues and the research reviews he made. Unless a research that scrutinizes the attitudes of teachers and students is conducted, the philosophy behind cooperative learning will lose its goal in many secondary schools of Ethiopia. Because it is the attitude that one has got to determine his/her activity. This study is, therefore, to investigate teachers' and students' attitudes towards cooperative learning in English classes at secondary schools of Chena woreda in 2008 academic year. This is because without making distinction between characteristics of sub-skills of language(productive or receptive) that is to be facilitated more preferably in CL and without considering the concept of learning styles, students in the secondary schools of the study area are supposed to learn through CL.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General objective

The main objective of this study is to investigate teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

More specifically, this study is intended to:-

1. Examine teachers' attitudes towards cooperative learning.
2. Examine students' attitudes towards cooperative learning.
3. Find out the links between teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning.

1.4 Research questions

In order to achieve the above stated objectives, the following questions are designed. These are:-

1. What is teachers' attitude towards cooperative learning?
2. What is students' attitude towards cooperative learning?
3. Are there any links between teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative base groups learning?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The finding of this study could basically benefit both teachers and students. They could identify certain issues that influence their attitude either positively or negatively towards cooperative learning. Besides, it could create awareness on various stake holders to play their significant roles to establish conducive environment for the strategy.

The finding possibly initiates material developers to pay attention to activities that create interest for both teachers and students to facilitate cooperative learning. It could also help the policy makers to take in to account students' learning styles and differences in the class room. So, they willingly participate in the discussions and develop positive outlook

for the strategy. Besides, the upcoming researchers could find source to conduct further study on related issues.

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

The primary aim of this study was to investigate EFL teachers' and sample grade 9 and 10 students' attitudes towards cooperative base groups learning in English class rooms. The local researchers explored the effectiveness of cooperative learning. But, this study investigated the attitudes of teachers and students that could hinder or facilitate the implementation of cooperative learning. Because the researcher believes that before talking about the effects of something, it is better to know the source of a problem that helps to arrive at possible conclusion. Thus, the researcher found it worth to conduct research on this title

The study was bounded in SNNP- Kafa Zone- in Chena Woreda at five secondary schools namely Shishinda, Chena, Wareta, Kulush and Kutashora in 2008 academic year because the researcher has been working in this area for several years. So, he could not encounter difficulties in getting access to relevant information to conduct the study.

1.7 Limitation of the study

This study got some limitations. The sample size of the study was restricted to only 21EFL teachers and 174 students selected from five secondary schools of the same woreda. The study was limited to a small number of general secondary education teachers and students. So, it was hard to generalize the results to all educational settings. This is because the researcher had time and financial constraints at least to expand the study at the Zone level.

1.8. Definitions of Terms

Attitude: -a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favors or disfavors (Eagly and Chai ken 1993).

Cooperative: - working together towards a shared goal rather than competing or working separately from their peers (Sal end, 1994).

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Definition and Concept of Cooperative Learning

Various definitions have been given so far by researchers on the concept of cooperative learning. As to Slavin (1995) cooperative learning refers to instructional methods in which teachers organize the students in to small groups, which then work together to help one another to learn an academic content. The other definition comes from Johnson and Johnson (2000) that cooperative learning is generic term that refers to numerous methods for organizing and conducting classroom instruction. Besides, they stated that cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning. Parkay & Standford (2007) also defined cooperative learning as an approach to teaching in which students work in small groups or teams to share the work and help one another to complete the tasks. In addition, Christison (1994) stated that cooperative learning can be defined as a strategy for the class room that is used to increase motivation and retention to help students develop a positive image of self and others, to provide a vehicle for critical thinking and problem-solving, and to encourage collaborative social skills. Salend (1994) also stated that cooperative learning refers to a method for organizing learning, in which students work with their peers towards a shared academic goal rather than competing or working separately from their peers.

Though different writers defined cooperative learning differently, there are certain similar concepts in their definitions. So, what makes these definitions almost similar is that the idea of working in team and an effort to be made for achieving the predetermined goals.

The concept of cooperative learning triggered a number of scholars to conduct studies. Johnson, Johnson and Manson, (2012) noticed cooperative learning as a new paradigm of teaching that involves creating the conditions under which students can actively discover and construct their own knowledge, having students work together cooperatively to do as learning is a social process, creating personal relationships among students, developing the competencies and talents of all students, and motivating students through intrinsic goals.

Similarly, Eslamian and Aref (2012) considered cooperative learning as a new approach in educational practice. The central idea underlying cooperative learning is involvement, which basically means that learners form a kind of mutual help group, and work independently to achieve a common goal of learning. Likewise, Hijazi and Al-Natour (2012) said that cooperative learning is a learning style where students group together to accomplish significant cooperative tasks. It is a learning style where students are likely to attain higher levels of achievement, to increase time on task, to build cross-ethnic friendships, to experience enhanced self-esteem, to build a life-long interaction and communication skills. Similar to this idea Cheong (2010) said that in cooperative learning, the development of interpersonal skills is as important as the learning itself. The development of social skills in group work-learning is a key to high quality group work. Many cooperative learning tasks are put to students with both academic and social skills objectives.

Furthermore, cooperative learning is compared with competitive or individualistic learning. Competition was practically understood as the existence of negative objective or reward interdependence. Participants work alone or with a minimum of interaction and rewards were given on a norm-referenced basis or by ranking participants from best to worst. All studies in this area focused on competition between group members, not competition among groups. Individualistic efforts are practically seen as the shortage of social interdependence among participants. Participants work alone or with a minimum of interaction and rewards are given according to the pre-set criteria; therefore, there is little opportunity for social comparison. When the control condition is labeled as traditional instruction, the condition is coded as either competitive or individualistic depending on the descriptive of the condition (Johnson, Johnson and Stanne, 2000).

In line with this, Slavin (1995) said that cooperative learning methods vary widely in their details. Group sizes may be from two to several. Group members may have individual roles or tasks, or they may all have the same task. Groups may be evaluated or rewarded based on group performance or the average of individual performances or they may simply be asked to work together.

Thus, competition can only benefit individuals. But, cooperation benefits both an individual and group members that could bring about a great deal of development for a community in particular

and for a country in general. A good Ethiopian proverb to strengthen this idea is” a thread in harmony ties a lion”.

Researchers have identified the four major perspectives to the features of cooperative learning. (Slavin, 1995; Cohen, 1986; Slavin, Hurley, & Chamberlin, 2004; Damon, 1984)

2.2. Theoretical perspectives on Cooperative Learning

The first perspective is motivational. It presumes that task motivation is the single most impactful part of the learning process, asserting that the other processes such as planning and helping are driven by individuals’ motivated self- interest. Motivational- oriented scholars focus more on the reward or goal structure under which students operate, even going so far as to suggest that under some circumstances, interaction may not be necessary for the benefits of cooperative goal structures to manifest. Furthermore, cooperative incentive structures create a situation in which the only way group members can attain their own personal goals is if the group is successful. Therefore, to meet their personal goals, group members must both help their group mates to do whatever enables the group to succeed, and perhaps every more importantly, to encourage their group mates to exert maximum efforts. In other wards rewarding groups based on group performance creates an interpersonal reward structure in which group members will give or withhold social reinforces (Slavin, 1995).

The second perspective to cooperative learning is social cohesion perspective. This is somewhat related to the motivational view point holds that the effects of cooperative learning on achievement are strongly mediated by the cohesiveness of the group (Slavin, Hurley, & Chamberlin, 2004). The quality of the groups’ interactions is thought to be largely determined by group cohesion. In essence students will engage in the task and help one another learn because they identify with the group and want one another to succeed. This perspective is similar to the motivational perspective in that it emphasizes primarily motivational rather than cognitive explanations for the instructional effectiveness of cooperative learning. The motivational perspective emphasizes primarily on motivation rather than cognitive explanations for the instructional effectiveness of cooperative learning. However, motivational theorists hold that students help their group mates learn primarily because it is in their own interests to do so. Social cohesion theorists, in contrast, emphasize the idea that students help their group mates learn because they care about the group (Slavin et al. 2004). The entire mark of the social cohesion

perspective is an emphasis on teambuilding activities in preparation for cooperative learning, and processing or group self-evaluation. Social cohesion theorists have historically tended to downplay or reject the group incentives and individual accountability held by motivational researchers to be essential. They emphasize instead, that the effects of cooperative learning on student achievement depend substantially on the quality of the groups' interaction. With regard to this, if the task is challenging & interesting, and if students are sufficiently prepared for skills in group processing, they will experience the process of group work as highly rewarding (Cohen, 1986).

Cognitive perspective is the third theoretical feature of cooperative learning. It holds that interactions among students themselves increase student achievement for reasons which have to do with mental processing of information rather than with motivations. Cooperative methods developed by cognitive theorists involve neither the group goals that are the cornerstone of the motivational methods nor the emphasis on building group cohesiveness characteristics of the social cohesion methods. However, there are several quite different cognitive perspectives, as well as some similar in theoretical perspectives (Slavin et al., 2004).

The final theoretical perspective to cooperative learning is developmental perspective. According to Slavin (1995) the fundamental assumption of the developmental perspective on cooperative learning is that interaction among children around appropriate tasks increase, their mastery of critical concepts. In this view, cooperative activities among children promote growth because children of similar ages are likely to be operating within one another's proximal zones of development. Modeling in the cooperative group behaviors more advanced than those they could perform as individuals. Besides, from the developmental perspective, the effects of cooperative learning on students' achievement would be largely or entirely due to the use of cooperative tasks. The use of extrinsic incentives as part of the group learning situation arguing that there is no compelling reason to believe that such influences are important ingredients in peer learning. In this view, opportunities for students to discuss, to argue, and to present and hear one another's viewpoints are the critical element of cooperative learning with respect to students' achievement (Damon, 1984).

To sum up, the stated four perspectives have some sort of interrelated nature. When cooperative learning is undertaken, members in the group need to have motivation for team work that is driven and concluded by predetermined goals. It is again true that cooperative learning requires

the group mates to harmonize themselves for social cohesion. They have to work very jointly to attain the primarily set goals. And they have to realize those goals are reached if and only if they work cooperatively. Furthermore, group mates should be rich mentally or cognitively to play their contribution in the team. Members of the team are expected to come up with prerequisite skills for an effective interaction in the cooperative learning. The developmental perspective shows the progress that every group member makes timely. I think it is the development or progress that can be the main reinforcement to determine the group members' motivation for further active participation in the cooperative learning.

2.3. Essential Elements of Cooperative Learning

Academic learning success for each individual and all members of the group is one feature that separates cooperative learning groups from other group tasks (Slavin,1990).In order for lesson to be cooperative, five basic elements are essential and need to be included (Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Johnson , Johnson & Holubec, 1993;Joliffe,2007; Putnam,1997 & Stahl,1994). The five essential elements are positive interdependence, individual accountability, face to face promotive interaction, social skills and group processing.

2.3.1. Positive Interdependence

It is the perception that one is linked with others in a way so that there is no success unless everybody does, that is common benefit is there for every member of the group. It promotes a situation in which students work together in small groups to maximize the learning of all members sharing their resources. Providing mutual support, and celebrating their joint success. Positive interdependence is the heart of cooperative learning. Students most believe that they “sink or swim together” (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1998:4). Within every cooperative lesson positive goal interdependence must be established through mutual learning goals (learn the assigned material and make sure that all members of your group learn the same materials) in order to strengthen the positive interdependence, joint rewards are available for the members under cooperative learning and divided resources (giving each group member apart of the total information required to complete an assignment). Besides, contemporary roles (reader, checker, encourager, elaborator) may also be used for a learning situation to be cooperative students must perceive that they are positively interdependent with other members of their learning group. It is positive interdependence that creates the overall super ordinate goals that unite diverse students in to common effort. It also results in a joint super ordinate identity. Students need to develop a

unique identity and a social identity. Among other things on their ethnic, historical and cultural background and a superordinate identity that unites them with all the other members of their society. At the same time they need to understand the social identity of classmates and respect them as collaborators and friends. It is positive interdependence, furthermore, that underlies a common culture that defines the values and nature of the society in which the students live. Having developed the spirit of positive interdependence, pupils are required to strengthen their unity to struggle for a common goal (Joliffe, 2007). Likewise cooperative learning is a pedagogical method that students learn on their own through explaining the subject matter to others and learning from others (Riley and Anderson, 2006).

2.3.2 Individual Accountability

Individual accountability means that each member of the group is accountable for completing his or her part of the work. It is important that no one can ‘hitchhike’ on the work of others, and it requires each person in the group to develop a sense of personal responsibility to learn and to help the rest of the group (Joliffe, 2007). To ensure that group members accept the shared responsibility of contributing towards achieving their goal, individual accountability will increase members’ awareness of their positive interdependence. Individual accountability exists when the performance of individual students is assessed and the results are given back to the group and the individual in order to ascertain who needs more assistance and encouragement (Slavin, 1996). Besides, the result not only affects the student but the group also. The student should know that without doing anything individually, he/she cannot achieve any goal. The group’s one of the main aims is to strengthen each member (Gillies, 2007). Therefore, cooperative learning empowers individual responsibility (Cruickshank, Bainer and Metcalf, 1999; Gillies, 2007; Yi and Luxi, 2012). The reasons why teachers put students in to cooperative learning is to enable all students achieve higher academic success than where they are supposed to study alone. Consequently, each student must be held individually responsible and accountable for doing his or her own share of the work and for learning what has been targeted to be learned (Stahl, 1994).

2.3.3 Face to Face Promotive Interaction

Once teachers establish positive interdependence, they need to maximize the opportunity for students to promote each other’s success by helping, encouraging and praising each other’s efforts to learn. There are cognitive activities and interpersonal dynamics that only occur when

students get involved in promoting each other's learning. This includes orally explaining how to solve problems, discussing the nature of the concepts being learned, teaching one's knowledge to the class mates and connecting present with past learning. Accountability to peers, ability to influence each other's reasoning and conclusions, social modeling, social support and interpersonal rewards all increase as the face to face interaction among group members increase. In addition, the verbal and non-verbal responses of other group members provide important information concerning students' performance. Silent students do not actively participate in the interaction promoting each other's success results in both higher achievement and in getting to know each other on a personal as well as professional level. To obtain meaningful face to face interaction the size of groups needs to be small (2 to 4 members). Finally, while positive interdependence creates the conditions for working together, it is the actual face to face interaction in which students work together and promote each other's success that the personal relationships are formed that are essential for developing multiple values (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

2.3.4 Social Skills

Contributing to the success of a cooperative effort requires interpersonal and small group skills. Placing socially unskilled individuals in a group and telling them to cooperate does not guarantee that they will be able to do so effectively. Learners must be taught the social skills for high quality cooperation and be motivated to use them. Leadership, decision making, trust-building, communication, and conflict management skills have to be taught just as purposefully and precisely as academic skills. Finally, social skills are required for interacting effectively with peers from other cultures and ethnic groups (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 1991; Stahl, 1994; Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1998).

2.3.5 Group Processing

Group processing exists when group members discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintain effective working relationships. While working in groups, the students meet each other and rely on each other. They improve their communication skills. They are aware of individual differences so they accept this and they support each other. They find constructive solutions to problems. Through developing good relationships and supporting each other, cooperative learning also leads to increase school success, improve higher order of thinking skills, develop self-esteem, grow a positive attitude towards school, courses and gain social skills

(Cohen, 1994; Slavin, 1996; Wang, 2012). Groups need to describe what member actions are helpful and unhelpful and make decisions about what behaviors to continue or change students must also be given the time and procedures for analyzing how well their learning groups are functioning and the extent to which students are employing their social skills to help all group members to achieve and to maintain effective working relationship within the group. When difficulties in relating to each other arise, students must engage in group processing and identity, define and solve the problems they are having in working together effectively. In order to effectively use cooperative learning, teachers must understand the nature of cooperation and the essential components of a well-structured cooperative lesson. Understanding what positive interdependence promote interaction, individual accountability, social skills and group processing are, and developing skills in structuring them, allow teachers to adapt cooperative learning to their unique circumstances, needs students and make clear to use of cooperative learning to solve problems that students are having the state of working together (Johnson & Johnson, 1998). Similarly, it has been mentioned that as students engaged in cooperative activities, they are encouraged to reflect on how well they are achieving the group goal. They also consider how they functioned as a team focusing on their success as well as areas that need improvements. It is highly recommended that teachers should provide students with feedback on functioning of the groups. Students and teachers together build understanding about why groups function well and why they struggle and sometimes fail (Putnam, 1997). Besides, students learn better when they work together rather in isolation; there is also an improvement in their social skills since it forces them to practice team and small group communication skills (Mourtos, 1997).

2.4. Values of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students together to maximize their own and each other are learning (Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec, 1993). Within cooperative learning students are given two responsibilities to learn the assigned material and make sure that all other members of their groups do participate. In cooperative learning situations, students perceive that they can reach their learning goals only if the other students in the learning group also do so. According to Johnson, et al., (1993) the values inherent in cooperative efforts are:-

1. Commitment to the common goal. In cooperative situation, individuals' work contributes not only to their own well-being, but also to the well-being of all other collaborators. There is a built in concern for the common good and the success of others, as the efforts of others also contribute to the one's own well-being.
2. Success depends on the joint efforts of every one to achieve individual goals. Since cooperators "sink or swim together" an "all for one and one for all" mentality is appropriate. What is valued is team work and civic responsibility. Succeeding depends on every one doing his or her part. Cooperative teaches the value of working together to achieve mutual goals.
3. Facilitating, promoting and encouraging the success of others is a natural way of life. Succeeding depends on everyone doing well. There are two ways to succeed in contributing all one can do the joint effort and promoting other cooperators' efforts to contribute. A smart cooperator will always find ways to promote facilitate and encourage the efforts of others.
4. The pleasure of succeeding is associated with others' happiness in their success. Cooperators feel great about other people succeeding. When someone succeeds, it is a source of pleasure and happiness because it means that one's help and assistance is important.
5. Other people are potential contributors to one's success. Because smart cooperators will promote and facilitate the work of others. Cooperators are to trust because their efforts to succeed will promote one's own success. Cooperation joins school mates as allies, colleagues and friends who will contribute to one's success.
6. Other people's worth is unconditional. Because there are so many diverse ways that a person may contribute to a joint efforts that everyone has a value all the time. This inherent value is confirmed by working for the success of all. Cooperation places a value a wide range of diverse qualities that facilitate joint success.
7. Self-worth is unconditional- cooperation teaches that self-worth results from contributing whatever resources one has to the joint effort and common good. A person never loses value. Cooperative experiences result in individuals believe in themselves and their worth.
8. Cooperatives value an intrinsic motivation based on striving to learn, grow, develop and succeed. Learning is the goal, not winning. The inducement of the trying to contribute to

the common good, like other intrinsic motivators, increases students' interest in the task itself.

2.5. Benefits of Cooperative Learning

Researchers and education specialists forwarded the view that students learning can be maximized, thus academic performance improved, by developing a sense of team spirit for a common success (Akhtar, Kiran, Rashid & Satti, 2012). When the class room is structured in a way that allows students to work cooperatively on learning tasks, students benefit academically as well as socially. Learners in cooperative learning groups can discuss, debate and clarify their understanding of the concepts and materials being considered during the class and can help one another master the basic facts necessary for computational procedures. The intent of cooperative work is to enhance the academic achievement of students by providing them with increased opportunity for discussion, for learning from each other, and for encouraging each other for better achievement (Slavin & Cooper, 1999). According to Dunn, Beaudry & Klavas (1989), students learn more when they study in their preferred setting and manner. A preferred particular style may not always guarantee that it is the most effective. Sometimes students prefer the easy or the comfortable way. Some may choose a way because he/she has no other alternatives. They may benefit from developing new and more effective ways to learn (Woolfolk, Winne and Perry, 2012). On the contrary, numerous research studies advocate that cooperative learning leads to higher academic success than individual or competitive approaches (Hornby, 2009; Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2012). Several researches done in the field of ELT show that learning English reading through cooperative learning have higher achievement scores than other approaches (Seetape, 2003; Tang, 2000; Wichadee, 2005).

The major benefits of cooperative learning are identified. These are:

2.5.1. Enhance Creativity

Cooperative learning promotes creative thinking by increasing the number of ideas, quality of ideas, feelings of stimulation and enjoyment, and originality of expression in creative problem solving. It is not surprising that students are triggered by the ideas of others and different perspectives cause group members to consider a large number of alternatives. The cooperative relationship also provides a context to consider and appreciate other group members' ideas instead of ignoring or trying to come up with a better one (Johnson and Johnson, 2009). Besides, Chanchalor & Chomputong (2004) in their study found that more hands on activities such as

problem based learning actually increased student participation encouraged. When CL is successfully practiced, it creates a considerable equity in a group. When striving to teach students to create, monitor and evaluate the equity in their CL, teachers enable them how to begin to create a just society. Thus, Cooperation is humanity's strongest asset and hope. Cooperative learning has been widely utilized by teachers from all subjects (Cohen, Brody &Shevi, 2004).

2.5.2 Psychological Benefits

Cooperative learning helps to develop the interpersonal relationships among learners. The opportunity to discuss their ideas in smaller groups and receive constructive feedback on those ideas helps to build learners self- esteem. In a while class format, learners are called up on to respond to a question in front of the entire class without having much time to think about their answer. Cooperative learning creates a safe, nurturing environment because solutions come from the group rather than from the individual. Errors are corrected in the group before they are presented to the class (Isaacs, 2008).

2.5.3. The Social Benefit

One of the most valuable users of cooperative learning is to teach social and interpersonal skills. Cooperative leaning teams provide a safe, intimate atmosphere where social skills are modeled by other group members. It is a place where students can practice new skills (Johnson &Johnson, 2009). Learners in cooperative learning tend to become tolerant of diverse viewpoints, to consider other's thoughts and feelings in depth, and seek more support and clarification of others' positions (Stahl, 1994). Likewise it is stated that CL is a great tool that can be used to improve students' achievement in any classroom. It also fosters tolerance and acceptance in the community, which improves quality of everybody's life. Multiple researches have shown that CL strategies can be utilized to promote deeper understanding. Educators can use various strategies of CL along with their instructional techniques to enhance learning in a classroom. This results in higher student achievement (Cohen et al., 2004).

2.5.4. Benefits for Teachers

During cooperative learning both teachers and students can assume responsibility for evaluating the skills and contributions of group members. While students are engaging in group activities, teachers often collect and share information on how groups are functioning in regard to the

academic and social aspects of the lesson. This information is shared with the groups during and after the lesson. Direct follow up and encouraging participation are valuable tools for teachers who are concerned about a learner's performance in a specific area (Isaacs, 2008). Likewise the proven benefits of CL notwithstanding, teachers who attempt it frequently encounter resistance and sometimes open hostility from the students. Bright students are discounted or ignored in group sessions; and resentments build when some team members fail to pull their weight. Knowledgeable and patient teachers find ways to deal with these problems, but others become discouraged and revert to the traditional teacher-centered instructional paradigm, which is a loss both for them and for the students (Felder & Brent, 2007).

In conclusion, from the above benefits of cooperative learning stated by different scholars, learners are expected to achieve the specific objectives that are set to be gained right after the completion of every content. These are cognitive, affective and psychomotor. The objectives and benefits of cooperative learning should reach the students before they start to discuss certain contents in their groups. In addition, creating awareness on the benefits of cooperative learning leads the students to achieve greater motivation and higher level of self-esteem.

2.6. Limitations of Cooperative Learning

The previous sections have shown certain advantages of CL for language class room. Besides, it has been stated that this approach has got good acceptance and recommendation. However, like the other teaching methods, there are various scientifically tested limitations of CL.

The first limitation of CL comes from not being able to implement the cooperative structure carefully. If the teachers just put the students in to groups to learn and did not structure the positive interdependence and individual accountability, then it would not be unusual to find groups where one person did most or all of the work and the others become idle as if they had learnt it or had done the work. Or, it may be easy to have a "bossy" student who did not allow the others to take part; or other group dynamic problems that might come from not setting the ground rules for behavior and carefully structuring the group dynamics. Furthermore, it was considered to teach materials in a cooperative way, although more students might have learnt and retained better of the material, as suggested in learning philosophy. This might be true, especially in the beginning when CL was new to the teacher and to the students (Kagan, 1995).

The second limitation as to Turco and Elliot (1990) is that the educational rationale for CL techniques tended to develop more from socialization needs than from achievement needs. Several possible advantages might emerge from this perspective. First of all, there was an inherent danger for low- achievers to be underestimated by high achievers if they have nothing or little to contribute (Slavn, Sharan, Hertz, Webb & Schmuck (1985). Secondly, some of the cooperative learning strategies, like STAD, TGT, and Jigsaw seemed to ignore the importance of individual education (Turco&Elliott, 1990). Thirdly, as Pigot, Pantuzzo, and Clement (1986) pointed out that, the group contingencies might cause peer pressures that could be either facilitative or detrimental. In line with this, Carroll (1994) reported in his study that a significant number of the students at school had negative responses to CL. So, these respondents were reluctant to talk over personal ideas with their peers for fear that other students might little of their opinions. Moreover, McClure (1990) also reported unsuccessful experience in group work in secondary English class. In the class, the students felt uncomfortable being judged by their peers.

The next limitation of CL lied in the differences of opinion regarding encouraging conflict or achieving consensus among group members (Tsai, 1998). There was an underlying establishment in cooperative learning to encourage consensus and there by arousing unnecessary peer pressure to suppress individual differences and comply with the decisions of the group (Dipardo& Freeman, 1988). Similarly, it is stated that the challenge faced in cooperative and collaborative learning is group conflict. Students need to learn to work together. It is not always something that comes naturally. Also, teachers who have not previously used cooperative or collaborative learning might also need to get used to the noise level in the class room, which is raised during these activities. Some teachers may also feel that CL takes too much planning time and might also take longer to cover the required portion of the curriculum. With all these challenges studies have shown that once teacher starts to use this tool, they continue to use it and make it the foundation for their teaching. One fear that many teachers have about CL is that when students' are affected by the achievement of their group mates, the students believe that the grading practices are unfair. When positive interdependence is structured within learning groups, achievement is greater than when students work on their own (Hwong, Caswell, Johnson &Johnson, 1993).

Lastly, some teachers might experience frustration and open hostility from their students. For example, bright students complained about being discounted or ignored in group sessions, and resentments build when some team members failed to pull their weight. Instructors with sufficient patience generally found ways to deal with these problems, but others became discouraged and reverted to the traditional teacher-centered instructional paradigm, which was loss both for them and for their students (Kagan, 1991; Sapon-Shevin, 1991).

To wind up, the above stated limitations of CL can be handled and reduced to normal circumstances if the major participants like teachers and students have developed good awareness before implementing the CL. Moreover, scientifically tested benefits of the strategy and good experiences of various educational settings can be taken and scaled up for the others to implement cooperative learning effectively.

2.7. Types of Cooperative Learning

The three types of Cooperative groups identified by Johnson & Johnson (1990, 1998) are formal cooperative learning groups, informal cooperative groups, and base groups. Features of each type of cooperative learning are presented as follows.

2.7.1. Formal Cooperative Learning Groups

Formal cooperative learning groups last from one class period to several weeks or to several class sessions to complete a specific task or assignment. Teachers can plan and structure any academic assignment or course requirement for formal cooperative learning. The heart of formal CL groups is to “ensure that students are actively involved in the intellectual work of organizing materials, explaining it, summarizing it, and integrating it in to existing conceptual structures” (Johnson, Johnson& Holubec,1998).

2.7.2. Informal Cooperative Learning Groups

Informal cooperative learning groups are temporary, ad hoc groups that last only for one discussion or one period whose purposes are to focus students’ attention on the material to be learnt, set a mood to conduct learning (Johnson et al ,1998). They mentioned that teachers can use them during direct teaching (lectures, demonstrations, films & videos) to focus students’ attention on the material they are to learn, help and set expectations as to what class to cover,

ensure that students cognitively process the material the teacher is teaching and providing closure to an instructional session.

2.7.3. Cooperative Base Groups

Cooperative base groups are long term heterogeneous, cooperative learning groups with a stable membership whose primary responsibility is to provide support, encouragement, and assistance in making educational progress. Base groups provide students with long term committed relationships. Base groups meet formally to discuss academic progress of each member and informally they communicate everyday within and between classes, discussing assignments, and helping each other with homework (Johnson et al., 1998). The three types of cooperative learning can be utilized in combination to handle conducive classroom situation for interaction. However, creating and maintaining cooperative groups are not easy. Arends (2004) for instance, expressed that the process of getting students in to learning teams and getting them started on their work is perhaps one of the most difficult steps for the teachers using cooperative learning. There is nothing more frustrating to teachers than transitional situations in which students are moving in to small groups, not sure of what they are to do and each demanding the teacher's attention and help.

2.8. Methods of Cooperative Learning

Over the last two decades various methods for the implementation of cooperative learning were identified and developed. The following are the major types of cooperative learning structures (methods).

1. Think-Pair-Share

In this particular cooperative learning method students are given an opportunity to think and exchange ideas with their peers. According to Baloch (1998) the major benefits of think-pair is that learners develop the interpersonal and small group skills such as sharing ideas, listening carefully and asking for clarification. Besides, this method is usually embedded within large lessons and activities. It comprises four steps. First, a teacher poses a question or problem on the class. Second, students are given time to think by themselves. Third, students are to discuss their ideas with their partner and fourth, the teacher calls on some students to share their own thinking with the whole class. The focus is on preparatory thinking process rather than completed work. Thus, rewards are not the main features of this method (Stahl, 1994).

2. Learning Together

This method involves pupils working in four or five member heterogeneous groups on papers. The groups hand in a single paper, and receive praise and rewards based on the group product (Slavin, 1990). The typical description for this method is that students work as a group to complete a single group product, share ideas, and help each other to answer the questions, make sure all members involve and understand group answers, and ask for help from each other before asking the teacher praises and rewards the group on the bases of group performance (Knight & Bohlmeier, 1990).

3. Student-Teams Achievement Division (STAD)

This is a cooperative learning method where by students are assigned to four or five member learning teams that are mixed in performance level, sex and where appropriate ethnicity. The teacher presents a lesson, and then pupils work within their teams to make sure that all team members have mastered the lesson. Finally, all pupils take individual quizzes on the material at which they may not help one another (Slavin, 1990; Borich, 2007). Likewise, this method is considered as the simplest of the Student-Team-Learning-Methods. It involves students in a cycle of: class presentation, team work, individual assessment, and team recognition (Putnam, 1997).

4. Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT)

This method uses the same teacher's presentations and team works as in STAD, but this time the quizzes are replaced by weekly tournaments in which pupils compete with members of other teams to contribute points to their team scores (Borich, 2007; Slavin, 1980; Putnam, 1997).

5. Jigsaw Method

In implementing jigsaw method students are assigned to six member teams to work on academic material that has been broken down into sections (Slavin, 1990). Independence among students is promoted given each student in a learning group access to information comprising only one part of the lesson. Students are then accountable to their jigsaw group for teaching that part of the lesson to the rest of the jigsaw group members. In addition, the students from the different groups, each having the same material to learn, meet similar groups to discuss and learn their

part of the lesson before attempting to teach the material to the students in their jigsaw groups. In this way cooperation among students occur (Knight & Bohlmeier, 1990).

6. Group Investigation (GI)

Group investigation is a general classroom organization plan in which students work in small groups using cooperative inquiry, group discussion, and cooperative learning and projects. In this method, students form their own two-six member groups. After choosing sub-topics from a unit that the entire class is studying, the groups break their sub-topics in to individual tasks and carry out the activities that are necessary to prepare group reports. Each group then makes a presentation or display to communicate its findings to the entire class (Slavin, 1990). Furthermore, investigating actively engages students in the instructional process by requiring that they carry out investigations, integrate their findings, and make presentation to the class. This method encourages students to determine what they study and how they conduct their investigation (Putnam, 1997).

7. Round Table

It is a cooperative structure in which a single piece of paper and a pencil are systematically passed around a small group. One partner responds to a question or idea and then passes the paper and pencil to the team member to the left (Kagan, 1993).

In conclusion, certain differences are noticed among the different cooperative learning approaches. But, all cooperative learning methods share that student's shoulder a great deal of responsibility to own learning rather than considering learning is something that is imposed by others.

2.9. Characteristics of Cooperative Learning

2.9.1. Heterogeneity and Group Size

Properly designed cooperative learning teams can maximize the achievement of each team member. For well- structured and organized teams, teachers should not let students self-select their teammates. They ought to plan the heterogeneous team to be made up of students who have different ability levels. Teachers should organize the three-five member groups so that students are mixed as heterogeneously as possible, first according to academic abilities, and then on the

basis of ethnic backgrounds, race and gender. Students should not be allowed to form their groups based on friendship. When groups are maximally heterogeneous and the other essential elements are met, students tend to interact and achieve in ways and at levels that are rarely found in other instructional strategies (Stahl, 1994). In line with this, Hailu, Solomon & Desta (2011) found that heterogeneous small-group cooperative learning strategy opens door for greater interaction through which negotiation of meanings and sharing of ideas are enhanced. They further stated that heterogeneous small-group enables the students to develop the sense of responsibility, leadership, and managerial skills in the process of learning.

2.9.2 Assigning Roles

Complementary and interconnected roles are designed for each group member where specific responsibilities that the group needs in order to complete the joint task. Teachers create role interdependence among students when they assign them the complementary roles. Such as reader, recorder, checker of understanding, encourager of participation, and elaborator of knowledge. Such roles are vital to high quality learning. After group members are structured in to heterogeneous ability small groups and receive instruction and different roles, students within the group cooperate to one another and work through the task –until each team member successfully understands and completes the team task (Johnson and Johnson, 2009).

2.9.3. Sufficient Time

Students in cooperative learning should be given appropriate time with the issue they are given to discuss. Besides, the amount of time needed to learn the target information and abilities should be properly planned (Stahl, 1994). Moreover, Cooperative learning teams should be provided enough time for the students to function as a team where they learn to rely on, cooperate with, and learn from one another. Without adequate time, students may become frustrated and not function well as a team (Johnson & Johnson, 2011).

2.9.4 Clear Instructions

According to Johnson & Johnson (2011) for cooperative learning to be effective, teachers are required to give the team a set of well-defined and explicit instructions or guidelines before they begin each team activity. So, all team members know what is expected of them, their roles, and how they should work within the team. In line with this, it is stated that teachers need to give instructions that describe in clear, precise terms exactly what students are to do, in what order,

with what materials, and when appropriate, what students are to generate as evidence of their mastery of targeted content and skills. These instructions are given to students before they involve in their group learning efforts (Stahl, 1994).

2.9.5 Clear Set of Specific Objectives

Cooperative learning is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Therefore, teachers should begin planning by describing precisely what students are expected to learn and be able to do on their own well beyond the end of the group task and curriculum unit. Regardless of whether these outcomes emphasis academic content, cognitive processing abilities, or skills, teachers should describe in very unambiguous language the specific knowledge and abilities students are to acquire and then demonstrate on their own (Stahl, 1994).

2.10 Attitude in Cooperative Learning Context

2.10.1 Definition and Concept about Attitude

Eagly and Chaiken (1993:1) defined attitude as “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor.” The other definition came from Maio & Martha (1995) that attitudes are tendencies to like or dislike something. Such as an idea, person or behavior and the object of these tendencies (the thing being liked or disliked) are often called the attitude object. Similarly, Walmsley (2003) defined attitude as the way of thinking or feeling about something. When working with students, their attitude can play an important role in the learning process. If a student feels that he/she can do well & be successful; therefore, he/ she will be willing to put forth the effort needed to be successful. In addition, Gardner (1985) defines attitude as an evaluative reaction to some referent, inferred on the basis of the individual’s beliefs or opinions about the referent. Attitudes are generally viewed to be formed through the process of individual subjective evaluation (involving a rational assessment of costs and benefits), but also influenced by affective and emotional responses and related beliefs. Attitudes are defined as being specific to an object or behavior. Whereas beliefs are more generic, related to a wider worldview, and tend to be more stable (Jowell, 2005). Likewise it has been noted out that teachers should recognize that all students possess positive and negative attitudes in varying degrees, and adds that the negative attitudes can be changed by thoughtful instructional methods, such as using materials and activities that help students achieve an

understanding and appreciation of foreign culture, a fact that might be reflected in the process of learning the foreign language (Brown, 2000).

Thus, definitions and views from different scholars show that attitude is understood as the behavioral entity through which certain in mind processing is manifested. This can be manifested through the action or reaction one makes towards an object, idea or environment. The manner of responding can be either positively or negatively.

2.10.2 Components of Attitude

According to Wenden (1991) the term attitude has got three major components.

2.10.2.1 Cognitive

A cognitive component is made up of the beliefs and ideas or opinions about the object of the attitude.

2.10.2.2 Affective

This part refers to the feeling and emotions that one has towards an object: ‘the likes’ or ‘dislikes’ and the ‘with’ or ‘against’.

2.10.2.3 Behavioral

This component deals with one’s consistent actions or behavioral intentions towards the object.

In conclusion, these three components of attitude have their own boundary of manifestation. The cognitive component can be understood as the primary level of attitude from where the other components of attitude emerge. On the other hand, affective component is the second level of attitude where one develops the feeling of good/bad, favor /disfavor, negative/positive and like/dislike towards something. The third component of attitude (behavioral) can also be perceived as the final level where one reacts to something or environment positively or negatively due to the feeling he/she has developed at affective level.

2.10.3. Importance of Attitude

According to Ajzen & Fishbein’s (1980:7) theory of reasoned action, “Attitudes are a function of beliefs.” based on this theory, believing that performing a task will result in mainly positive outcomes that lead to have a favorable attitude towards the task. On the other hand, mistrust of the success of performing a task will take an unfavorable attitude. Therefore, if students believe that, for example, cooperative methods have a significant effect on their achievement in learning

EFL, then this method will be to their benefit. Attitudes once formed, can shape the way students think, understand, feel, and behave. As to Richardson(1996:102) cited in Kaufman & Sawyer(2004) “Attitudes and beliefs are a subset of a group of constructs that name, define and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person’s actions”. Similarly it is believed that attitudes play a remarkable role in determining one’s behavior, as the attitude has the driving force which stimulates the behavior and directs it in a particular direction. Attitudes are thus indirectly related to second language achievement. It can be said that improving the positive attitudes of students towards a particular academic subject may increase their desire to learn the subject and to develop the ability to apply what they have been taught, as well as leading to an improvement in remembrance (Tahaine & Danna, 2013).

2.10. 4. Forming and Changing Attitudes

2.10.4.1. Formation of Attitudes

Attitude formation is a result of learning, modeling others, and our direct experiences with people and situations. Attitudes influence our decisions, guide our behavior, and impact what we selectively remember. Attitudes appear in various ways and similar to most things that are learned or influenced through experience. (Pickens, 2005)

Attitudes are formed over a life time through an individual’s socialization process. An individual’s socialization process includes his/her formation of values and beliefs during childhood, influenced not only by family, religion and culture but also by socioeconomic factors. This socialization process affects a person’s attitude towards work and his or her related behavior (Pickens, 2005).

2.10.4.2 Changing Attitudes

In order to change a person’s attitude, one has to address the cognitive and emotional components. The primary step to convince someone to start a new phenomenon /situation is to challenge his/her behavior by providing new information (Pickens, 2005).

To sum up, it is quite natural that everyone forms either positive or negative towards the situations that are going around him/her. This shows that the person has learnt and convinced with the situation. This formation of attitude could last for a certain period of time until the new

stimuli come to his/her mind. Therefore, when the latter stimuli get stronger, the primarily formed attitude towards something can be shifted to some sort of new attitude.

2.10.5. Attitudes and Language learning

The nature of language learning has psychological and social aspects and depends primarily on the learners' motivation and attitude towards learning the target language (Padwick, 2010). In line with this, Gardner and Lambert (1972) conclude that the ability of students to master a second language is not only influenced by their mental competence or language skills but also by students' attitudes and perception towards the target language. They also advocate that attitude concepts could enhance the process of language learning, influencing the nature of student's behaviors and beliefs towards the other language and its culture and community and that identify their tendency to acquire that language. Besides, attitudes are crucial in language growth or decay and restoration or destruction. Attitudes are internal states that influence what the learners are likely to do. The internal state is some degree of positive/negative or favorable/unfavorable reactions towards an object. Attitudes differ in intensity or strength. Language attitude is an important concept because it plays a key role in language learning and teaching. According to Oller (1979) attitudes are merely one of types of factors that give rise to motivation which eventually results in attainment of proficiency in a second language. There are three types of attitudes in second language learning situation. (a) Attitudes towards the community and people who speak the L2. (b) Attitude towards learning the language concerned. (c) Attitudes towards languages and language learning in general.

2.10.6 Attitudes and Judgments

Attitudes cannot be directly observed but can be inferred from individuals' self-reports and behavior. Attitude measurement is highly context dependent and minor changes in question format or order can have a profound impact on the obtained reports (Schuman & Presser, 1981; Schwartz & Sudman, 1992; Sudman, Bradburn, & Schwartz, 1996; Tourangeau & Rasinski, 1988). The underlying dynamics are increasingly well understood and reflect an intricate interplay of cognitive and communicative processes. Besides, answering an attitude question entails several tasks: Respondents need to interpret the question to determine the attitude object and evaluative dimension the researcher has in mind. Next the respondents need to retrieve relevant information from memory. In most cases, a previously formed judgment that meets the

specifics of the question will not be accessible and they have to draw on information that seems relevant to the question at hand. Relevant information includes features of the attitude object, the respondent's own behavior with regard to the object. Based on this information, Respondents need to compute a judgment. Having formed a judgment, they can report it in their own words but need to draw it to a set of response alternatives provided by the researcher. Finally, respondents may want to edit their private judgment before they communicate it to the researcher for reasons of social desirability and self-presentation. Performance at each of these steps is context dependent, yet this context dependency has different implications for the notion that people hold about their attitudes (Strack & Martin, 1987; Tourangeau, 1984).

2.11 Previous Studies on Attitudes towards CL

2.11.1. Studies on Teachers' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning

Hijazi & Al-Natour (2012) wanted to investigate teachers' attitude towards using cooperative learning for teaching English language in Jordanian schools. The researchers used experimental research method. To achieve the aim of the study, a pre-/post-test was constructed to measure students' achievement in English language. Descriptive statistical analyses were used (means and standard deviation) for the pre-and post- tests of students' English language test to experimental and control groups. Means and standard deviations and T-test were used for teachers' attitudes and measure the effect of experience and educational level variables. The samples of the study comprised of 113 seventh grade students in Zubaida secondary school for girls and Al Khansaa School for girls in Amman and were distributed in to four sections, which were selected purposefully and also 20 teachers to measure their attitudes towards using cooperative learning for teaching English language. The subjects were 60 students for the experimental group and 53 students for control group. The findings of the study indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the post-test between the control and the experimental group's in favor of the experimental group and there were statistically significant differences in teachers' attitudes due to experience variable and educational level variable.

Berhanu (2013) conducted research to describe the knowledge, attitude and practice of teachers towards cooperative learning. The researcher used descriptive survey method. Besides, he selected three schools through simple random sampling technique. Questionnaire, interview and observation were used to gather data. Moreover, for this study both qualitative and quantitative

data analysis techniques were used. The data that were collected through interview and some open-ended items of the questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively. However, the data collected from close-ended questionnaires and observation checklist were analyzed using descriptive analysis and the end result of the study was presented by means of percentages, mean, grand mean and standard deviation. Moreover, one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to test knowledge and attitude difference of teachers towards cooperative learning across the three schools. Participants of the study were teachers, students, supervisors and principals. Accordingly, there were 30 teachers, 212 students, 1 supervisor and 3 principals. The study revealed that teachers did not know what cooperative learning really is. However, it was found that teachers seemed to have a favorable attitude towards cooperative learning.

2.11.2. Studies on Students' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning

Suhendan & Bengu (2014) wanted to investigate on university ELT students' attitudes towards cooperative learning through the descriptive research method. A questionnaire was given to 166(M=66, F=100) university students whose ages were between 18-20 and were all studying at preparatory school and of different faculties. A questionnaire inquiring on the students' attitudes on CL was administered. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive analysis. It was shown that 66.9% of the students were at the side of CL in ELT classes where as 33.1% of them believed that if they worked alone, they would have better results and they thought working alone was more enjoyable. A focus group was organized and the students mentioned both negative and positive sides of cooperative work. Furthermore, the findings report that there were differences in gender and attitudes towards CL for the good of females.

Farzaneh & Nejadansari (2014) conducted research to evaluate the students' attitude towards the cooperative learning for reading instruction. The researchers used descriptive survey-based design for their study. To determine the views of intermediate level students towards CL strategies, a questionnaire was used for 52 participants (16 male, 36 female). So, the data obtained from the survey were analyzed and interpreted using SPSS version 19. The results of this study indicated that the participants held generally a positive view of the implementation of cooperative strategies in teaching and learning context. This is probably because when students work in groups, they feel that they can depend on others for help and this gives them the confidence to solve problems and enjoy learning. Positive attitude towards cooperative

approaches may indirectly change the learners' attitude towards language learning and encourage their interest.

Dale, Nassir & Sullivan (2005) aimed to study students' attitudes to cooperative learning through descriptive research method. Therefore, to evaluate the students' attitudes towards cooperative learning, the pre-and post-task questionnaires and focus group discussion were used. The data obtained from questionnaire were analyzed by the help of SPSS and statistical test was used to identify any significant shifts in students' attitudes. Participants of the study consisted of 98 fourth year under graduate students at the university of Glasgow during academic year of 2003-4. Students were randomly assigned in to 13 groups, each consisting of seven to eight students and supported by staff facilitators. Thus, the finding indicated that students who regarded themselves generally as team plays rather than competing individuals had few concerns before or after the cooperative learning sessions. There were some significant shifts from negative to positive in response to some of the questions but generally the results that were obtained are encouraging.

McLeish (2009) conducted research to determine the attitudes of students towards cooperative learning by employing descriptive research method. Questionnaires were administered to ninety (90) students and twelve (12) lecturers, in-depth interviews were conducted with three lecturers and two classes were observed to investigate the students' attitude towards cooperative learning. The data collected from observation & interviews were coded to ensure that the researcher was making accurate inferences. The data from questionnaire was analyzed by the help of SPSS 14.0 software. The finding indicated that students preferred to work on their own rather than within the group due to various fears.

Akinbobola (2009) intended to discover the attitudes of students towards the use of cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning strategies in Nigerian senior secondary school. The research design for this study was quasi-experimental. There were a total number of one hundred and forty (140) students taking part in the study who were selected by a random sampling technique. A structured questionnaire was administered to collect the data. Poor students' performance can be attributed to poor teaching methods, unqualified/inexperienced teachers, poor learning environment and gender effect. The finding showed that cooperative learning strategy was the most effective in facilitating the class room instruction.

Atta Mimi (2014) conducted a study to investigate the effectiveness of cooperative learning in English language class rooms to enhance Yemeni students' speaking skills and attitudes. A quasi-experimental design was used with sixty (60) undergraduates enrolled in English department at Hadhramout University, Yemen. The data of a study was gathered at different points of time before and after the end of the experiment to determine the effectiveness of cooperative learning on the sample's speaking skills and attitudes. In addition, a five likert scale questionnaire was administered to the sample before and at the end of the course to identify students' attitudes towards the use of cooperative learning in English classes. The data were analyzed using basic and inferential statistical methods including mean scores, standard deviations, paired sample t-test, and effect size. The finding showed a remarkable development in the students' speaking skills and attitudes after the introduction of cooperative learning techniques.

2.11.3. Study on the Link between Teachers' and Students' Attitudes towards Cooperative Learning

Muhammad (2012) wanted to investigate the current practice of cooperative learning in college of education and behavioral sciences in Haromaya University, Ethiopia. To achieve this purpose a descriptive survey research method was employed. By using quota sampling and purposive sampling a total number of 154 respondents were selected. The data were collected from different primary and secondary sources of data by using questionnaire, interview and document analysis. Quantitative data were analyzed using percentages, mean and Friedman mean rank. In addition to this, qualitative data was analyzed by narration and description in the way it supplements the quantitative analysis. The finding of the study revealed that cooperative learning is important to improve the academic achievement and social skills of students. However, cooperative learning practices is not effective in the study area. Lack of awareness, lack of motivation, resistance, shortage of instructional materials and lack of clear guidelines are some of the major challenges to implement cooperative learning. Based on the findings, it was recommended that college of education and behavioral sciences should provide continuous and relevant trainings for both instructors and students.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

The main objective of this study was to investigate the attitudes of teachers and students towards cooperative learning in EFL classes. Therefore, the study was conducted on a descriptive survey-based research design in which data was collected to describe the participants. By employing this study design both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used to collect data for more reliable and applicable research conclusion.

3.2. The Setting and Participants of the Study

3.2.1. The School and Grade

The study was conducted using the sample population of grade nine and ten students and teachers from Shishinda, Chena, Wareta, Kulush and Kutashora secondary schools that are found in SNNP Kafa Zone-Chena Woreda. These schools were selected because of the reason that the researcher has worked in that area for a number of years. Thus, he has got good familiarity and partnership with teachers and school directors. They could help the researcher to get access of different information and necessary materials which were very supportive for the study.

3.2.2. Teachers

Twenty one (21) English language teachers who teach in grade nine and ten from the above five schools were the sample of the study. These teachers were taken through purposive sampling technique to fill in both closed and open ended questionnaires. Besides, 9 teachers were selected through simple random sampling for focus group discussion. The main reason to take teachers for this study was to get certain information about their attitudes towards cooperative learning.

3.2.3. Students

The selected schools have 58 grade nine and ten sections with total number of 2627 students. Among these 174 students were selected through systematic sampling method to represent the mentioned grade nine and ten students in five secondary schools. These respondents participated in filling the close-ended questionnaire of the study. In addition, from each grade level 6 sections were selected randomly and then from these sections all together 12 students were selected through simple random sampling for focus group discussions.

3.3. Data Gathering Tools

The data was collected from sample population through questionnaires and focus group discussions. These tools helped the researcher to evaluate the credibility of data.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

3.3.1.1. Questionnaire for teachers

Fourteen close-ended and four open-ended questionnaire items were designed based on the literature review and used for teachers to examine their attitude towards cooperative learning which was stated under the first objective.

3.3.1.2. Questionnaire for Students

Fifteen close-ended questionnaires were prepared and used for students to examine their attitudes towards CL that was indicated in the second objective.

As to Kothari (2004) this method of data collection is quite popular, particularly in case of big inquiries. A questionnaire consists of a number of questions printed or typed in a definite order on a form or set of forms. The questionnaire is filled by respondents who are expected to read and understand the questions and write down the reply in space meant for the purpose in the questionnaire itself. The respondents have to answer the questions on their own.

Teachers' questionnaire items were adapted from Berhanu (2013) and McLeish (2009). Besides, students' questionnaire items were adapted from McLeish (2009). Therefore, the reliability has been tested by the fore-researchers. The result obtained from the Cronbach alpha method revealed that the computed reliability of the instrument was 0.83 for items prepared to examine teachers' attitude towards CL. Hence, the conducted test confirmed that the instrument was reliable to collect data for the main study. For its validity senior teachers were invited to comment on the items.

3.3.2. Focus Group Discussions

The major objective of conducting focus group discussions was to find out the links and mismatches between teachers' and students' attitudes towards cooperative learning which is indicated under objective three.

According to Ritchie & Lewis (2003) the group context of focus groups creates a process which is in some important respects very different from an in-depth interview. Data are generated by interaction between group participants. They present their own views and experience, but they also hear from other people. They listen, reflect on what is said, and this considers their own stand point further. Additional material is thus triggered in response to what they hear. Participants' ask questions of each other, seek clarification, comment on what they have heard and prompt others to reveal more. As the discussion progresses individual response becomes sharpened and refined, and moves to a deeper and more considered level.

In line with this Kothari (2004) states that FGD is meant to focus attention on the given experience of the respondent and its effects. The interviewer has the right to determine the manner and order in which the questions would be asked and has also the right to investigate reasons and motives. The main task of the interviewer in case of a focused interview is to confine the respondent to a discussion of issues with which he seeks good familiarity with something. Such interviews are used generally in the development of hypotheses and constitute a major type of unstructured interviews.

Thus, FGD helped the researcher to forward cross examination questions; it was also possible to prove the credibility of the data obtained from the other tool and to realize the internal feelings of the respondents on the issues. Besides, teachers' and students' focus group discussion questions were adapted from Liang (2002)

3.4 Pilot Testing

At the very beginning of collecting data in September, 2016, the researcher took certain steps to test the effectiveness of the tools. 6 EFL teachers and 20 students from grade 11 and 12 who were non-concern of the study were randomly selected to fill in the questionnaires. These participants were found in SNNP-Kafa Zone- Chena woreda -Shishinda and Chena secondary schools. The pilot testing was made to see if the instrument could collect useful data. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the questionnaires of both teachers and students and the focus group discussion items were commented by two veteran TEFL instructors from Bonga College of Teachers Education. Thus, the pilot testing identified any ambiguities and useless items.

Finally, the researcher made all necessary revisions on those items that were ineffective to collect data.

3.5. Data Organization and Analysis Procedures

This study was conducted using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Thus, the results of the study for quantitative data to meet the first and second objectives were presented using frequency distribution, percentages, mean and grand mean obtained from numerical values assigned on the degree of agreement that were presented in the form of tables. Besides, the qualitative data that was gathered from focus group discussions and open-ended items of teachers' questionnaires were analyzed by narration and description in the way it supplements the quantitative analysis and to meet the third objective. The gathered data from each instrument was independently analyzed. The order of instruments began from the major tool to the other. Therefore, questionnaire was the first and focus group discussions were the next to be analyzed.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected from respondents. The quantitative and qualitative data that were collected from the early mentioned participants accordingly to different instruments were presented and analyzed as follows.

4.1. Teachers' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning

Teachers' Questionnaire items (please see appendix "A") were mainly designed to answer the first research question: What is teachers' attitude towards cooperative learning? The response obtained from the participant teachers is presented on the Table 4. 1 below.

Table 4.1 Distribution of Teachers' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning

S/ N	Item	5=SA		4=A		3=U		2=DA		1=SDA		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	Mean
1	I feel cooperative learning is advantageous for students learning.	16	76.19	3	14.29	-	-	1	4.76	1	4.76	21	4.52
2	I like heterogeneous ability group members in a cooperative learning.	13	61.9	4	19.05	1	4.76	2	9.53	1	4.76	21	4.23
3	Cooperative learning improves students' self-esteem.	12	57.14	6	28.57	-	-	-	-	3	14.29	21	4.14
4	Cooperative learning increases students' productivity.	14	66.66	4	19.05	1	4.76	-	-	2	9.53	21	4.33
5	Cooperative learning improves respect of others opinions among students.	12	57.14	6	28.57	2	9.53	-	-	1	4.76	21	4.33
6	I feel cooperative learning affects students' academic achievement positively.	8	38.09	7	33.33	-	-	2	9.53	4	19.05	21	3.61
7	Cooperative learning facilitates students to use higher level of thinking strategies.	12	57.14	6	28.57	-	-	1	4.76	2	9.53	21	4.19
8	Cooperative learning encourages students to create new ideas.	13	61.9	7	33.34	-	-	-	-	1	4.76	21	4.47
9	I do not like CL group members that are formed based on friendship.	13	61.9	2	9.53	-	-	2	9.53	4	19.05	21	3.85
10	Cooperative learning is important both for students and teachers.	13	61.9	5	23.81	1	4.76	-	-	2	9.53	21	4.28
11	I like to make use of the essential elements of cooperative learning.	15	71.43	3	14.29	1	4.76	1	4.76	1	4.76	21	4.42
12	Cooperative learning is a valuable instructional approach.	10	47.61	9	42.86	-	-	-	-	2	9.53	21	4.19
13	Positive interdependence among group members ensures effective learning.	12	57.14	6	28.57	-	-	1	4.76	2	9.53	21	4.19
14	I feel cooperative learning makes students responsible for their learning.	9	42.86	9	42.86	-	-	1	4.76	2	9.53	21	4.04
	G.M												4.19

Key: SA: strongly agree

U: undecided

DA: Disagree

A: Agree

SDA: Strongly disagree

As can be seen from Table 4.1 item 1, 16 and 3 (Strongly agreed & agreed respectively) respondents felt that cooperative learning is advantageous for students learning. On the other hand, 1 & 1 participants replied disagreed & strongly disagreed respectively and none of them answered undecided. The mean value is 4.52 which is above the average that is 3 to the degree of favor for the item. Based on the above result, it can be understood that teachers had a strong favor on the benefits of CL.

Item 2 depicts that 13 and 4 (Strongly agreed & agreed) respondents like heterogeneous ability group for CL. However, 2, 1 & 1 of them reported disagreed, undecided & strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for this item is 4.23 that majority of teachers like to implement diversified ability grouping for CL.

Based on the result of data in item 3, 12 and 6 (Strongly agreed & agreed respectively) respondents put forward that cooperative learning improves students' self-esteem. However, 3 teachers responded strongly disagreed and no one responded undecided and disagreed. The mean value for the item is 4.14 which indicated that respondents got positive views towards the benefits of CL.

With regard to item 4, 14 and 4 respondents strongly agreed & agreed respectively to the item that claims cooperative learning increases students' productivity. On the other hand, 1 and 2 teachers replied as undecided and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for the item is 4.33 that illustrated cooperative learning is a learning style where students grouped together to accomplish significant cooperative tasks.

As depicted by item 5, 12 and 6 (Strongly agreed & agreed) respondents believed that cooperative learning improves respect of other opinions among students. Furthermore, 2 and 1 teachers answered to undecided and strongly agreed respectively. The mean value for this item is 4.33 that is above the average.

Concerning item 6, 8 and 7 (Strongly agree & agree) respondents reported that cooperative learning affects student's academic achievement positively. In addition, 4 and 2 teachers reported strongly disagree & disagree respectively. When the mean is calculated, it is 3.61 which are favorable in the positive attitude scale. Majority of the respondents felt that CL possibly brings about success for all members of the group.

With regard to item 7, 12 and 6 (Strongly agreed& agreed respectively) respondents stated that cooperative learning enables students to use higher level of thinking strategies. 2 teachers said strongly disagreed and 1 remained disagreed. The mean value computed for this item is 4.19 which is by far above the average to determine the attitude scale. Thus, majority of teachers believed that CL has a potential benefit to uplift students' thinking ability.

In response to item 8, 13 and 7 (Strongly agreed& agreed) respondents stated that cooperative learning encourages students to create new ideas. 1 respondent reported to strongly disagreed. But, there was no one who replied to undecided and disagreed. The mean value for this item is 4.47 that revealed teachers developed strong favor towards CL as it encourages students' creativity.

In replying to item 9, 13 and 2(Strongly agreed& agreed) respondents stated that they do not like the cooperative learning group that was formed based on friendship. Whereas 2 and 4 respondents forwarded as disagreed & strongly disagreed to the item respectively. The item has 3.85 mean values which is above the average to determine the degree of favor to positive.

Teachers' responses to item 10 showed that 13 and 5(Strongly agreed & agreed) respondents identified that cooperative learning is important for both students and teachers. Besides, 2 respondents confirmed to strongly disagreed and the remaining 1 reported to undecided. The mean value for the item is 4.28 that is above the average. During cooperative learning both teachers and students can assume responsibility for evaluating the skills and contributions of group members.

Concerning item 11, 15 and 3(Strongly agreed& agreed respectively) respondents confirmed that teachers should be interested in the essential elements of cooperative learning, However, 1, 1 and 1 teacher replied to undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. When the mean value is computed it is 4.42 which shows favorable attitude to the item. Besides, the response obtained from open –ended questionnaires supplements to the result of this item that majority of the respondents stated that they were familiar with CL techniques.

In responding to item 12, 10 and 9 (Strongly agreed & agreed) respondents confirmed that cooperative learning is a valuable instructional approach. Besides, 2 respondents replied to the item as strongly disagree. No one has reported to undecided and disagreed. Accordingly, in

response to this item, teachers with the mean score of 4.19 responded favorably. This result was substantiated with the response the teachers gave in open-ended questionnaires and the result of focus group discussion. They believed that CL as an approach can be used with all subjects, but it is highly suitable to facilitate English instructions.

In responding to item 13, 12 and 6 (Strongly agreed& agreed) teachers stated that positive interdependence among group members ensures effective learning. On the other hand, 2 and 1 teachers responded to strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively. The mean value for this item is 4.19 which is above the average to determine the degree of favor.

The result in item 14 depicts that 9 and 9 (Strongly agreed& agreed) respondents felt that cooperative learning makes students responsible for their learning. But, 1 and 2 participants answered as disagreed and strongly disagreed to the item respectively. There was no teacher who replied to undecided and the mean score with this score is 4.04 that is majority of the respondents believed in the strategy as it makes the students to shoulder responsibility for their learning.

In conclusion, analysis made on Table 4.1 clearly revealed that participant teachers were interested in having certain benefits and principles of cooperative learning. From the attitude scale towards the items under the mean value; it was found that teachers' response was above the average mean value which was 3. They believed that these benefits can be attained if they got positive attitude towards cooperative learning. Thus, from this section of the analysis, it was possible to deduce that teachers developed some sort of favorable attitude towards cooperative learning.

4.2 Students' Attitude towards Cooperative Learning

Fifteen close-ended questionnaire items were designed and used to examine the students' attitude towards cooperative learning (please see appendix "B"). The primary aim of the items was to answer the second research question on students' attitude towards cooperative learning? The response obtained from participant students were presented from Table 4.2 to Table 4.5 below.

Table 4. 2. Students' view of participation on Cooperative Learning

No	Item	Yes		No		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Do you like to participate in a cooperative activity/assignment?	155	89.09	19	10.91	174	100

As can be seen on Table 4.2, nearly all respondents 89.9% stated that they like to participate in cooperative activities or assignments. Whereas the remaining 10.91% respondents reported that they have never participated in cooperative activities or assignments. This implies that almost all students are interested in working on activities/ assignments through cooperative learning.

Table 4.3 Students' View of the Area/s for Cooperative Learning Activities/Assignments

No	Item	In the class		Out side		Both		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
2	Where do you usually like to participate in cooperative activities/assignments?	72	41.38	19	10.92	83	47.7	174	100

As indicated in item 2 of Table 4.3, 47.7% respondents stated that they like to participate in cooperative activities / assignments both in and outside the classroom, 41.38% students responded that they preferred to work on these activities/ assignments only in the class and the remaining 10.92% students agreed that they were interested in participating in cooperative activities/ assignments if they were allowed to work outside their classroom. This implies that there are individual differences or learning style differences in the cooperative learning classrooms that should be properly handled for its effective implementation.

Table 4. 4. Students' Opinion about Typical Group Size of Students

No	Item	2-4		5-7		8-10		Others		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
3	What is the typical size of the group you like?	32	18.39	105	60.34	22	12.65	15	8.62	174	100

As Table 4.4 shows majority of students (60.34%) favored 5-7 members as typical group size, 18.39% students stated that they could have felt comfortable if activities were given in group size of 2-4, 12.65% respondents said that their typical group size is 8-10 and the remaining 8.62% respondents confirmed that their typical group size is not specified. This implies that restricting the group size throughout the academic year is not recommended since individual differences are found in cooperative learning classes.

Table4.5 Distribution of Values of Cooperative Learning and Students' Attitude in terms of Frequency, Percentage, Mean and Grand mean

N o	Item	5=SA		4=A		3=U		2=DA		1=SDA		Total		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	Mea
4	I like to work together more than to work alone for better achievement.	144	82.75	23	13.22	5	2.88	-	-	2	1.15	174	100	4.76
5	I willingly participate in cooperative learning activities.	99	56.9	55	31.6	10	5.75	8	4.6	2	1.15	174	100	4.38
6	Cooperative learning can improve my attitude towards work.	119	68.39	35	20.11	15	8.62	2	1.15	3	1.73	174	100	4.52
7	Cooperative learning helps me to socialize more.	127	72.99	23	13.22	17	9.77	4	2.29	3	1.73	174	100	4.53
8	I like cooperative learning as it enhances good working relationships among students.	109	62.64	38	21.84	14	8.04	8	4.6	5	2.88	174	100	4.36
9	Cooperative learning enhances class participation.	110	63.22	37	21.27	10	5.75	6	3.44	11	6.32	174	100	4.31
10	Creativity is facilitated in the cooperative learning situation.	96	55.17	42	24.14	15	8.62	10	5.75	11	6.32	174	100	4.16
11	Cooperative learning makes the learning experience easier.	101	58.05	37	21.27	17	9.77	15	8.62	4	2.29	174	100	4.24
12	I like to learn to work with students who are different from me.	106	60.92	40	22.99	21	12.07	4	2.29	3	1.73	174	100	4.39
13	I enjoy the material more when I work with other students.	95	54.59	47	27.02	20	11.49	5	2.88	7	4.02	174	100	4.25
14	My work is better organized when I am in a group.	114	65.51	39	22.42	14	8.05	4	2.29	3	1.73	174	100	4.47
15	I like that my teacher uses more group activities/assignments.	95	54.59	42	24.14	17	9.77	14	8.05	6	3.45	174	100	4.18
G.M.													4.37	

Key:S A: strongly agree : U : Undecided SDA: Strongly disagree
A: Agree DA: Disagree

As can be seen from Table 4.9 item 4, 82.75% and 13.22% (Strongly agreed& agreed) of the respondents stated that they like to work together to achieve more than they work alone, 2.88% of them replied to undecided on the item and 1.15% of the students confirmed that they strongly disagreed on the issue. Accordingly, in response to this item, students with the mean score of 4.76 preferred to work with other students in a cooperative learning for better success.

As can be seen in item 5, 56.9% and 31.6 % (strongly agreed and agreed respectively) of the respondents reported that they willingly work in CL activities. However, 5.75 %, 4.6% and 1.15% replied to the item as undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for this item is 4.38. Thus, the data showed that the students were working very willingly in CL activities.

With regard to item 6, 68.39% and 20.11 % (Strongly agreed& agreed) of the respondents stated that cooperative learning can improve their attitude towards work. On the other hand, 8.62%, 1, 15% and 1.73% of the respondents answered to the item as undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. When the mean value is calculated, it becomes 4.52 which refer to strong favor of the participants to the item. The response indicated that majority of students benefited from working with their teammates.

Concerning item 7, 72.99% and 13.22% (Strongly agreed and agreed respectively) of the participants reported that cooperative learning helps them to socialize more. However, 9.77% of them confirmed to undecided and 2.29% and 1.73% (disagreed and strongly disagreed). The mean value for this item is 4.53 that show the students developed positive favor to the item. There are a number of benefits of cooperative learning. Among these one is socializing oneself to group members. So, majority of the respondents concluded that CL would help them to strengthen their social life.

According to the data on item 8, 62.64 % and 21.84 % (strongly agreed and agreed) of the respondents identified that cooperative learning enhances good working relationships among students. 8.04 % of the respondents remained undecided on the issue. Similarly, 4.6% & 2.88% replied to disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value of this item is 4.36 which shows favorable attitude towards the issue.

Based on the result of data analysis on item 9, 63.22% and 21.27 % (strongly agreed and agreed) of the respondents reported that they like cooperative learning because it enhances class participation. Moreover, 6.32%, 5.75% and 3.44% of the students believed to strongly disagreed, undecided and disagreed respectively. The mean value for this score is 4.31 which indicate a very favorable scale.

In replying to item 10, 55.17% and 24.14 % (strongly agreed and agreed) of the respondents indicated that creativity is facilitated in the cooperative learning strategy. On the other hand, 8.62% approved to undecided the remaining portion went to 5.75% and 6.32% of the respondents reported to disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Accordingly, in response to this item, students with the mean score of 4.16 confirmed that they like to work in CL to achieve its major benefits.

The responses on item 11 indicate that 58.05 % and 21.27 % (strongly agreed and agreed respectively) of the respondents noted that cooperative learning makes the learning experience easier. However, 9.77%, 8.62% and 2.29% of the teachers confirmed to undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively on the item. The mean value for this item is 4.24 that show the students have favorable attitude towards the item.

With regard to item 12, 60.92% and 22.99% (Strongly agreed and agreed respectively) of the respondents reported that they like to learn to work with students who are different from them. On the other hand, 12.07% noted as undecided, 2.29 % (disagreed) and 1.73 % (strongly disagreed). When the mean value is computed, it is 4.39 that illustrates the students were ready to develop the social skills through cooperative learning.

In replying to item 13, 54.59% and 27.02 % (strongly agreed and agreed) of the respondents stated that they enjoy the material more when they work with other students. Besides, 11.49% of them remained as undecided and the rest 2.88% and 4.02% of them reported to disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for the response is 4.25 which revealed that majority of students developed positive view towards the issue.

As item 14 depicts, 65.51% and 22.42% (strongly agreed and agreed) of the respondents reported that their work is better organized when they are in a group, 8.05 % of them noted as undecided and the remaining 2.29% and 1.73% answered to disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Thus, the mean value is 4.47 which indicate the students have very strong favor on the issue raised in the item.

Finally, item 15 shows that 54.59% and 24.14% (strongly agree& agree) of the respondents stated that they like their teachers use more group activities /assignments. But, 8.05% and 3.45% (disagree and strongly disagree) and the rest 9.77% of respondents replied to undecided. The mean value is 4.18 that conclude more than average number of participants has got positive feeling to work in more group activities.

In conclusion, data that were obtained and the analyses made on questionnaire items in the above section revealed that almost all students had positive attitude towards cooperative learning. They confirmed that it helps them to work with the group mates for a common goal by contributing ideas and their resources to achieve that predetermined goal. Hence, they pointed out their typical group size, stated values of cooperative learning and responded very favorably to majority of the items. This finding was substantiated with the results obtained from the focus group discussion.

4.3. Links between Teachers' and Students' Attitude of Cooperative Learning Results from Focus Group Discussions

There were five discussion questions for both teachers and students (please see appendix C &D) respectively. The main objective to conduct FGD was to answer the third research question: Are there any links between teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning? This instrument was used to supplement issues raised in the questionnaires used for both teachers and students and to triangulate the finding reached by using the complimentary data obtained from closed and open –ended questionnaires. Besides, the discussion was recorded with the consent of participants and then it was transcribed by the researcher (Please see appendix G). The response obtained from teachers and students FGD is presented as follows:

4.3.1. Results of Teachers' and Students' Focus Group Discussion

There were 9 EFL teachers and 12 students who participated in the FGD from the selected schools. Since they were not homogenous, they were not required to discuss on the issues in the same groups. Therefore, the FGD had five groups; two of them were teachers' and the remaining

groups were students'. The researcher facilitated the discussions and took the record by the help of the smart phone. The time that was taken by two groups of teachers ranges from 47' to 86' and students' FGD time ranges from 46' to 48'. The participants had a common set of experiences and beliefs with regard to the discussion topics because both groups were supposed to utilize the cooperative learning in their respective class rooms. Moreover, the contents for FGD leading questions for both teachers and students were similar (Please see appendix C& D).

The analyses on responses for the FGD items are presented below:

Majority of teachers and students unanimously agreed that cooperative learning as a strategy for instruction has not got a problem. They like to make use of its benefits in the teaching- learning process of EFL. They added that CL helps the students to share their idea, encourage the learners to build self-confidence and develop the spirit of team work.

Furthermore, the focus group discussion has also revealed the mismatch between the teachers' and students' responses. On one hand, the teachers stated that they have strong favor towards CL, but this could not be an end to make the strategy effective. Students on their part should play significant role in sharing responsibility for learning and establishing the sense of interdependence among themselves.

Teacher 1 Said:

"Well, cooperative learning strategy was very supportive for the learners. It paves the way for an effective interaction of students using English. But, English language teachers are facing a challenge in the high schools that students are not free from the long tradition of competitive learning. Besides, they felt very reluctant to work in CL."

On the other hand, students in their discussions blamed their teachers that they did not like teaching through CL. Most of the instructions is covered by their teachers.

Student 2 reported:

"I personally had a favorable view towards CL because the strategy benefitted me a lot. For instance, I had a chance to work out activities with my group mates,

share experience and build the confidence to speak in front of the class in the foreign language. I unhappily attended classes that our English teacher took much time to impart the contents. I could feel comfortable if he gave these contents to be discussed in CL.”

Like EFL teachers, students identified their favorite activities in a cooperative learning instruction. They like working on activities related to receptive skills. What is more, majority of teachers and students dislike working on productive skills. They confirmed that these activities are difficult for the students and they are simply wasting their time.

Hence, participant teachers pointed out the activities in which they were interested in teaching in CL classes and that of the activities seemed to be inconvenient for the strategy.

Majority of teachers mentioned their views on identifying their favorite activities in a cooperative learning. For instance, one of the participants said, “there are a number of activities that are designed for the students in the CL. Among these, activities related to reading were my favorite but my least favorite is speaking.” Teacher 4 added, “I am highly interested in teaching vocabulary lesson through CL and the least favorite activity for me is speaking. I think it is difficult for both teachers and students to apply it in CL classes.” The other informant added” OK, activities that are found in students’ text book are not tested whether they were convenient for CL or not. Especially activities that require developing the receptive skills shouldn’t have been included for CL I do not like teaching them. I am interested in teaching those activities that are identified to develop productive skills.”

In line with this, students have identified activities that are favorite for them. There were some students who wanted to prioritize the grammar as their most favorite activity in CL because they had back ground information from the other grades to generate ideas in discussions. However, reading activity was their least favorite one as most of its activities require an individual effort.

Data obtained from focus group discussion insights in to teachers’ feeling on the support CL made their teaching of English as effective as possible. Majority of teachers pointed out that they were interested in teaching through CL because it helps the students to develop their speaking skills, to share learning and studying experience and to avoid fear while expressing their feeling to the classmates. However, the response from students on the same issue revealed that their EFL

teachers were not interested in teaching through CL. They never encouraged the students to learn through the strategy; they had a tendency to divert the strategy to their own favor of teaching which teacher- centered method of instruction was.

One of the participants, teacher 7 disclosed “Cooperative learning helps to correct my mistakes while facilitating and giving feed backs on the students work,” he added “in cooperative learning the teacher is not the solely source of information which is one of the manifestations of traditional method of language teaching, but in CL ‘the give and take’ sort of teaching- learning process is likely to take place.’”

On the other hand, one informant, teacher 9 said:

“Logically speaking CL is a science. It really supports both teachers and students, but in my context I found it difficult to teach EFL through the strategy because I was suffering a lot to make my students work on activities cooperatively. Unfortunately they were afraid of making mistakes on speaking section. When topics were given for discussion, they were not found to the tune of using English rather they used their mother tongue for interaction. Besides, the students didn’t develop a sense of interdependence and individual accountability which were among the pertinent elements of CL that enhanced the effective implementation of the strategy. So, I had a number of hard times with my students to bring them in to right track and to be honest I am implementing the strategy unhappily.”

The focus group discussion made with students came up with their feeling of CL for the betterment of English in the classroom instruction. Therefore, all participants show their positive feeling for CL to learn the foreign language. The first speaker student 5 stated: “I was interested in learning through CL because I became courageous and less nervous to express my feeling. I was not worried when mistakes were committed.” The second participant student 10 added “I didn’t realize that I could contribute something to my group. Since I started to participate in CL, my English got better. I didn’t ask our teacher any question because I wasn’t confident in using English but in CL I felt less shy to speak to my friends. So, I like working with my friends in CL.”

The data obtained from FGD showed that majority of teachers were not motivated to use CL though they had positive feeling for the strategy. Teachers justified negatively contributing issues that created de-motivation on them.

Teacher 7 said:

“Oh! Cooperative learning didn’t motivate me much because it was just wasting of time giving some topics or activities for discussion throughout the daily or weekly periods. This really hindered me to cover the vast contents. Besides, students didn’t like learning in the strategy so that they felt reluctant to participate. What is more, I tried all my best to implement CL and I evaluated that I was not effective. Thus, I dislike teaching EFL through cooperative learning.”

Teacher 8 disclosed:

“Well, to be honest, I was not motivated to implement CL in EFL classes because I couldn’t get positive feedback from my students. In the discussions I had with them, I found information that they weren’t interested to learn English through CL. Having made continuous discussions and tried to create awareness, I began again teaching through the strategy but nothing changed. Since then I’ve been teaching English through CL without motivation. Unfortunately I couldn’t change my method of instruction as it was a must for every teacher to implement CL at school level.”

In contrary, students reported that they had good motivation to learn English through CL. They believed that it could enhance their creativity. The response from students also revealed that they were motivated to learn in CL strategy. Thus, unanimously the students forwarded their views that the strategy enabled them to have an opportunity to develop confidence in using the foreign language for interaction; it helped them to have better creativity & enhanced positive interdependence and strengthened their social skills

To wind up, the reflection made by almost all participant EFL teachers revealed that CL as a strategy supports students a lot and the educational philosophy it entails is very convincing. In the discussion there were some teachers who paid attention to facilities to help CL that had nothing to do with the strategy. But, in the end it was possible to see that majority of teachers confirmed they had positive attitude towards CL. Moreover, the result of students' FGD showed that the students highly like to work in CL in which students work together for a common success. Thus, throughout the discussion the students responded very positively to strategy.

4.4. Discussion of the Findings

The first research question was primarily designed having an objective to examine teachers' attitude towards CL. Thus, the finding of gathered data showed that majority of EFL teachers from Chena Woreda had positive attitude towards cooperative learning on all questionnaire items. Some of the issues they showed positive attitude are: benefits of CL, essential elements of CL and formation of the group members. The result is consistent with the study conducted by Berhanu (2013) that was aimed to describe the knowledge, attitude and practice of teachers' towards CL. Therefore, the study revealed that teachers seemed to have favorable attitude towards CL.

The second research question was mainly aimed to examine students' attitude toward CL in Chena Woreda. So, students confirmed that they like working with their group mates for the common goal. The finding showed that almost all students had favorable attitude towards CL in all questionnaire items provided to them.

The findings of students were consistent with the findings of the study conducted by Farzaneh & Nejadansari (2014) where the researchers aimed to evaluate the students' attitude towards CL for reading instruction indicated that the participants held generally a positive view of the implementation of cooperative strategies in teaching and learning context. The findings of students were also coincides with research result of Dale, Nassir & Sullivan (2005). Thus, the finding of their research indicated that students who regarded themselves generally as team plays rather than competing the individuals had few concerns before or after the class sessions. There were some significant shifts from negative to positive in response to some of the questions but generally the results obtained were encouraging.

Furthermore, the findings of students were consistent with the studies conducted by Zeleke, Fekadu & Ketema (2015). Therefore, their finding indicated that majority of the students had favorable attitude towards cooperative language learning.

The finding was also consistent with the finding of Atta Mimi (2014). Hence, the result of a study indicated that a remarkable development in the students' speaking skill and attitudes after introduction of CL techniques.

The finding of this study, however, was contradictory to the finding of the study by McLeish (2009). As a result, the finding indicated that students preferred working on their own to within the group due to various fears.

The third research question was mainly prepared to find out the link between teachers' and students' attitude towards CL. Hence, it was found that there were matches and mismatches on the responses obtained from both teachers and students. For instance, both of them had shown hesitation and resistance on teaching/ learning through CL but the results obtained from instruments (questionnaire and FGD) showed that they had positive attitude towards the strategy. Moreover, there was a great match between students' response to questionnaire items and FGD in which they reported that they had positive attitude towards CL very consistently. However, teachers' responses on questionnaire items and FGD were inconsistent. For example, majority of them had favorable attitude towards CL on close-ended questionnaires items. However, the results from FGD and open-ended questionnaires concluded that there were some teachers who got hesitation and resistance to teach EFL through CL. Finally, the aggregate results of the analysis on the instruments confirmed that there was a link between teachers' and students' attitudes towards CL because both groups developed favorable attitude towards the strategy.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter comprises summary of the findings, Conclusions and possible recommendations of the study. The major objectives of this study were to investigate teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning in five secondary schools of Chena woreda. In order to achieve this Objective, the following research questions were formulated.

1. What is teachers' attitude towards cooperative learning?
2. What is students' attitude towards cooperative learning?
3. Are there any links between teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning?

5.1. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussions made in this study, the following conclusions were drawn.

It was found that teachers had positive attitude towards cooperative learning. Some of the aspects of CL where they favorably responded are: the five essential elements of CL, values of CL and issues related to how to form groups for CL. Besides, it was found that teachers like to teach EFL through CL since it encourages the students to become accountable for their learning. They stated that it creates a more conducive climate to facilitate the learning process. It was also found that students from the study area had strong positive attitude towards cooperative learning. Some of the aspects of CL on which students positively responded are: Whether they like to participate in CL or not, suitable area/s for CL, the typical group size they like to participate in and values of CL. In addition, it was found that students like learning through CL as it improves, supports and creates opportunity for them to share skills and knowledge with the group mates. As the response obtained from students CL enabled them to learn from one another rather than spoon-fed by their teacher and it paved the way for working together for a shared goal. Hence, it can be

concluded that the EFL students have positive attitude towards CL. Furthermore, it was found that there was a link between teachers' and students' attitude towards CL. Majority of the two groups showed favorable attitude towards CL. The main aspects of the link are particularly focused on the essential elements and benefits of CL. Thus, the analysis of the finding indicated both teachers and students confirmed that CL develops students' interpersonal and social skills; it improves social relations within and between groups and it creates individual accountability for learning. On the other hand, the finding showed that both teachers and students believed that CL wastes much time. Furthermore, the finding of the study revealed that there was a mismatch between the hesitation and resistance both teachers and students had got for CL and the finding that was drawn. As the finding of the study showed, both EFL teachers and students identified the potential benefits of CL. With regard to responses obtained from teachers and students and findings reached, it was possible to get great matches on questionnaire items and some mismatches on FGD. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a positive link between teachers' and students' attitudes towards CL.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and conclusions reached, the following recommendations were made

The finding revealed that majority of EFL teachers in the selected secondary schools like to teach through CL. However, from the FGD made with them, it was possible to understand that there were some teachers who had unfavorable attitudes towards cooperative learning. They were not motivated to teach in CL. The main reason for these teachers for de-motivation was students' passive participation in their groups. As the point of views of the researcher, the students' stand was plausible. Because the approach was recommended by various studies and it was also the duty that was given by MOE for both teachers and students to implement the CL. Thus, as a practitioner teachers should have good motivation towards the approach they were supposed to utilize in their classrooms.

As to the finding reached, almost all students like to learn through CL. They were interested in having benefits of the strategy. But, from the analysis made in the data

obtained from teachers, it was possible to notice that there were some students who were not interested in learning EFL through CL. Hence, concerned bodies such as school principals, unit leaders and home room teachers should identify barriers that have brought about students' dissatisfaction on the way they implement CL. Besides; MOE should take in to account learner differences and various learning styles when bringing certain strategies to be implemented in educational settings.

As evidenced in their responses, both teachers and students had positive attitude towards CL, and data obtained from FGD revealed that there were issues where teachers' and students' point of views towards cooperative learning were matched and mismatched. This finding showed that there was some sort of attitudinal link between them on the importance of the strategy.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviors (2 Vols) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Akhtar, P., Kiran, S., Rashid, A. and Satti, A. (2012). A Study of Students' Attitudes towards Cooperative Learning. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2(11).
- Akinbobola, A. (2009). Enhancing Students' Attitude towards Nigerian Senior Secondary School Physics through the Use of Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Learning Strategies. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1)1-9
- Atta Mimi, R.A. (2014) Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in Enhancing Speaking Skills and Attitudes towards Learning English. International Journal of Linguistics volume 6, No. 4
- Baloche, L. (1998). The Cooperative Learning Class room: Empowering Learning. Prentice Hall: New Jersey.
- Berhanu, Y. (2013) Teachers' knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Cooperative Learning. Addis Ababa. AAU
- Borich, G.D. (2007). Effective Teaching Methods: Research Based Practice. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Carroll, P. (1994). Metamorphosis: One Teacher's Change/One Classes Reaction. English Journal, 83(6), 60-61.
- Chanchalor, S. & Chomphutong (2004). Teaching Model Focus Utilizing a Student Centered Strategy for Vocational Students. World Transformation of Engineering And Technology Education 13 (1). Vol 3 No 1/16
- Cheong, C. (2010). From Group- Based Learning to Cooperative Learning: A Meta

- Cognitive Approach to Project-Based Group supervision. Informing Science: The international Journal of an emerging Tran discipline 13
- Christi son, M.A.(1994).Cooperative Learning in the EFL Classroom. In T. Kral(Ed), Teacher Development: Making the right moves. Washington: English Language Programs Division.
- Cohen, E.G. (1986). Designing Group Work: Strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroom. New York: teachers' College Press.
- Cohen, E.G. (1994).Restructuring in the Classroom: Conditions for productive Small Groups. Review of Educational Research, 64, 1-35.
- Cruickshank, D.R., Bainer, D.L.Metcalf, K.K. (1999).The Actof Teaching. Boston: MCDRAW -Hill
- Dale, M.H.V., Nasir, L. & Sullivan. (2005).Evaluation of Student Attitudes to Cooperative Learning in Undergraduate Veterinary Medicine.UK: University of Glasgow.
- Damon.(1984) Peer Education: The Untapped Potential. Journal of Applied Development Psychology, 5,331-343.
- Dipardo, A. & Freeman, S. (1988).Peer Response Groups in the Writing Classroom: Theoretic Foundations and New Directions. Review of Educational Research, 58,119-149.
- Dornyei, Z. and Csizer, K. (2002).Some Dynamics of Language Attitudes and Motivation: Results of a longitudinal national survey. Applied Linguistics 23,421-462.
- Dunn, R., Beaudry, J.S. &Klavas, A. (1989).Survey of research on learning Styles. Educational leadership, 47(7), 50-58.
- Eagly, A.H and Chaiken, S. (1993).The psychology of Attitudes. Forth worth, TX; Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Eslamian, D. &Aref, K.(2012). The Influence of Cooperative Learning on Academic Performance. Journal of American Science, 8(2).

- Farzaneh, N.&Nejadansari, D. (2014).Students' Attitude towards Using Cooperative Learning For Teaching Reading Comprehension. Isfahan university of Isfahan vol4. No2.
- Gardner. & Lambert.(1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gillis, M. (2007).Cooperative Learning .University of Queensland: Sage.
- Hailu Negus, Solomon Tewolde and Desta Berhe (2011).The Effects of Small Group Cooperative Learning Strategy on College Students' Performance of Basic Mathematics.The Ethiopian journal of education,31(1).
- Havard, B., DU, J. & XU, J. (2008).On line Collaborative Learning and Communication Media.Journal of interactive learning research, 19, 37-50.
- Hijazi, D& Al-Nat our, A (2012) Teachers' Attitudes towards Using Cooperative Learning for Teaching English Skills. Amman: Al Yarmouk University Vol3, No.12
- Hornby, G.(2009).The Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning with Trainee Teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 35(2),161-168.
- Isaacs. (2008). Cooperative Learning Implementing an Alternative Teaching and Learning Strategy in a Grade 7 Technology Class. CPUT Thesis and Dissertations.
- Iyer, R.B. (2013).International Journal of Education and Information Studies. India Research India publication.
- Johnson, D.W, & Johnson, R. (1989) Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research.Endina, MN: Interaction Book Company
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., &Smith.(1991). Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity. SHE-ERIC. No 4. Washington, DC the George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Holubec, E.(1993).Cooperation Learning, Values, and Cultural Plural Class Rooms.Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1998).Cooperative Learning and Social Interdependence Theory-In R. Trindale, L., etal. (Eds.), Theory and Research on Small Groups (pp. 9-36).New York: Plenum, Social Psychological Applications to social Issues.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Holubec, E. (1998) Cooperation in Class room. Boston: AllynAnd Bacon.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., &Smith, K. (1998).Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Class room. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, D.W, Johnson, R, &Stanne, B.M. (2000) Cooperative Learning Methods. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.
- _____(2012). Cooperative learning methods: A meta- analysis.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (2009).An Overview of Cooperative Learning. Edina MN:Interaction Book Company.
- _____(2011). Cooperative Learning. Standard article Published Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. & Manson, S.B. (2012).Cooperative Learning Methods. A Meta-Analysis.Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.
- Jolliffe, W. (2007). Cooperative Learning in the Class room: Putting it in to practice Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Jowell, R. (2005). Understanding and Measuring Attitudes. London Franca Eirich (OCR).
- Kagan, S. (1991). Cooperative Learning: Resources for Teachers. Laguna Niguel, CA: Resources For teachers. Canada: Rubicon Publishing Inc.
- _____(1993).The Structural Approach to Cooperative Learning. In D.D.Hold (Ed.), Cooperative Learning: A response to linguistic and cultural diversity. United States of America: Delta Systems.Inc.

- _____. (1995). We Can Talk-Cooperative Learning in the Elementary Class room.
Washington DC (ERIC Document Production).
- Kaufman, D.E.S., & Sawyer, B.E. (2004). Primary Grade Teachers' Self-efficacy Beliefs,
Attitudes towards Teaching Practice Priorities in Relation to the Responsive
Classroom Approach. The elementary school journal, 04, 321-341.
- Knight, G.P. & Bohlmeier, E.M. (1990). Cooperative Learning and Achievement:
Methods for Assessing Casual Mechanisms. In S. Sharan (Ed.), Cooperative
Learning: Theory and practice. New York: Praeger.
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). Research Methodology. New Delhi. New age International (P)
Limited.
- Liang, T. (2002). Implementing Cooperative Learning in EFL Teaching: Process
And Effects. Doctoral Dissertation. National Taiwan Normal University
- Maio, G. & Augostinos (1995). Attitudes, Attributions and Social Cognition. London: sage
- McClure, M. (1990). Collaborative Learning: Teacher's game and Students' game. English
Journal, 72(2), 66-68.
- McLeish, k. (2009). Attitudes of Student towards Cooperative Learning Methods.
Jamaica: University of Technology.
- Mourtos, N. (1997). The Nuts and Bolts of Cooperative Learning in Engineering
Education. Journal of Engineering Education.
- Muhammad, K. (2012). Cooperative Learning Practices in College of Education and
Behavioral sciences in Haromaya University. International Journal of Science
And Research Vol3 Issue II, November, 2014.
- Oller, J.W. (1979). Language Tests at School. London: Longman.
- Pad wick, A. (2010). Attitudes towards English and Varieties of English in Globalizing
India: University of Groningen. Newcastle, England. Allyn and Bacon.
- Parkay, F.W. & Stanford, B.H. (2007). Becoming a Teacher (3rd Ed.) New York: Allyn
And Bacon.

- Piaget, J. (1970). *The Science of Education the Psychology of the Child*. New York: Orion Press.
- Pickens, J. (2005). *Attitudes and Perception*. Florida. Thomas University.
- Pigot, H., Pantuzzo, J. & Clement, P. (1986). The Effects of Reciprocal Peer Tutoring and Group Contingencies on the Academic Performance of Elementary School Children. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 19, 93-98.
- Putnam, J. (1997). *Cooperative Learning in Diverse Classrooms*. New Jersey Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Rani, K. (2000). *Educational Aspirations and Scientific Attitudes*. New Delhi: Discovering Publishing house.
- Riley. & Anderson. (2006). Randomized study on the impact of cooperative learning: Distance education in public health. *The quarterly review of distance education* 7(2), 129-144)
- Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: SAGE Public Ltd.
- Salend, S.J. (1994). *Effective Mainstreaming: Creating Inclusive classroom* (2nd Ed.) New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (1991). Cooperative Learning in Inclusive Class rooms: Learning to Become a Community. *Cooperative Learning*, 12(1), 8-11.
- Schuman, H., & Presser, S. (1981). *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys*. New York: Academic press.
- Schwartz, N., & Sudman, S. (1992). *Context Effects in Social and Psychological Research* New York: Springer Verlag.
- See tape, N. (2013). *Effects of Cooperative Learning on English Reading Achievement And Learning behaviors*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Kasesar University.
- Seid, M. (2012). *Effects of Cooperative Learning on Reading Comprehension Achievement in EFL and Social Skills of Grade 10 Students*. Unpublished (PhD Thesis) Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Slavin, R.E. (1980). *Effects of Student Teams and Peer Tutoring on Academic*

- Achievement Time on Task. Journal of experimental education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Slavin, R.E., Sharan, S., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Webb, C. & Schmuck, R. (1985). (Eds), Learning To Cooperative. Cooperating to Learn, New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Slavin, R.E. (1990). Comprehensive Cooperative Learning Models. Embedding Cooperative Learning in the Curriculum and the School. In S. Sharan (Ed.), Cooperative learning theory and practice. New York: Praeger.
- _____. (1991). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. Educational Leadership, 48, 71-82.
- _____. (1995). Instruction Based on Cooperative Learning. USA: Johns Hopkins University and University of York.
- _____. (1996). Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: What We Know, What We Need to Know. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21(1). New Jersey, Mahawari.
- Slavin, R.E. & Cooper, R. (1999). Improving Intergroup Relations: Lessons Learned from Cooperative Learning Programs. Centre for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. Johns Hopkins University. The Journal of Social Issues.
- Slavin, R.E., Hurley, E.A., & Chamberlain, A. (2004). Cooperative Learning and Achievement: Theory and Research. In I.B. Weiner (Ed.), Hand book of Psychology (V7). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stahl, R.J. (1994). The Essential Elements of Cooperative Learning in the Class Room. New Jersey: John Wiley & sons, Inc.
- Strack, F., & Martin, L. (1987). Thinking, Judging and Communicating: Process Account Of Context Effects in Attitude Surveys. Social information processing and Survey methodology (pp.123-148). New York: Springer Verlag.
- Sudman, S., Bradburn, N.M., & Schwartz, N. (1996). Thinking about Answers The Application of Cognitive Processes to Survey Methodology. San Francisco, CA:

- Suhendan, E.R. & Bengu, A.A. (2014). The Attitudes of Students towards a Cooperative Learning in ELT Classes. *International online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 2(1), 109-122.
- Tahaine, Y. and Dana, H. (2013). Jordanian Undergraduates' Motivations and Attitudes Towards Learning English in EFL context, *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities* Vol.4, No2.
- Tang, H. (2000). Using Cooperative Concept Mapping Skill to Teach ESL reading. *PASSA*, 30, 77-89.
- Tourangeau, R. (1984). *Cognitive Aspects of Survey Methodology: Building a Bridge Between Disciplines* (pp.73-100). Washington DC: National academic press.
- Tourangeau, R., & Rasinski, K.A. (1988). Cognitive Processes Underlying Context Effects in Attitude Measurement. *Psychological Bulletin*. 103, 299-314.
- Tsai, S. (1998). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Senior High School Students. Master's Thesis. National Kaohsiung University.
- Turco, T. & Elliott, S. (1990). Acceptability and Effectiveness of Group contingencies for Improving Spelling Achievement. *Journal of School Psychology* 28, 27-37.
- Warmsley, R. (2003). Cooperative Learning and Its Effects in a High School Geometry Classroom. 96 (2), 112-116.
- Wang, M. (2012). Effects of Cooperative learning on Achievement Motivation of Female University Students. *Asian Social Science*, 8(15), 108-114.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Wichadee, S. (2005). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on English Reading Skill Attitudes of First Year Students at Bangkok University. *Bu Academic Review*.
- Winne, P.H. & Marx, R.W. (1989). A Cognitive Processing Analysis of Motivation With

- In Classrooms Tasks. Inc. Ames & R-Ames (Eds.), Research on Motivation in Education: Vol.3 Goals and Cognitions San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Woolfolk, A.E., Winne, P.H. and Perry, N.E. (2011). Educational Psychology. Canada: Rahnama Press.
- Yi, Z. & Luxi, Z. (2012). Implementing cooperative learning. Educational Studies, 38(2), 165-173.
- Zelege, T.L., Fekadu, G. & Ketema, J. (2015). Assessment of EFL Learners' Attitude Towards Cooperative Language Learning: Science, Technology and Arts Research Journal July-Sep 2015, 4(3):240-252.

APPENDICES

Appendix- A: Teachers' questionnaire

Arbaminch University

School of Graduate Studies

College of Social Science and Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

Instructions: - The following items under questionnaire are designed to examine teachers' attitudes towards cooperative learning. Please read them carefully and give your appropriate response to each item. The information you provide would be used only for academic purpose and kept confidential. Besides, your responses could vary from ``Strongly Agree`` to ``Strongly Disagree`` use☑ mark to give your responses.

N.B. You don't have to write your name.

Thank you in advance

Key to numbers

1. Strongly disagree

3. Undecided

5. Strongly Agree

2. Disagree

4. Agree

NO	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	I feel cooperative learning is advantageous for students learning.					
2	I like heterogeneous ability group members in a cooperative learning.					
3	Cooperative learning improves students' self-esteem.					
4	Cooperative learning increases students' productivity.					
5	Cooperative learning improves respect of others opinions among students.					
6	I feel cooperative learning affects students' academic achievement positively.					
7	Cooperative learning facilitates students to use higher level of thinking strategies.					
8	Cooperative learning encourages students to create new ideas.					
9	I do not like CL group members that are formed based on friendship.					
10	Cooperative learning is important both for students and teachers.					

11	I like to make use of the essential elements of cooperative learning.					
12	Cooperative learning is a valuable instructional approach.					
13	Positive interdependence among group members ensures effective learning.					
14	I feel cooperative learning makes students responsible for their learning.					

15. Do you like different techniques of cooperative learning?-----

16. Name the subject/subjects in which you believe greater learning can be facilitated in cooperative learning.

17. Do you like giving more cooperative activities/assignments? Please give your reason/s for your response -----

-18. Please write down anything else you would like to say about your attitude towards cooperative learning -----

Appendix- B: Students' Questionnaire

Arbaminch University

School of Graduate Studies

College of Social Science and Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is designed to examine students' attitude towards cooperative learning. Thus, I would like to appreciate your genuine and frank responses that help the research to meet its objectives. The information you provide is very crucial for academic purpose and your response is kept confidential. Besides, your responses could vary from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" and use `✓` mark to give your responses.

NB: You don't have to write your name.

Thank you in advance

Section one

1. Do you like to participate in a cooperative activity/ assignment? ☐ Yes
☐ No
2. If yes, where do you usually like to participate in cooperative activities/assignments?
☐ In class
☐ Outside of class Both ☐
3. Which typical size of the group do you like most?
☐ 2-4 ☐ 5-7 ☐ 8-10 ☐ other please specify

Section two

Read the following and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the statements.

Questionnaire key

Key to numbers

- 1 Strongly Disagree
- 2 Disagree
- 3 Undecided
- 4 Agree
- 5 Strongly Agree

No	Statement	5	4	3	2	1
4	I like to work together more than to work alone for better achievement.					
5	I willingly participate in cooperative learning activities.					
6	Cooperative learning can improve my attitude towards work.					
7	Cooperative learning helps me to socialize more.					
8	I like cooperative learning as it enhances good working relationships among students.					
9	Cooperative learning enhances class participation.					
10	Creativity is facilitated in the cooperative learning situation.					
11	Cooperative learning makes the learning experience easier.					
12	I like to learn to work with students who are different from me.					
13	I enjoy the material more when I work with other students.					
14	My work is better organized when I am in a group.					
15	I like that my teacher use more group activities/assignments.					

Appendix-C Focus Group Discussion Lead Questions for Teachers

Arbaminch University

School of Graduate Studies

College of Social Science and Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

The major objective to make this focus group discussion is to find out the links between teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning.

1. Do you like teaching English in cooperative learning? Why? Or why not?
2. What are your favorite activities in a cooperative learning class? What are your least favorite activities? Why do you or don't you like them?
3. Are you interested in teaching English as a foreign language through cooperative learning? If yes, in what way? If no, please tell me your reason/s.
4. How does cooperative learning help in your motivation towards teaching English?
5. How do you like your future English class to be? What are your suggestions for future English class?

Appendix-D: Focus Group Discussion Lead Questions for Students

Arbaminch University

School of Graduate Studies

College of Social Science and Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

The major objective to make this focus group discussion is to find out the links between teachers' and students' attitudes towards cooperative learning.

1. Do you like learning English in cooperative learning? Why? Or Why not?
2. What are your favorite activities in a cooperative learning class? What are your least favorite activities? Why do you or don't you like them?
3. Are you interested in learning of English as a foreign language through cooperative learning? If yes, in what way? If no, please tell me your reason/s.
4. How does cooperative learning help in your motivation towards learning English?
5. How do you like your future English class to be? What are your suggestions for future English class?

Appendix- E Students' Questionnaire in Amharic version

ቅጥያሔ፡ የተማሪዎች መጠይቅ

አርባምንጭዩኒቨርሲቲ

የድህረ-ምረቃት/ት/ቤት

በማህበራዊሳይንስና ስነ-ሰብካሌ

የእንግሊዘኛ ቋንቋ እና ፅሁፍት/ትክፍል

ውድመላሽ፡

የዚህ መጠይቅ ዋና ዓላማው በህብረት መማር ላይ ተማሪዎች ያላቸውን አመለካከት ለመፈተሽ ይሆናል፡፡ በተጨማሪም በመጠይቆቹ ላይ በቅንነት እና በታማኝነት የሚሰጡ ምላሾች ጥናቱን ከታሰበው ዓላማ ላይ ለማድረስ ከፍተኛ አስተዋፅኦ ደርጋል፡፡ በመሆኑም ተሳታፊዎች ለመጠይቆቹ የሚሰጡአቸው ምላሾች ሚስጥራዊነታቸው በእጅጉ የተጠበቀ በመሆኑ ከምንም አይነት ስጋት ነፃ በመሆን ያላቸውን ሃሳብ መግለፅ ይችላሉ፡፡ ለመጠይቆቹ ምላሽ ለመስጠት በሳፕሞች/ በሠንጠረዥ ውስጥ የ☐ ምልክት ተጠቀሙ፡፡ በመጨረሻም በየትኛውም ቦታ ላይ ስማችሁን መፃፍ አይጠበቅባችሁም፡፡

ለምታደርጉት መልካም ትብብር በቅድሚያ ምስጋናዬን አቀርባለሁ፡፡

ክፍል አንድ

1. ከዚህ በፊት በህብረት(በቡድን) ሥራዎች ላይ ተሳትፈህ/ሽ/ ታውቃለህ/ታውቂያለሽ አዎ/አይደለም ☐ ☐
2. መልስህ/ሽ አዎ ከሆነ ህብረት ሥራዎችን የምትሰራው (የምትሰራው) የት ነው ?
☐ ክፍል ውስጥ
☐ ከክፍል ውጭ
☐ በሁለቱም
3. በህብረት ሥራው ውስጥ የቡድን አባላት ቁጥር ምን ያህል ነው ?

☐ 2 – 4 ☐ 5 - 7 ☐ 8-10 ☐ ሌሎች

ክፍልሁለት

የሚከተሉትን መጠይቆች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ የስምምነት ወይም አለመስማማት ደረጃህን/ሽን ለእያንዳንዱ ያረጃል/ክት/ ቺ።

የመጠይቆች መፍቻ

5. በጣም አስማማለሁ 4. አስማማለሁ 3. በመካከለኛ 2. አልስማማም 1. በጣም አልስማማም

ተ/ቁ	መጠይቅ	5	4	3	2	1	
4	ሥራዎቼን በግል ከመሥራት ይልቅ በጋራ ስሰራ የበለጠ ውጤታማ እሆናለሁ።						
5	በህብረት ትምህርት እና ሥራዎች ላይ በፍቃድኝነት ነው የምሳተፈው።						
6	በህብረት መማር ለሥራ ያለኝን አመለካከት ሊያሻሽልኬ ይችላል።						
7	በህብረት መማር ከሌሎች ጋር የበለጠ እንድትዋወቅ እና እንድትገባ ይረዳኛል።						
8	በህብረት መማር በተማሪዎች መካከል ጤናማ የሥራ ግንኙነት እንዲኖር ያደርጋል።						
9	በህብረት መማር የክፍል ውስጥ ተሳትፎን ይጨምራል።						
10	የህብረት ት/ት የፈጠራ አቅምን ለማሳደግ ምቹ ሁኔታን ይፈጥራል።						
11	የህብረት ት/ት የመማር ልምድን ቀልጣፋ እና ቀላል ያደርጋል።						
12	በህብረት በመማር ሂደት ውስጥ ከሌሎች ተማሪዎች ጋር መሥራትን እማራለሁ።						
13	ከሌሎች ተማሪዎች ጋር ስሰራ የተሰጡኝን ቁሳቁስ / የመማሪያ መጻህፍት የበለጠ ደስተኛ ሆኜ እማርባቸዋለሁ።						
14	በቡድን እና በህብረት ስሆን ሥራዎቼ በተሻለ ሁኔታ የተደራጁ ይሆናሉ።						
15	መምህራን የቡድን ሥራዎችን / መልመጃዎችን ቢሰጡኝ እመርጣለሁ / እሻለሁ /።						

Appendix F: Students' Questions for Focus Group Discussion in Amharic Version

ቅጥያረ

አርባምንጭዩኒቨርሲቲ

የድህረ-ምረቃት/ትቤት

በማህበራዊሳይንስእናስነሱበኮሌጅ

የእንግሊዘኛቋንቋእናሥነ- ጽሁፍት/ትክፍል

ለጋራውይይትለተለዩተማሪዎችየሚቀርቡጥያቂዎች

የዚህ ውይይት ዋነኛ ዓላማ በህብረት ት/ት አሰጣጥ ሂደት ላይ በመምህራንና ተማሪዎች አመለካከት መካከል ትስስር መኖር ወይም አለመኖሩን ማየት /ማረጋገጥ ይሆናል፡፡

1. እንግሊዘኛን በህብረት በመማር ሂደት ላይ ያለህ/ሽ አስተሳሰብ እንዴት ይገለጻል ?የትም/ትአሰጣጥ ሂደቱን ትወደዋለህ /ትወጅዋለሽ ?ለምን ?የማትወደው ወይም የማትወጂው ከሆነ ለምን ?
2. በህብረት መማሪያ ክፍል ጊዜያት ላይ ወደህ/ሽና/ ደስተኛ ሆነህ/ሽ/ የምትሰራቸው/የምትሰሪያቸው መልመጃዎች /ተግባራት የትኞቹ ናቸው ? በዝቅተኛ ፍላጎትስ የሚሰሩ መልመጃዎች / ተግባራት የትኞቹ ናቸው? የምትወዳቸው /የምትወጃቸው በምን ምክንያት እንደሆነ ግለጽ/ግለጭ፡፡የምትጠላቸው/የምትጠያቸው ተግባራት ካሉ በምን ምክንያት እንደሆነ አስረዳ/ አስረጅ፡፡
3. በህብረትመማርእንግሊዘኛንእንደውጭቋንቋለማጥናት / ለመማርይረዳኛልብለህ /ብለሽታስባለህ /ታስብያለሽ ? መልሱህ /ሽ/ አዎከሆነበምንሁኔታ ? አይደለምከሆነደግሞእባክህ /ሽ/ ምክንያትህን /ሽን/ አስረዳ /ጅ/ ፡፡
4. በህብረትእንግሊዘኛንመማርእንዴትቋንቋውንለመማርያለህን/ሽን/ተነሳሽነትያሳድጋል ?
5. ለወደፊት የሚኖሩህ የእንግሊዘኛ ክፍል-ጊዜያት እንዴት እንዲሆኑ ትፈልጋለህ? ወደፊት ለሚኖሩህ /ሽ/የእንግሊዘኛ ክፍል ጊዜያት ምን አስተያየቶችን ትሰጣለህ/ ትሰጭያለሽ ?

APPENDIX G

There were five in-depth questions for both teachers and students (please see appendix C &D) respectively. The main objective to conduct FGD was to answer the third research question. Are there any links between teachers' and students' attitude towards cooperative learning? This instrument was used to supplement issues raised in the questionnaires used for both teachers and students and to triangulate the finding reached by using the complimentary data obtained from closed and open –ended questionnaires. Besides, the discussion was recorded with the consent of participants and then it was transcribed by the researcher. The response obtained from teachers and students on FGD is presented as follows:

As it has been stated earlier, there were 9 EFL teachers who participated in the FGD from the selected schools. Their responses for the FGD items are presented below:

Item1: What do you think of teaching English in Cooperative learning? Do you like it? Why? Or Whynot?

Teacher 1 Said:

“Well, cooperative learning strategy was very supportive for the learners. It paved the way for an effective interaction of students using English. But, the challenge that English language teachers was facing in the high schools was that students were not free from the long tradition of competitive learning. Besides, they felt very reluctant to work in CL”

Item. 2. What are your favorite activities in a CL class? What are your least favorite activities? Why do you or don't you like them?

One of the participants said, “There were a number of activities that were designed for the students to practice. Among these, activities related to reading were my favorite but my least favorite was speaking.” Teacher 4 added: “I was highly interested in teaching vocabulary lesson through CL and the least favorite activity for me was speaking. I think it is difficult for both teachers and students to apply it in CL classes.” The other informant added” OK, activities that were found in students' text book were not tested whether they were convenient for CL or not.

Especially activities that required developing the receptive skills shouldn't have been included for CL. What is more, those activities that were identified to develop productive skills should be facilitated for cooperative learning."

Item 3. Do you think cooperative learning helps in your teaching of English as a foreign language? If yes, in what way? If no. please tell me your reason/s..

One of the participants, teacher 7 disclosed "Cooperative learning helped to correct my mistakes while facilitating and giving feed backs on the students work," he added "in cooperative learning the teacher was not the solely source of information which was one of the manifestations of traditional method of language teaching, but in CL 'the give and take' sort of teaching- learning process was likely to take place."

On the other hand, one informant, teacher 9 said:

"Logically speaking CL was a science. It really supported both teachers and students, but in my context I found it difficult to implement this strategy because I was suffering a lot to make students practice it effectively. Unfortunately my students were afraid of making mistakes on speaking section. When topics were given for discussion they were not found to the tune of using English rather they used their mother tongue for interaction. Besides, the students didn't develop a sense of interdependence and individual accountability which were among the pertinent elements of CL that enhanced the effective implementation of the strategy. So, I had a number of hard times with my students to bring them in to right track and to be honest I am implementing the strategy unhappily."

Item 4 How does cooperative learning help in your motivation towards teaching English?

One of the participants, teacher 6 forwarded "personally I agreed that motivation was very important for every activity to take place. I had great motivation to implement CL. But, this shouldn't be an end. Finding out what was likely demotivating the students and putting certain intervention could bring about students' motivation towards CL."

The other two participants, on the other hand, stated that they were not motivated in teaching English through CL. These teachers pointed out the reason why they were demotivated.

Teacher 7 said:

“Oh! Cooperative learning didn’t motivate me much because it was just wasting of time giving some topics or activities for discussion throughout the daily or weekly periods. This really hindered me to cover the vast contents. Besides, students didn’t get awareness on the benefits of CL so that they felt reluctant to participate. What is more, I tried all my best to implement CL and I evaluated that I was not effective. Thus, I was implementing this strategy unhappily.”

Teacher 8 disclosed:

“Well, to be honest, I was not motivated to implement CL in EFL classes because I couldn’t get positive feedback from my students. In the discussions I had with them I found information that they weren’t interested to learn English through CL. Having made continuous discussions and tried to create awareness, I began again teaching through the strategy but nothing changed. Since then I’ve been teaching English through CL without motivation. Unfortunately I couldn’t change my method of instruction as it was a must for every teacher to implement CL at school level.”

Item 5 How do you like your future English class to be? What are your suggestions for future English class?

The participants expressed their interest and suggestions for future English class. So, almost all of them heartily forwarded their views to establish effective cooperative learning classes. Issues that participants repetitively raised and reached at a consensus to make their future English class convenient for CL are: getting active participant students, forming manageable class size to follow up discussions and getting the students who make use of benefits of CL. Likewise, the participants suggested on a number of issues that were connected to the effective implementation of CL. Some of the suggestions made to pave the way for a conducive environment of CL are: creating awareness of the students on the benefits of the strategy. Concerned bodies should fulfill educational facilities, curriculum developer ought to minimize the bulky volume of text books,

workshops should be prepared for teachers to update their profession and the last but not the least is exam specialists should consider the wash back effect of questions that are designed for the national exam.

As mentioned in the earlier section, there were 12 students who took part in the FGD from the selected five secondary schools. Their responses for the FGD items are presented below;-

Item1. What do you think of learning English in cooperative learning? Do you like it? Why? Or Why not?

Student 2 said:

“I personally had a favorable view towards CL because the strategy benefitted me a lot. For instance, I had a chance to work out activities with my group mates, share experience and build the confidence to speak in front of the class in the foreign language. I unhappily attended classes where our English teacher took much time to impart the contents. I could feel comfortable if he divided these contents to discuss in CL.”

The second informant, student 3 reported:

“Well, I couldn’t say CL was practiced in our school effectively because our teacher had a tendency to go to traditional method of teaching. For example, he wanted to translate everything in to Amharic, I was not encouraged to speak in front of my classmates and much of the contents were covered by him and very little opportunity was given for CL.”

The other participant, student 4 disclosed:

“Cooperative learning created a great chance for me to work together for a shared goal. It helped me to uplift my language competency. But, there were my classmates who were not free from the traditional method of learning where they were spoon-fed by their teacher. I strongly supported this strategy because other developed countries made use of it effectively to develop their students’ language skills.”

Item2. What are your favorite activities in a CL class? What are your least favorite activities? Why do you or don’t you like them?

One of the participants, student 6 said:

“Ok, I was interested to learn speaking skills in CL classes because it gave me chance to share experience with my group mates.”

Moreover, student 11 mentioned:

“I wasn’t interested in reading activities because they did not make me improve my speaking skills. I thought most of the reading activities could be done individually either at home or in the classroom and they needed no more to cooperate with other students. However, I was highly interested in speaking activities most favorably as it gave me a chance to practice speaking skills.”

On the other hand, one participant (student 4) forwarded:

“I’m interested in reading activities. I understood that this skill was highly disliked by students. But, I believed that a lot of issues could be obtained from reading. He added reading made my thought complete; therefore, I did not lose ideas to share with my partners in CL.” This participant strongly argued with the other students to change their views towards reading skill. Thus, the saying that strengthened this student’s notion on the related issue was that “A man is himself plus the book he/she reads.”

One of the participants reported: “I understood that CL helped me a lot by creating a favorable situation to practice the foreign language. However, our teacher unhappily implemented the strategy. And that is why he used up much of our time to explain details of the contents.”

Item3.

Do you think cooperative learning helps in your learning of English as a foreign language? If yes, in what way? If no, please tell me your reasons.

The first speaker, student 5 stated: “I was interested in learning through CL because I became courageous and less nervous to express my feeling. I was not worried when mistakes were committed.” The second participant student 10 added “I didn’t realize that I could contribute something to my group. Since I started to participate in CL, my English got better. I didn’t ask

our teacher any question because I wasn't confident in using English but in CL I felt less shy to speak to my friends. So, I like working with my friends in CL."

Item4. How does cooperative learning help in your motivation towards learning English?

One of the participants said: "What motivated me most about CL was that it gave me an access to interact in English with my group mates. The practice I made in English through CL on one hand enabled me to have an effective interaction with my partner. On the other hand, it supported me to have better understanding for more than eight subjects as a medium of instruction."

The other participant said, "I completely agreed that CL played a great role in bringing about motivation to study English. I had been very shy but CL created courage to share my idea with other students in the same group." The next speaker suggested "practicing English in CL was motivating because it helped me to have better creativity, enhanced positive interdependence and strengthened my social skills."

The last participant, student 12 stated: "Well, I was highly motivated to learn English in CL. The strategy benefitted me a lot. Since our English teacher required us to work in CL, I could find improvements in my language competency."

Item 5. How do you like your future English class to be? What are your suggestions for future English class?

One of the participants stated, "I was tired of listening to our teacher's translation of English contents to Amharic. I could be very much happy if I were taught the target language by the native speaker." The other informant said, "I don't think our English teacher was inspired to teach through CL. I'm saying this because most of the time he used up the entire period without letting us discuss on the issues."

”
.