NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL of EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT of ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE EFFECT of COOPERATIVE LANGUAGE LEARNING ON STUDENTS' ORAL PERFORMANCES

MASTER THESIS

NİLDEM YIRTICI

NICOSIA

May 2013

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL of EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT of ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE EFFECT of COOPERATIVE LANGUAGE LEARNING ON STUDENTS' ORAL PERFORMANCES

MASTER THESIS

NİLDEM YIRTICI

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. ÇİSE ÇAVUŞOĞLU

NICOSIA

May 2013

We certify that we have read the thesis submitted by Nildem Yırtıcı titled "The Effect of Cooperative Language Learning on Students' Oral Performances" and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

....
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt
Head of the Committee

....
Assist. Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu
Supervisor

....
Assist. Prof. Dr. Doina Popescu
Committee Member

....
Assist. Prof. Dr. Asliye Dağman
Committee Member

Approved for the
Graduate School of Educational Sciences

....
Prof. Dr. Cem Birol

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all materials and results that are not original to this study.

Name, surname: Nildem Yırtıcı

Signature: ....

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE LANGUAGE LEARNING ON STUDENTS' ORAL PERFORMANCES

Yırtıcı, Nildem

MA Programme in English Language Teaching

Supervisor, Assist Prof. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu

May 2013, 117 pages

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) in increasing students' success in foreign language learning in terms of their oral performances. To reach the aim of this study, two groups pre-test and post-test quasi-experimental design was used. CLL structures, principles, strategies and researcher made CLL activities were carefully applied in the classroom setting with the experimental group and the non-cooperative/traditional activities were used with the students in the control group. Each group contained 22 participants who were all first year students at European University of Lefke at the Department of Pre-School Teaching. There were 13 females and 9 males in the experimental group whereas there were 15 females and 7 males in the control group. At the beginning of the Fall Semester of the 2011-2012 academic year, an oral pre-test was given to both groups and at the end of the semester the same test was given to both groups again as the post-test. The gathered data was analysed on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 18.0. Paired sample t-tests showed that both groups had significant differences in their pre-post test results. However, it was observed that the performances of the students in the experimental group have increased in the post-test when compared to their performances in the pre-test. This difference was also found to be statistically significant. Further independent t-test analysis showed that the difference between the post-test results of the experimental group and the control group was both significant and meaningful in favour of the experimental group. It is concluded that CLL has been useful in increasing the oral performances of the participants.

ÖZET
İşbirlikçi Dil Öğreniminin Öğrencilerin Sözlü Performansı Üzerindeki Etkileri

Yırtıcı, Nildem

Yüksek Lisans, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çise Çavuşoğlu

Mayıs, 2013, 117 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İşbirlikli Dil Öğrenimi'nin (İDÖ) öğrencilerin konuşma becerileri açısından yabancı dil öğrenme sürecindeki başarılarını artırmadaki etkisini incelemektir. Çalışmada, öğrencilerin sınıf içerisindeki işbirlikçi grup çalışması ya da ikili çalışma etkinliklerine katılımı ve onların sözlü performans/konuşma becerilerindeki başarıları arasındaki olası ilişki incelenmiştir. Bu amaca ulaşabilmek için yarı deneysel bir desen kullanılarak, deney grubu ve kontrol grubu olmak üzere iki gruptan oluşan katılımcılara ön test ve son test uygulanmıştır. İşbirlikçi Dil Öğrenme yapıları, ilkeleri, stratejileri ve araştırmacının hazırlamış olduğu işbirlikçi dil öğrenme etkinlikleri sınıf ortamı içerisinde deney grubuna uygulanırken, işbirliğine dayalı olmayan/geleneksel etkinlikler de kontrol grubuna uygulanmıştır. Katılımcılar, Lefke Avrupa Universitesi Okul Öncesi Öğretmenliği Bölümü'nde okuyan birinci sınıf öğrencilerinden oluşmaktaydı. Deney grubunda 13 kız ve 9 erkek, kontrol grubunda ise 15 kız ve 7 erkek olmak üzere toplamda her grupta 22 katılımcı bulunmaktaydı. 2011- 2012 akademik yılı Güz Dönemi başında her iki gruba verilen konuşma ön testi, dönemin sonunda her iki gruba da son test olarak verilmiştir. Elde edilen veriler Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 18.0 yazılım programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiş, eşlenmiş t-test sonuçları her iki grubun da ön ve son test sonuçlarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar olduğunu göstermiştir. Buna rağmen, deney grubundaki öğrencilerin son test performanslarının kontrol grubundaki öğrencilerin son test performanslarına göre daha iyi olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Diğer yandan, bağımsız t-test analizi deney ve kontrol gruplarının son test sonuçları arasındaki farkın deney grubunun lehine anlamlı olduğunu göstermiştir. Araştırmanın sonunda, İşbirlikçi Dil Öğrenimi'nin katılımcıların sözlü performanslarını artırmada yararlı olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To my parents and my brother

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CIRC: Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition

CL: Cooperative Learning

CLL: Cooperative Language Learning

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

EUL: European University of Lefke

GI: Group Investigation

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

STAD: Student Team Achievement Division

STT: Student Talking Time

TAI: Team Assisted Individualization

TGT: Teams-Games-Tournament

TRNC: Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

TTT: Teacher Talking Time

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

Communication is the essence of human interaction. Although communication can be in many modes and may serve diverse purposes, one approach to defining it is through the concept of information gaps. According to this perspective, people use their communicative skills to learn something that they do not know or because they want to give information to another person about something. In other words, there is an information gap between them which has to be filled. This is the way communication is perceived by cooperative language learning. In cooperative language learning, the nature of communication depends on the interaction between two or more people and comprehension is constructed through that interaction. In the classroom setting, however, it is difficult to create this information gap in the traditional teacher-initiated interactions, where students are expected to respond and then get feedback from the teacher. Therefore, language teachers should try to provide their students with activities in which a genuine information gap of some kind exists. This means that activities in which students can only get the information they need by talking to other students in the target language should be designed for language learning. In such activities, teachers need to minimize their talking time and increase students' talking time to give their students a chance to practice language with their peers. In this way, students' speaking skills will be developed in the classroom. Harmer (2007) believes that if the teachers talk too much it means the students get less chance to practise speaking in the classroom environment. Therefore, a good teacher needs to give chance to their students to practise speaking and develop their speaking skills because they are the ones who really need to practise their speaking not the teachers themselves. As a result, if the teachers really

want to increase their students' speaking skills, they need to maximize student talking time (STT) by minimizing teacher talking time (TTT) in the classroom. To do this requires teachers to shift their teaching strategies from teacher-centred strategies to student-centred strategies.

Killen (1992) states that teacher-centred approaches are also called direct instruction, deductive teaching or exposition application teaching. According to Killen, lecturing is one of the teacher-centred approaches to teaching and in this type of interaction, the teacher has full control of what and how the students will learn a specific topic. On the other hand, student-centred approaches put more emphasis on the learner. They are also known as discovery learning, inductive learning, or inquiry learning. Killen (1992) argues that "When using student-centred techniques, you still set the agenda but you have much less direct control over what and how your students learn" (p. 1). As one of these approaches, Cooperative Language Learning (henceforth CLL) emerged as an important method which helped language teachers make their classrooms more student-centred. However, CLL is not a new term in education. Marr (1997) stated that the idea of cooperative groups was brought to America by Joseph Lanchaster and Andrew Bell in the late 1700s. In 1806, Lanchaster and Bell opened the Lanchastrian School. There was a great emphasis on CLL in this school because there was a great diversity of children attending there in terms of their cultural backgrounds and CLL was used to socialize them into becoming 'Americans' (Marr, 1997). By using cooperative teaching methods, it was believed that mutual responsibility, which was the central principle of democracy for the advocators, was being promoted.

According to Marr (1997), one of the most well-known advocators of CLL was Colonel Francis Parker, superintendent of the public schools in Quincy, Massachusetts (1875-1890). Parker believed that if shared learning was encouraged and competition was eliminated as the main purpose of school tasks, students' capacities would fully

develop. Marr (1997) stated that John Dewey, who was another well-known advocate of CLL, followed on from these scholars and developed the idea of cooperative learning in the early twentieth century. Dewey and his colleagues stressed the public side of learning and the schools' function in educating students in democratic way of life. Although Dewey's theories were for education in general, CLL is currently being used in many classes to teach English to students all over the world.

Duxbury and Tsai (2010) argue that CLL is different from other methods suggested for teaching English in four important ways. They claim that CLL (a) allows students to use the target language more often, (b) promotes interaction with others in the classroom, (c) builds an environment for encouraging classroom activities and (d) gives diversity to language learning. In the following sections, detailed information about CLL and its place in this research will be presented.

1.2. Cooperative Language Learning (CLL)

As explained earlier, CLL is considered to be a student-centred teaching strategy. The most significant characteristic of CLL is the use of small group work during instruction. Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998) state that "Cooperative Learning is practising small group work in class to accomplish cooperation and optimum learning for each learner" (p. 15). According to Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1992), use of small groups helps students "to maximize their own and each other's' learning" (p. 1). Due to this strong emphasis on small group work in CLL activities, the terms 'group work' and 'cooperative learning' have often been confused to mean the same thing. Indeed, in group work activities, several students work together. However, working together does not necessarily involve cooperation among students. According to Woolfolk (2001) "Cooperative learning is an arrangement in which students work in mixed ability groups and are rewarded on the basis of the success of the group" (para.2). According to Siegel

(2005), CLL involves students working in small groups in order to accomplish a shared task. Chafe (1998) stated that in order to achieve their common aims and be successful in CLL, students need to work in small groups and share information to help each other's learning. Along with Siegel and Chafe's definitions, Panitz (1996) defines CLL "as a set of processes which help people interact together to accomplish a specific goal or develop an end product, which is usually content specific" (para.4).

Heterogeneous groups are the most effective way to form the groups for CLL. Marr (1997) explains that "CLL is an instructional technique or group structures in which students are divided into heterogeneous groups to complete instructional activities" (p. 7). According to Mandal (2009), the idea of teamwork is the key in CLL, where students, who have different levels of ability, work in small teams and use a range of learning activities to enhance their understanding of a subject. Mandal (2009) also explains that the aim of this arrangement is to ensure that "each member of a team is responsible not only for learning what is taught but also for helping teammates learn, thus creating atmosphere of achievement" (p. 97).

According to many research findings (see Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Johnson, Johnson, & Stanne, 2000; Slavin, 1995), CLL techniques do not only help students to improve their language skills. Johnson and Johnson (1989) highlight that as a result of students' collaboration and collective effort, students' self-esteem, socialization skills, and interpersonal skills are enhanced when CLL is used in language learning. By providing meaningful situations, CLL helps students to acquire the language better and offers opportunities to use the target language in the classroom to complete the task cooperatively by sharing their knowledge, ideas and experiences with each other (Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000). Kohonen (1987) also argues that CLL motivates learners and creates positive interdependence because learners have a common aim to achieve in order to promote their own learning and the others' in the group.

The increased amount of interaction among students makes CLL powerful because in order to complete their group's task, students must exchange their ideas, make plans and find solutions. As Adam and Powell (1994) state, here the teacher's job is to observe students and encourage them to exchange their ideas and information with each other. According to Johnson and Johnson (n. d.) it is the teacher's job to intervene the group to provide assistance in "completing the task successfully or using the targeted interpersonal and group skills effectively" (para. 11). Johnson and Johnson (n. d.) also state that monitoring the learning teams creates individual accountability because when a teacher monitors a team, the members of the teams "tend to feel accountable to be constructive members" (para.11).

1.3. The Problem

Interaction is essential for humans to understand each other and the communication they produce should be meaningful for effective interaction. Therefore, students are expected to achieve an exchange of meaning using whatever means they have within their skills and the aim of classroom activities is to get students develop their communicative competences by performing well in the target language. Although this sounds like a very effective argument on paper, in most cases, students tend to refrain from participating in individual, group or pair work activities in real life classrooms. The most important reason for this is that anxiety plays an important role within the process of second language learning and that "this anxiety has a debilitating effect on learning and achievement" (Duxbury & Tsai, 2010, p. 1). As Campbell and Ortiz (1991) state, the level of anxiety in language classrooms can be "alarming" (p. 3). Especially for adult learners, language learning and being a student in a classroom full of other adults may cause an increase in their affective filters and cause lower levels of language learning (Roberton, 2011). As a result of such psychological factors, a great

majority of language learners do not seem to participate in group work or pair work activities. Duxbury and Tsai (2010) reported in their review of the literature that CL has been suggested as one possible means of reducing the effects of such negative psychological factors in real life classrooms.

CLL environments have received increasing attention in classrooms due to their potential for improvement and achievement in foreign language learning. CLL helps students to learn from each other by sharing their knowledge to accomplish their tasks. As a result of students' cooperative efforts, students have a reason and a motivation to work and they learn to be one of the active members of the learning team. As Slavin (1990) points out, in CLL, learning becomes an activity which enables students to work in their peer groups. Although CLL has been advocated in many second/foreign language learning settings as an effective method, research on its effectiveness in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms at university level in North Cyprus seems to be scarce. There is one specific study which has focused on Collaborative Learning in EFL classrooms at Near East University by Hamidan (2005). Hamidan's study showed that the learners in collaborative groups were more willing to work with others on the assigned tasks. In Hamidan's study, the participants also stated that working in groups with Collaborative Learning provided them many "opportunities to interact, practice, learn and to understand the need of working in a group" (p. 31). Therefore, they learnt to use communication skills while they were working together toward a common goal. Moreover, the results revealed that to get students more involved with each other, to actively promote each other's learning, and to develop those social behaviours which encourage participation in the group's activities teachers need to provide students opportunity to work cooperatively together with the collaborative learning activities. However, in Collaborative Learning, the focus is on the process rather than the product, which is the opposite in CLL. In other words, Collaborative

Learning gives emphasis on how the students deal with the other students in their group while performing the task and how they collaborate with each other during the activity. On the other hand, for Cooperative Learning, the result, which is the end product, is more important. Therefore, CLL principles need to be carefully applied in foreign language classrooms and the results need to be discussed to see the effectiveness of this method as a teaching strategy in EFL settings at university level in North Cyprus.

1.4. Aim of the Study

This study aims to examine the effectiveness of CLL in increasing students' success in foreign language learning in terms of their speaking skills. The purpose is to investigate whether there is a correlation between learners' participation in group work or pair work activities in the classroom and their success in speaking skills/oral performances.

1.4.1. Research Question

In order to achieve the aim of this study stated in the previous section, answer to the following question will be sought:

Does the use of CLL activities in EFL classrooms at university level have an effect on the oral performances of students when compared to the students' performances who were engaged with traditional learning activities?

1.5. Significance of the Study

As mentioned earlier, there seems to be a lack of student interaction in current EFL classrooms in the Cypriot context at university level. Therefore, new and innovative methods of teaching need to be introduced, especially for teaching and

learning of speaking. However, before any recommendations for changing the existing teaching practices can be made, empirical evidence is needed in this respect. Thus, this study examines the effectiveness of CLL in increasing students' success in foreign language learning in terms of students' speaking skills. It also investigates whether there is a correlation between learners' participation in cooperative group work activities in the classroom and their success in speaking skills/oral performances. The results of this study can guide English language teachers, who teach at university level, in changing the way they organise their classrooms and can help them to better understand the use of CLL activities in classroom settings.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

This study was a small scale research, limited with three months of teaching period to 44 first-year students in Pre-School Teaching department at European University of Lefke (EUL). As there were only two groups of students from EUL, (22 students in each group), the findings cannot be generalized to other students in other universities in TRNC. In addition, because this study was limited with three months teaching period, it focused only on one aspect of CLL, namely use of CLL techniques in EFL classrooms, as opposed to using CLL structures throughout the semester.

1.7. Conclusion

Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is important because it encourages learners to work together as a team in a group and promote one another so that the learning team may reach its shared goals. As a result of their cooperative efforts, the students learn from one another and learn to be active members of the learning team. Therefore, it is proposed as one of the effective methods for increasing students' oral performances in EFL classrooms. In this chapter, a brief discussion of the main characteristics of CLL, such as the importance of forming small heterogeneous groups in language learning and the teachers' roles during CLL activities, has been given. In addition, information about the problem, the aim of this study and the main research question were presented. In the following chapter, related literature about CLL and its applications will be reviewed.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. Presentation

The previous chapter presented a brief introduction to the topic, definition of cooperative language learning (CLL), the problem, the aim of the study, as well as research question. In this chapter, the related literature will be reviewed in detail.

2.1. Cooperative Learning and Collaborative Learning

Since CLL is one of the many student-centred teaching strategies, it has received attention from many educators. These scholars provide similar definitions of CLL. The most common definition of cooperative learning (CL) is that it is an instructional program which enables students to work in small teams to assist one another master academic content (Gokhale, 1995; Slavin, 1995). In other words, "cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning" (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec 1998, p.15). Brown (1994) defines CL as a learning process in which learners must work together in pairs or groups, and share information. This sharing and teamwork result in accomplishment of common goals and further learning (Dillenbourg, 1999). One of the key elements of CL is that the small groups are made up of students from different ability groups so that they can assist each other in completing the given tasks, hence be cooperative (Gokhale, 1995; Woolfolk,2001).

CL is often confused with collaborative learning in education. As opposed to CL, collaborative learning is not just a classroom technique but also a personal philosophy (Panitz, 1996). Collaborative learning suggests a way of managing people, when they come together in groups, which respects and highlights the importance of individual

group members' capabilities and contributions. Panitz (1996) states that in collaborative learning, group members have an acceptance of responsibility and they share an authority for the groups' actions. According to him, the main principle of collaborative learning is,

> based upon consensus building through cooperation by group members, in contrast to competition in which individuals best other group members. CL practitioners apply this philosophy in the classroom, at committee meetings, with community groups, within their families and generally as a way of living with and dealing with other people. (Panitz, 1996, p.1)

On the other hand, Panitz (1996) defines CL as a set of processes, which help people to communicate with each other to achieve a specific goal or develop an end product which is usually content specific. He also quotes Myers (1991, as cited in Panitz, 1996), who points out collaboration means the process of working together, while cooperation is the product of such work. In addition, Oxford (1997) indicates that CL is "more structured, more prescriptive to teachers about classroom techniques, more directive to students about how to work together in groups than collaborative learning" (p. 443).

When CL is applied to language learning, Kessler (1992) defines it as a within-class grouping of students whose level of second language proficiency vary and who learn to work together as a team on specific tasks or projects in such a way that all learners in the team benefit from the interactive experience in an equal level. Moreover, Kessler (1992) states that "CL is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others" (p. 8). As was argued by Oxford (1997) and Panitz (1996) earlier, in CLL, teachers need to adopt various important roles in the classroom. Hiçyılmaz (2005) indicates that during CLL teachers serve as facilitators and encourage students to be interdependent.

Heterogeneous grouping is also essential in CLL. Therefore, teachers need to assign students in heterogeneous groups to benefit from cooperation among students in teams. While conducting a lesson, the teacher adopts the role of a monitor, monitors each learning group and intervenes when needed to improve task work and teamwork. It is also important for the teacher to make sure that each learning team benefits from face-to-face interaction and to assess and evaluate the quantity and quality of students' learning. Along with these, Hiçyılmaz (2005) states that "it is important to observe the interaction among group members to assess students' academic progress and appropriate use of interpersonal and small-group skills" (para. 32). Larsen-Freeman (1986) further argues that the teachers' role in CLL is not only to teach language but to teach cooperation as well. According to Larsen-Freeman (1986), in CLL the teacher has a role of guidance whose job is to make students successful, rather than "a judge who hands out grades and marks papers with red ink" (p. 168). In addition to Hiçyılmaz and Larsen-Freeman, Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998) also state that the teachers' job is to define academic and social skills objectives rather than being just an evaluator of success. The teacher needs to make decisions about important organisational matters such as the heterogeneous group size, time limits, learners' experiences in group work, learners' age, and the availability of the appropriate materials.

2.2. Cooperative Language Learning Classroom versus Traditional Language Learning Classroom

According to Chafe (1998), CLL classroom is a place where students work together in groups to reach their shared goals. With CLL, students benefit from sharing their ideas with each other rather than working individually. Students help one another to accomplish their group tasks. On the other hand, traditional language classroom is typically a place where students work individually and/or competitively. In the traditional method, students are generally concerned with improving their own grade, and goals are individualistic rather than group-wide. Chafe (1998) states that traditional teaching is a method of learning that views the classroom environment as one where the role of the teacher is to simply give information to students. Johnson and Johnson (n. d.) also say that traditional language learning, which is also called direct transfer models of instruction, is an approach "in which the instructor is assumed to be the distributor of knowledge and skills" (p. 786). All students work individually and compete against one another. In this kind of classroom environment, the most important thing is the improvement of students' own grade. Moreover, the physical structure of the classroom clearly reflects this mode of learning; rows and columns of chairs and the teacher's table situated in the front is a common classroom setup. This is in contrast with a cooperative learning classroom. The physical make–up of the table and chairs suggests a different process of learning. The preferred seating arrangements in CLL classrooms are face-to-face, buzz groups, roundtables and sometimes pairs. In CLL, these kinds of seating arrangements should be carefully designed in order to benefit from the "maximum flow of communication among students and to produce a sense of quality among them" (Cragon, Wright & Kasch, 2008, p. 74).

Table 2.1 shows the differences and similarities between Cooperative Language Learning and Traditional Language Learning considering different aspects of the teaching and learning situation. It must be noted that there may be other variables that may impact the way that these methods are used or that they may be used in different ways in different contexts. The following provides only a rough description of both methods.

Table 2.1

Comparison of Cooperative Language Learning and Traditional Language Teaching

	Traditional Language Teaching	**Cooperative Language Learning**
Independence	None or negative	Positive
Learner Roles	Passive receiver and performer	Active participator, autonomous learners
Teacher roles	The centre of the classroom. Controller of teaching pace and direction, judge of students' right or wrong, the major source of assistance, feedback, reinforcement and support.	Organizer and counselor of group work, facilitator of the communication tasks, intervener to teach collaborative skills.
Materials	Complete set of materials for each student.	Materials are arranged according to purpose of lesson. Usually one group shares a complete set of materials.
Types of activities	Knowledge recall and review, phrasal or sentence pattern practice, role play, translation, listening etc.	Any instructional activity, mainly group work to engage learners in communication, involving processes like information sharing, negotiation of meaning and interaction.
Interaction	Some talking among students, mainly teacher-student interaction	Intense interaction among students, a few teacher-student interaction
Room arrangement	Separate desks or students placed in pairs.	Collaborative small groups
Student expectations	Take a major part in evaluating own progress and the quality of own efforts toward learning. Be a winner or loser.	All members in some way contribute to success of group. The one who makes progress is the winner.
Teacher-student relationship	Superior-inferior or equal	Cooperating and equal

Note: Adopted from Zhang (2010).

2.3. Learning Theories and Cooperative Language Learning

Many practical and theoretical studies that have been conducted to understand the relationship between CL and language learning are seen as "supportive of the use of CL in second language instruction" (Jacobs, n. d.). According to Jacobs and Hannah (2004), there are five hypotheses and theories on language pedagogy which overlap with CLL. These are the input hypothesis, the interaction hypothesis, the output hypothesis, sociocultural theory and content-based instruction. These theories will be explained in detail in the following sections.

2.3.1. The Input Hypothesis

According to Krashen and Terrell (1983) the input hypothesis assumes that second language acquisition (SLA) is driven by the *comprehensible input*. This means that students acquire language when they comprehend input that can be written or spoken. According to Lightbown and Spada (1999), "If the input contains forms and structures just beyond the learner's current level of competence in the language (what Krashen calls $i + 1$), then both comprehension and acquisition will occur" (p. 39). On the other hand, if the input which students receive is so far beyond the students' current level of second language competence, such as $i + 5$, which is not comprehensible, that input does not contribute to students' SLA. Cooperative Learning enables students to promote the amount of comprehensible input in two ways. The first way is, peers can give one another comprehensible input and the second way is, students in pairs might create an environment which is more stimulating and less anxiety producing for language use so that they can have opportunities to get abundant input.

2.3.2. The Interaction Hypothesis

According to Pica (1994) the interaction hypothesis suggests that learners who study a language can increase the amount of comprehensible input they receive through communications with interlocutors and this is named negotiating for meaning. This interaction includes students asking for explanations, clarifications and repetition when they do not understand the received input. According to Jacobs (n. d.), "the collaborative setting in groups and the trust that can grow among group mates make it more likely that students will have opportunities to repair comprehension breakdowns" (p. 2). CLL might improve students' interaction by providing students with group activities in a context where they may tend to have more opportunities for interactions unlike in a whole class environment. Moreover, in such a group environment, students have positive interdependence and individual accountability.

2.3.3. The Output Hypothesis

The output hypothesis claims that forming output is necessary for learners to increase their proficiency in the target language. This includes producing language by speaking, writing and receiving feedback on the comprehensibility of their output (Swain, 1985). It is highlighted that the learners need output as well as input to learn a language because output is seen to be fundamental as it improves fluency, enables students not only concentrate on meaning but also enables them to take part in syntactic processing of language. Furthermore, it enables them to test their hypothesis so that they can learn what works and is acceptable by providing them with opportunities and chances to get feedback from the other students. Jacobs (n. d.) states that students' output can increase dramatically when they interact with each other simultaneously in cooperative groups.

2.3.4. The Sociocultural Theory

The sociocultural theory sees "human as culturally and historically situated – not as isolated individuals" (Vygotsky, 1978). In this theory, students do not learn individually but they learn by helping each other's learning in different ways. For instance, teachers can help their students' learning by encouraging them to work in groups and supporting them during the group work activities, in which the students also help each other, use their skills to support one another for their learning while actively participating in meaningful tasks.

Cooperative learning and sociocultural theory both try to establish a situation that improves "mutual aid" (p. 102). In other words, it provides a situation that students have a common shared goal to achieve together by exchanging information and helping each other.

As Newman and Holtzman (1993) explain,

> Vygotsky's strategy was essentially a cooperative learning strategy. He created heterogeneous groups of… children (he called them a collective), providing them not only with the opportunity but the need for cooperation and joint activity by giving them tasks that were beyond the developmental level of some, if not all, of them (p.77).

Providing an environment that enables students to work together in joint activities encourages mutual aid between students and develops their cooperation and social skills.

2.3.5. The Content-based Approach

As the communicative approach to language learning argues, the best way of learning a language is to focus on meaning rather than on form. Hence, the overall inductive teaching approach is followed, "in which students learn content from

anywhere in the curriculum, e.g., science or social studies, but at the same time, they are learning grammar and vocabulary as they receive input and produce output while learning that content" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 103).

As Chamot and O'Malley (1994) state, content-based instruction is suitable for CLL because in CLL, cooperation creates content to make learners understand the benefits of cooperation in CLL so that it improves students' language learning process.

2.4. Factors that Affect Second Language Acquisition and Cooperative Language Learning

In addition to the theories discussed above, Jacobs and Hannah (2004) identified three factors that affect SLA in relation to CLL. These factors are individual differences, learner autonomy and affective factors. In the following sections, these factors will be explained in detail.

2.4.1. Individual Differences

History of education and the development of educational theories in the past suggest that it was believed that all learners had the same learning style. However, today, this belief seems to have changed to focus on individual differences. As Robinson (2002) highlights, the key belief in second language pedagogy is that learners differ from one another in important ways. Kagan and Kagan (1998) indicate that "The more ways we teach, the more pupils we reach" (p. 6). CLL overlaps with these arguments in favour of catering for individual differences as:

1. activities performed in groups create a new way of learning unlike the one seen in teacher controlled teaching.

2. working in groups enables learners to improve in a better way as it provides learners opportunities to adopt different roles than they can adopt in teacher controlled teaching.

3. heterogeneous grouping, which is one of the principles of CL, stimulates students' interaction by celebrating diversity among students that is advantageous and teaches different learners to work together.

4. group work saves teachers' time to assist learners individually when it is required.

2.4.2. Learner Autonomy

Learner autonomy is defined by Jacobs and Hannah (2004) as learners taking part on deciding about what and how they learn as well as managing to control their own learning. They also state that learner autonomy overlaps with the idea on education which suggests that "education should be a self-directed, life-long process" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 103). Learner autonomy is not about learning individually but it is a matter of leaving an environment in which the teacher is the only person who has the authority and allowing the students to perform as much as they can within the learning context provided by the teacher.

It is stated that learner autonomy goes well with CLL strategies in three ways (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004). The first way is that students in cooperative groups learn to rely not only on their teacher but also on their group mates. The second way is that the teacher gives the authority to the cooperative groups so that the cooperative groups have group autonomy. The third way which CLL goes well with the group autonomy is that by giving and receiving feedback from their group mates, students develop their evaluation skills and the tendency to look beyond figures for feedback.

2.4.3. Affective Factors

It is stated that the teaching environment where teaching takes place and the students perceive the educational context provided by the teacher has an impact on the accomplishment of learning as well as cognitive factors do (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004). For this reason, affective factors, "such as anxiety, motivation and attitudes, demand attention in any approach to pedagogy" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 104). Dornyei (1997) states that CLL may promote the affective climate, and therefore it might enhance language learning in two different ways. Firstly, while engaging in supportive CLL group work activities, students might worry less and become more motivated to take risks. Secondly, learners become more willing to make the effort to optimize their learning when they have the sense that their group mates rely on them.

2.5. Principles of Cooperative Language Learning

There is no single and standard accepted version of CLL because of the impact of different theoretical perspectives on learning including behaviourism, sociocultural theory, humanist psychology, cognitive psychology and Piagetian developmental psychology (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004). Baloche (1998), Jacobs, Power, and Loh (2002), Johnson and Johnson (1999), Kagan (1994), Kessler (1992) and Slavin (1995) highlight that many different principles have been put forward in the CLL literature against this background of heterogeneity. According to Jacobs and Hannah (2004) and Jacobs (n. d.), there are eight main elements of CLL. These are heterogeneous grouping, collaborative skills, group autonomy, simultaneous interaction, equal participation, individual accountability, positive interdependence and cooperation as a value. In the following eight sections, these elements will be explained in detail.

2.5.1. Heterogeneous Grouping

Heterogeneous grouping refers to mingling the members of the CLL groups according to at least one variable. It is stated that while grouping the learners heterogeneously, these variables can be "sex, ethnicity, social class, religion, personality, age, language proficiency and diligence" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 98). There are several benefits of this arrangement. Some of these benefits are "encouraging peer tutoring, providing a variety of perspectives, helping students come to know and like others different from themselves, fostering appreciation of the value of diversity" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 99).

In CLL, groups often work together cooperatively at least for five weeks. During this period of time, it is suggested that while selecting the learners to establish heterogeneous groups for activities, teachers should consider the capabilities of the learners in their class and they should make a decision about which students should work together, rather than leaving the matter to the chance or students' preferences. If learners make decisions about forming their own groups, these groups will usually have low level of heterogeneity. Moreover, spending some time on ice-breaking activities for heterogeneous groups is a good idea since teacher-selected heterogeneous group of students is likely to be one that would never have been created had it not been for our intervention (Slavin, 1995).

2.5.2. Collaborative Skills

Collaborative skills are the skills that students are required to use during cooperative work to accomplish their task. However, some students might not have the collaborative skills, "the language involved in using the skills or the inclination to apply the skills" (Jacobs, n. d., p. 3). Therefore, cooperative skills should be explicitly taught one at a time. Some of the many important skills which students need for successful

collaboration are "checking that others understand, asking for and giving reasons; disagreeing politely and responding politely to disagreement and encouraging others to participate and responding to encouragement to participate" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 99).

2.5.3. Group Autonomy

Group autonomy stimulates students to look to themselves for resources when the problem arises instead of trusting on their teacher who may be tempted to intervene in a specific group or the whole class to solve the problem. Johnson (n. d.) argues that teachers must avoid this intervening and they should rely on the interaction, which happens among the team members, and let them feel that they are accountable for achieving most of the work together.

2.5.4. Simultaneous Interaction

According to Kagan (1994), in traditional classrooms where there is a lack of group activities, the type of interaction is generally a sequential one, i.e. in this kind of interaction the one who speaks, at a time, is the teacher. On the other hand, Kagan (1994) further indicates that when group work activities are used in the classroom, one learner in each group is probably speaking. So, in a class with 40 students, divided into groups of four, ten students are speaking simultaneously. This element of CLL is called simultaneous interaction. Pairs are also assumed as group work. For example, if we consider the same class of 40 students, it means that, we might have 20 students speaking simultaneously (Kagan, 1994). When group work activities are used in the classroom, it is essential for each group to report their results to their teacher and the entire class, one at a time (Kagan, 1994). When this happens, it means that we are back to the sequential interaction after the groups have completed their tasks. According to

Kagan (1994), instead of having sequential interaction one at a time in the reporting session, we can use several ways to keep the simultaneous interaction. To illustrate, one student in each group can go to another group to represent their own groups and explain their group's views to the students of other groups. Therefore, naturally, the teacher combines simultaneous and sequential interactions usefully in the classroom.

2.5.5. Equal Participation

Kagan (1994) indicates that during group work activities some students in each group may try to dominate their group members and this causes other students not to take part in the activity. CLL provides a lot of ways to increase equal participation in groups during group work activities. According to Kagan (1994), one of these ways is the use of rotating roles in groups such as facilitator, understanding checker, questioner, praiser, encourager and paraphraser. Another way of promoting equal participation among group members is the use of multiple ability tasks that requires a range of abilities, such as drawing, singing, acting and categorizing, rather than only language abilities (Cohen, 1994; Gardner, 1999).

2.5.6. Individual Accountability

It is stated by Jacobs and Hannah (2004) that "individual accountability is, in some ways, the flip side of equal participation" (p. 100). When teachers support equal participation in groups, they would like every student to have a sense that they have chances to participate in their groups. Furthermore, while teachers are supporting individual accountability in groups, they expect that none of the students will try to avoid benefiting from those chances. It is highlighted that "techniques for encouraging individual accountability seek to avoid the problem of groups known variously as social loafing, sleeping partners or free riding" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 100). In other

words, some students in the cooperative groups may not take part in the activities and use the activity time by chatting with other students in the groups or some may do not take part and just listen or do not have any idea about the activity.

Along with these, techniques for individual accountability naturally go well with the ones used for stimulating equal participation. These techniques involve providing each group member a particular turn to participate, having small groups, addressing learners randomly to exchange their group's ideas and having an individual task to accomplish after the group activity is completed.

2.5.7. Positive Interdependence

Positive interdependence is one of the main principles of CLL. When there is positive interdependence among group members, students feel that they are together for better or worse. For instance, according to Jacobs and Hannah (2004), "what helps one member of the group helps the other members and that what hurts one member of the group hurts the other members" (p. 100). This is the "all for one, one for all" feeling, which enables students to help each other in their groups, to see that they share a common goal (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 100). Johnson and Johnson (1999) state that the following six ways increase positive interdependence among group members:

1. Goal positive interdependence: The group members have a common goal and they need to work together to accomplish their shared goal.

2. Environmental positive interdependence: Group members take their seat close to each other in order to be able to follow their group members' efforts and not to talk loud voices. Although it seems unimportant, arranging the students' seats in this way may be significant.

3. Role positive interdependence: Housekeeping types of roles are the kinds of roles that students adopt while working in groups. Some of those roles are

timekeeper and sound hound. Timekeeper is the one who checks the time and tells the group members the time limits. Sound hound is the one who warns the members of the group about the loud voice while they are working in groups.

4. Resource positive interdependence: Every learner in the group possesses unique resources including knowledge or equipment such as paper or a particular colour marker.

5. External challenge positive interdependence: As many books and websites recommend, in CL the groups need to be together over a period of time to allow the members of the group to work to improve their group dynamics. Therefore, the students aim to improve on their past performance.

6. Reward positive interdependence: When the team members achieve a pre-set aim, they are given a type of reward. Students in teams can be rewarded in various ways, for instance, they can be given grades, sweets, certificates, praise, the choice of a future activity the class does, the chance to do their team cheer or handshake or just a feeling of satisfaction.

All of these interdependence types have different effects on students in the cooperative groups and they help them to develop positive interdependence among the groups.

2.5.8. Cooperation as a Value

Cooperation as a value means "cooperation being not only a way to learn, i.e., the *how* of learning, cooperation also becomes part of the content to be learned, i.e., the *what* of learning" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p. 101). This contains and begins with the idea of positive interdependence which is all for one, one for all. This feeling starts expanding in small classroom groups to the whole class and the whole school. It continues to develop affecting many more "people and other beings into students' circle of ones with whom to cooperate" (Jacobs & Hannah, 2004, p.101).

2.6. Characteristics of Effective Groups

In 1998, Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec identified three types of cooperative learning groups. These groups are formal cooperative learning groups, informal cooperative learning groups and cooperative base groups.

2.6.1. Formal Cooperative Learning Groups

The first type of cooperative learning groups is formal cooperative learning groups. In formal cooperative learning groups, the teacher assigns the students into groups for one class period to several weeks. Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998) state that during this period of time, students work together to achieve their common targets. Formal cooperative learning groups can be used by the teacher to structure any academic or course requirement. According to Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998), in this type of learning groups, students are actively involved in the work of organizing material, explaining it, summarizing it, and integrating it into their existing conceptual knowledge. All of these are in the heart of CL.

Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998) recommend the following procedure of establishing formal cooperative groups. First of all, instructions and objectives are given to students by their instructors. Secondly, the students are put into a learning group and given the needed materials. Also, specific roles are given to each student to fulfill in the group and the classroom is arranged by the instructor. Thirdly, the task and the cooperative structures were explained. Fourthly, the functioning of each learning group is monitored by the instructor. In addition to this, the instructor also teaches cooperative skills and helps students in academic learning when they need. Finally, the instructor assesses the quality and the quantity of each learning group as well as how effectively the group members have worked together.

2.6.2 Informal Cooperative Learning Groups

Another type of CL groups is informal cooperative learning group. According to Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1998), informal cooperative learning groups are temporary, ad-hoc groups, which take from a couple of minutes to one hour teaching periods. Informal learning groups are used during direct teaching such as lectures or demonstration, or film to get students' attention on the material to be covered, set a mood conducive to learning, help set expectations about material, what the lesson will cover, ensure that students are cognitively processing the material being taught, and provide closure to an instructional session. During the time of direct teaching the only teaching difficulty for the instructor is to guarantee that learners do the intellectual work of organizing material, explaining it, summarizing it, and integrating it into their existing conceptual structures.

2.6.3. Cooperative Base Groups

The third type of cooperative learning groups is cooperative base groups. According to Johnson et.al. (1992), cooperative base learning groups are long-term, heterogeneous cooperative learning groups with stable membership whose main duty is to support, stimulate, and help each student's progress academically when it is needed. Teachers provide an environment in which students can stimulate each in academics as well as in other aspects of their lives. In this kind of groups, members of cooperative base groups need to be certain that all the students are accomplishing their work and accepting each other as accountable for their efforts. In addition to these, cooperative base groups personalize the required work and the learning experience in the course. Johnson et.al. (1992) also explain that cooperative base groups consist of three or four participants who sit together during the entire teaching period, may exchange their

phone numbers and information about their schedules so that they can meet outside the school environment.

2.7. Effectiveness of Cooperative Language Learning

Many research findings clearly support the use of CL activities as they demonstrate how it improves students' academic achievement and helps them to develop their social skills. According to Marr (1997), CLL is effective because it "encourages students to work together and support one another so that the learning team may reach its goals" (p.14). As a result of learners' cooperative efforts, they learn from their teammates, have motivation to work together as a team, and learn to be one of the active members in their cooperative learning groups. According to the developmental theories of cognitive psychology, students' collaboration and interactions with each other help them to improve their concept understanding (Vygotsky, 1978). In addition to Vygotsky, Webb (1985 as cited in Marr, 1997) states that students, who benefited from the CLL activities, are the ones who give detailed explanations to their teammates.

According to Hiçyılmaz (2005), CLL stimulates and motivates students to rely on their own capabilities, rather than always depending on an authority figure, which usually is the teacher. In CLL, teacher assigns students into cooperative groups to enable them to work together in a cooperative way and to discuss the given topics also to gain the experience of taking not only the responsibility of their own learning but also taking the responsibility of their group mates' learning as well. Team spirit is stressed as students learn to work together as a cooperative team in mixed ability groups. Hence, both an atmosphere of achievement is created and liking of school and classmates are increased. Johnson and Johnson (1999), Johnson, Johnson and Stanne (2000), highlight that the use of CLL activities in the classroom increases students' self-esteem, enables students to have more positive feelings towards school and at the same time improves

inter-ethnic ties and students' higher order thinking skills. Killen (1993) states that every student has an opportunity to express their ideas and try to learn the content in a non-threatening environment.

With CLL activities, students learn to cooperate with each other by helping them to complete the given task and they enable the students to experience some roles such as leaders and peers, and to develop social relations with their teammates. Cooperative group work helps students to become less reliant on the authority and more reliant to their own ability to think and to search information from different sources. As CLL is an effective way of learning, this approach has many benefits. McGroarty (1989) identifies six primary benefits of CLL for students acquiring English. These benefits are listed below:

1. CLL provides increased frequency and range of second language practice through different types of interaction among teammates.
2. CLL support cognitive development and increased second language skills of the students in cooperative groups by offering possibilities for development or use of the first language.
3. CLL provides many opportunities to integrate language with content-based instruction.
4. CLL offers many chances to include a greater range of curricular materials to encourage language as well as concept learning;
5. CLL offers freedom for teachers to experience new professional skills, especially those giving emphasis on communication. Finally,
6. CLL provides great opportunities for students to act as resource for each other, hence adopt a more active role in their learning.

In addition to the benefits that McGroarty identifies, there are five more advantages that Mandal highlights. According to Mandal (2009):

1. CLL improves students' higher-level thinking skills.

2. Skill building and practice can be increased and made less monotonous though CLL activities are used in and out of the classroom.

3. CLL creates an environment for students to learn in an active, involved and exploratory learning ways.

4. If the weaker students are grouped with higher achieving students, their performances are improved with the help of the CLL.

5. CLL indicates learning style differences among students.

As many researchers found in their research studies, CLL is a very effective teaching and learning approach for both teachers and students (see Syafini & Tengku, n. d.; Law, 2008, Talebi & Sobhani, 2012). It has many benefits on students in terms of providing them a context to have meaningful interactions with their group mates so develop their self-esteem and social skills so students learn to rely on not only their teachers but their group mates as well.

2.8. Cooperative Learning and Academic Achievement

Many research studies have found that learners who engage in CLL groups usually show both higher achievement and demonstrate greater productivity. It is also found that learners in cooperative learning teams demonstrate a higher quality of reasoning, and it is also found that by engaging in CLL activities students' self-esteem, problem solving skill, team building skills, communication skills and higher order thinking skills are also improved (Gupta, 2004; Iqbal, 2004; Laughlin, 1965, 1972; Laughlin & Jaccard, 1975; Laughlin, McGlynn, Anderson, & Jacobson 1968; Law, 2008; MacArthur, Schwartz & Graham, 1991; McGlynn, 1972; Servetti, 2010;

Veenman, Kenter & Post, 2000; Yager, Johnson & Johnson, 1985). At the same time, students in cooperative learning teams pay more attention to the concepts and solving problems. These students are faster than their peers in competitive and individualistic situations (Laughlin, 1965, 1972; Laughlin & Jaccard, 1975; Laughlin, McGlynn, Anderson, & Jacobson 1968; McGlynn, 1972). Hagman (1990) observed that students who studies with CLL had better problem solving skills than other students who studies with non-cooperative language learning and that CLL led to a higher quality work among students in cooperative learning groups.

In a research study conducted by Iqbal (2004), who investigated the effectiveness of CLL techniques when compared to traditional teaching techniques to teach mathematics, it was found that students in cooperative learning groups got higher scores when compared to the traditional learning situation. The results also revealed that low achieving students who were engaged in cooperative learning groups had significant superiority over high achieving students who were engaged in cooperative learning groups. On the other hand, according to Yager, Johnson and Johnson (1985), high-, medium-, and low-achieving students showed not only greater achievement but also greater post-instructional achievement when compared to the students in cooperative learning groups in which there was not any group processing discussions or students in individualistic learning situations.

In another research study conducted by Kogut (1997) about using CLL teaching techniques to teach chemistry, it was concluded that CLL provided students a more supportive environment and therefore, that CLL stimulated chemistry students to learn the content material. Gupta's (2004) study on using CLL to teach physical sciences revealed that students received CLL very well and they were more enthusiastic to take part in cooperative learning groups than in other courses. Gupta (2004) also observed during the experiment that students had many opportunities to develop their teamwork

skills, speaking skills, life long learning and their problem solving skills. Moreover, Spurlin, Dansereau, Larson and Brooks (1984) revealed that students in cooperative learning classrooms use metacognition strategies and reasoning skills more frequently during the cooperative learning activities to complete their common task.

According to a series of surveys conducted by Gabert, Johnson and Johnson (1986), Skon, Johnson and Johnson (1981), Johnson, Skon and Johnson (1980), Johnson and Johnson (1981), students in CLL classroom use higher order thinking skills, higher level of reasoning strategies and these learners learn more than the students who engage in competitive and individualistic classroom learning environments. Their results highlight that learners who engaged in CLL classroom activities used many strategies to look for new knowledge and restore their existing knowledge, metaphoric reasoning, sequencing, and the formulation of equations more frequently than students in traditional learning environment. Moreover, Qin, Johnson and Johnson (1995) and Sherman and Thomas (1986) support the above researchers with their findings as their results revealed that students who experienced CLL teaching strategies got higher scores and made greater achievement than those students who experienced traditional learning strategies on problem solving and in mathematics classes.

Servetti's (2010) research about using CLL as a technique to correct students' written errors revealed that CLL was a good technique to motivate and get students' attention and stimulate them to learn from their group members. The findings of her research revealed that the learners who were engaged in CLL activities on written error correction got higher scores than the students whose written errors were corrected through traditional methods in long term processes. She states that "the cooperative correction activity was also enjoyed and perceived as useful by the students themselves" (Servetti, 2010, p. 7) and explains that CLL is useful because it provides environment for low achieving learners as they are expected to ask their teammates for assistance and

get their support, especially when they have problems. Finally, MacArthur, Schwartz and Graham (1991) found that students with learning disabilities benefited from CLL writing activities and the results revealed that students' writing skills were significantly enhanced when they were exposed to work cooperatively. In addition to this, those students produced higher quality compositions and essays when compared to their peers in the control group. All of these research studies suggest that CLL is a useful method to promote academic achievement.

2.9. Cooperative Learning and Peer Relationships: Social Development

According to Johnson and Johnson (1991), student-student interaction is the most instructional situation that influences students' performance. In a cooperative learning environment, students collaborate together to meet their common group goals. As they collaborate together, they learn from each other, they become productive and develop their own perspectives. Moreover, peer relationship among students is a crucial element in the development and socialization of teenagers (Hartup, Glazeri & Charlesworth, 1967; Johnson, 1980). Michaelsen's (1992) research findings indicate that students develop higher-level cognitive skills as well as interpersonal skills when they experience CLL environments. The findings of this study are also supported by research conducted by Johnson and Johnson (1989), Shacher and Sharan (1994), Slavin (1995) and Johnson and Johnson (2002) and these findings highlight that students' self-esteem, social and interpersonal skills were improved because of their cooperation and collective efforts. In addition to these research findings, another research study conducted by White and Dinos (2010) who investigate how structured mediated learning experiences may improve peer cooperative communication by using problem solving exercises and the results indicate that cooperative learning group on-task communication could be more effective if the teacher had taught students how to work

cooperatively. Thus, the cooperative skills and peer relationships are very crucial to be successful in CLL environment.

Johnson and Johnson (1983), Johnson, Johnson and Maruyama (1983) found in their studies that the CLL situation stimulates students to care about their teammates without taking into consideration the differences in race, ability, or disability. According to Johnson and Johnson (1991) the following list explains the ways that peer relationships are significant for CLL:

1. In interactions with peers, children and adolescents directly learn attitudes, values, skills, and information unobtainable from adults.

2. Interaction with peers provides support opportunities and models for prosocial behaviour.

3. Peers provide models of, expectations of, directions for, and reinforcements of learning to control impulses.

4. Children and adolescents learn to view situations and problems from perspectives other than their own through their interaction with peers.

5. In both educational and works settings, peers have a strong influence on productivity.

6. Student educational aspirations may be more influenced by peers than by any other social influence (p. 31).

Vermette (1988) and Pate's (1988) findings highlight that students who were engaged in CLL activities in cooperative groups gained a sense of social responsibility and developed mutual respect towards each other. According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), CLL enables students to exchange their thoughts and beliefs, make plans and generate solutions to the problems to achieve their common group goals cooperatively and thus improve students' socialization skills.

2.10. Drawbacks of Cooperative Language Learning

Along with the great benefits and effectiveness of using CLL, there are some disadvantages of using CLL in the language learning environment. According to Hiçyılmaz (2005), the majority of learners are not happy to work in a team cooperatively and expose their ignorance to other students.

Often, students may not be familiar with or skilled at working together because they have been trained to be competitive and work individually. Therefore, they do not have enough cooperative skills to work cooperatively (Hiçyılmaz, 2005). Moreover, aggressive students might attempt to dominate, successful learners might act superior, and loners might have difficulty to share their answers with other students in their teams (Hiçyılmaz, 2005).

CLL also has some drawbacks for the teachers. For instance, teams may become very noisy while they are trying to accomplish their tasks cooperatively, especially in large classes and teachers worry because of the possibility of disturbing the other classes with the noise (Hiçyılmaz, 2005). According to Killen (1993), the other drawback of CLL is that some learners prefer traditional language learning and are not happy when the teacher asks them to teach each other.

2.11. Cooperative Learning Structures

Slavin (1989) conducted a review of literature including more than 60 different studies to establish the effects of specific CLL structures. In Slavin's review, five programs were found to have made significant impact on students' achievement and social development. These five programs are called Student Team Achievement Divisions (STAD), Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), Team Assisted Individualization (TAI), Group Investigation (GI), and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC). In the following sections, these programs will be explained in detail.

2.11.1. Student Team Achievement Divisions (STAD)

In student team achievement divisions (STAD), students are assigned to heterogeneous teams in mixed abilities, gender and ethnicity. Each group has four students. The teacher presents a lesson on a concept and then the students work in teams together "on worksheets or a series of written problems related to the lesson" (Marr, 1997, p. 12) and the students should make sure that all of the members in their group have mastered the lesson. When the follow-up activities are completed, an individual quiz on the material is completed by all the students. Students' quiz scores are compared to their own earlier performance and the students are awarded if they meet or exceed their earlier performance and these points are applied to students' total team score. In STAD, the whole process usually lasts between three to five periods and all teams have a chance to improve and be successful.

2.11.2. Teams Games Tournament (TGT)

Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) is very similar to STAD, but the assessment process is different. Instead of a quiz, in TGT, games are used to assess what the students have learnt. The teacher teaches the topic and the learning team works on the selected materials and when they complete their selected materials, the teacher selects one member of each learning team to play in a tournament. During the tournament stage, a series of content-relevant questions are asked of each tournament player and when each member of the tournament team gets an answer correct, his or her learning team gains recognition.

According to Marr (1997), research studies which have examined the effectiveness of TGT and STAD have found significant improvement in both social development and academic achievement. Marr (1997) also states that specifically students who participated in STAD and TGT seemed to have fostered positive

intergroup relations and increased cooperation with their peers. There was also an improvement in on-task classroom behaviour and internal locus of control.

2.11.3. Team-Assisted Individualization (TAI)

Team-Assisted Individualization (TAI) is the third cooperative learning structure which was designed for Math instruction in grades three to six (Slavin, 1990). According to Marr (1997), in TAI, based on a placement test, students commence an individualized sequence of instruction. After that, the learners work at their own pace and at their own level. The instructor might present lessons to small teams of students working on the same topics. Team members, check each other's work and help one another if problems arise, even though they are working on different instructional tasks. In this cooperative structure, at the end of each unit, students are given a quiz and they answer the quiz questions on their own, without their teammates' help and this quiz is scored by one of their teammates. When students pass the quiz, they are given the unit test by a member of a different learning team. A team score is given to all learning teams based on the average number of units acquired by each team member at the end of each week.

Slavin, Leavey and Madden (1984) state that the California Test of Basic Skills measured that TAI had a positive and significant effect on achievement in mathematics. It is also stated that TAI was found effective in stimulating social development among students. According to a research study conducted by Oishi, Slavin and Madden (1983, as cited in Marr, 1997) intergroup relations among students participating in TAI have also increased.

2.11.4. Group Investigation (GI)

According to Marr (1997), in Group Investigation (GI) students are required to select a broad topic, break it down into subtopics, get information about the subtopics from many different sources, and prepare and present a final report to the class. GI emphasizes not only cooperative working skills but also emphasizes individual responsibility. As it is stated in Marr's (1997) article, significant improvements have been found on the students' sub-tests of Standard Achievement Test in reading and language arts for students from grade two to six using GI.

2.11.5. Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC)

The Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) program is especially effective in enhancing students' performances in reading and writing. According to many research findings, students' reading, comprehension, vocabulary, language expression, language mechanics, spelling, and writing performances significantly improved with the help of the CIRC program (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987; Slavin & Madden, 1989; Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989).

2.12. Cooperative Learning Techniques

In addition to the CL structures explained earlier, there are many techniques that can be used in CLL classrooms. These techniques refer to individual activity types that may or may not be used in conjunction with one or more CLL structures. According to Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) jigsaw, think-pair-share, round-robin, buzz groups, talking chips and three step interview are the major CLL techniques used in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. These techniques will be explained in detail below.

2.12.1. Jigsaw

According to Hiçyılmaz (2005), the Jigsaw method was designed by Aronson and his colleagues (1978). Mandal (2009) states that in this technique, all learners are put into groups to work on academic material that is broken down into different parts. Each member of the cooperative groups engage in their own parts and then the learners meet in expert groups to discuss their parts together. After practising in expert groups, the representative of the students go back to their original groups and teach their parts to their group members. Test and assessments follow after this section. In Jigsaw method, every learner has to depend on one another to learn the whole material.

Coelho (1996) states that Jigsaw technique develops learners' higher-level cognitive skills, such as "evaluating and synthesizing facts and opinions", especially if the task includes "problem solving as well as knowledge of facts" (p. 70).

2.12.2. Think-Pair-Share

Think-pair-share is one of the simple and the quick techniques for creating discussion groups. In this technique, the teacher develops and asks questions to students and sets a time limit to let them think about the answer of the question and then tells them to share their thoughts with another learner. This technique is especially effective if it is used as a whole class discussion in the warm up section. As Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) state, students are required to stop and then reflect before speaking in the Think component, therefore giving learners a great opportunity to gather and organize their thoughts. The Pair and Share components stimulate students to compare and contrast their comprehension of the question with other students in the classroom and to practice their answers first in low-risk situations before presenting their thoughts and beliefs in public in front of the whole class. Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) highlight that the opportunity to practice their thoughts and beliefs first with a peer tends to

enhance the quality of student contributions and generally increase eagerness and readiness to speak in a whole class environment.

2.12.3. Round Robin

Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) and Mandal (2009) emphasize that this technique is mainly used for brainstorming, where students produce ideas "but do not elaborate, explain, evaluate, or question the ideas" (Barkley, Cross & Major, 2005, p. 108). All the group members take turns by telling their answers for the question just in a few words or short answers. Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) state that the order of the students' answers is organized by proceeding from one student to another until all the students give their responses. With the help of Round Robin technique, many ideas are produced because all the students should take turns equally to express their ideas freely without getting discouraged by interruption that prevents the flow of the activity. At the end of the Round Robin technique, students' thoughts can be used for another activity.

2.12.4. Buzz Groups

Barkley, Cross, and Major (2005) and Mandal (2009) state that in buzz groups students are put into a groups of four to six. This technique is usually used for course related questions and the students are expected to give a response to those course related questions. Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) indicate that in buzz groups, the group can answer more than one question and all the students can discuss the same or different questions informally and at the end of the discussion, the aim is to make students exchange their ideas. Buzz groups serve as a warm up and whole class discussion. Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) express that "buzz groups are effective for generating information and ideas in a short period of time. By dividing the whole class into small groups, more students have the opportunity to express their thoughts" (p.112).

2.12.5. Talking Chips

Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) state that in talking chips technique, learners actively participate in a group discussion, "surrendering a token each time they speak" (p. 117). "Talking Chips is useful for helping students to solve communication or process problems, such as dominating or clashing group members" (Barkley, Cross & Major, 2005, p. 117). According to Mandal (2009), Talking Chips technique stimulates shy students to participate and solve communication problems that may happen with "dominating or clashing group members" (p. 100).

2.12.6. Three-Step Interview

In three-step interview, every learner of a group chooses a partner from another group. They both ask clarifying questions and interview each other. At the last stage of three-step interview, learners report their findings to the other members of the group (Mandal, 2009). Barkley, Cross and Major (2005) highlight that "Three-step interview creates the opportunity for students to network and improve specific communication skills" (p.121). Therefore, students must listen carefully, focus on the interviewee's answers and stimulate elaboration.

2.13. Conclusion

It is argued in the literature that CLL is an effective teaching and learning approach not only to teach language skills but to teach other subjects as well. As it is explained by referring to many research findings here, CLL is found to be an effective approach which improves students learning skills and develop their understanding and as well as developing their social skills, higher order thinking skills, communication skills. In addition, CLL can enable them to rely more on their group mates and less on their teachers.

As it was argued in this chapter, CLL is an approach that provides students with a suitable context in which students can work cooperatively by exchanging their ideas. To exchange their ideas and information, students need to interact with their group mates and this interaction becomes possible within a CLL environment as it provides students with information gap activities where students can have meaningful communicative exchanges. Therefore, the current study is designed to test the effectiveness of this approach in improving the oral performances of students in EFL contexts.

In the next chapter the method that was used to conduct this research study, information about the participants and the data analysis methods will be explained in detail.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction

This chapter presents information about the research design, participants of the study, procedures of the conducted study, the materials used during the experiment, how the collected data were analysed and ethical procedures that were followed during the study.

3.1. Research Design

This research was designed as a quasi-experimental study with pre- and post-tests which investigates the effectiveness of using Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) activities on students' oral performances in English language classrooms at European University of Lefke (EUL). Two groups of participants, i.e. the experimental group and the control group, took part in the study. With the experimental group, CLL techniques and activities were used and the traditional language teaching was used with the control group. For the purposes of this study, traditional language teaching is defined as a teaching technique which does not require any cooperative work among learners. Therefore, in the current study, students who were engaged with the traditional language teaching/learning worked individually in the classroom environment.

As it was mentioned in Chapter I, the following research question was considered in the study:

> Does the use of CLL activities in EFL classrooms at university level have an effect on the oral performances of students when compared to the students' performances who were engaged with traditional learning activities?

3.2. Participants

The participants in this study were first year students at EUL, studying at the Pre-School Teaching Department. Since this department teaches in Turkish language, all of the participants were exempted from the English Preparatory School and were directly admitted to the department on registration. In terms of their language proficiency levels, the information provided by the Coordinator of English Services at EUL suggested that they were all at beginner level.

There were 22 students both in the experimental group and in the control group. In the experimental group, there were seven students from North Cyprus and the rest of the students were from Turkey. On the other hand, in the control group, there were two students from North Cyprus and the rest of the students were from Turkey. In both groups, students' ages ranged between 17 and 20. In the experimental group, all the students were low-ability students in terms of their English proficiency. This is evident in their pre-test results as none of them have scores above 2. On the other hand, in the control group, there was only one high-ability student, whose score in the pre-test was 4. As the number of the high-ability students in the study was limited to this particular student, it can be said that the results are valid for low-ability students.

3.3. Context

European University of Lefke (EUL) is an English medium university which is located in Gemikonağı, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) and it was founded in 1990.

EUL is an international university with a multicultural population of students from 35 different countries. The university offers education in seven different faculties with 36 undergraduate and 12 postgraduate programmes. As mentioned before, the participants in this study were from the Pre-School Teaching Department, where there

were approximately 110 full-time students registered at the time of the study. Students are taught English during both Spring and Fall semesters of their first and second years in this department within their four-year program. They have only three hours of English lessons every week. As it was mentioned in the previous section, students' other courses are taught in Turkish. It must be noted that the students' contact with English language as an academic subject is limited to their English language lessons in the classroom setting. This does not eliminate the possibility of them having contact with the language outside the classroom setting via their social networks or media. However, since their proficiency level is low, it can be assumed that this limited contact in the classroom setting is their only chance to focus on their language learning.

3.4. Procedures

The first step before starting data collection was to get permission from the Head of the English Preparatory School of EUL, who is also the director of the Service English courses at EUL, and the Coordinator of Service English, to carry out the experiment. As part of the designed experiment, CLL activities were developed by the researcher using the topics in the students' course books (New English File, Beginner Level) together with some activities from the "New English File Teachers' Books" (both Beginner level and Elementary level) and the "English for Life" Beginner Level Teachers' Book. As this research was designed as a quasi-experimental study, these activities (see Appendix A) were only used with the experimental group. The control group studied the activities in their course books without any changes.

At the beginning of Fall Semester of 2011-2012 academic year, the researcher started the study by explaining to the participants her purposes and why they were going to use CLL and what they were supposed to do during the semester. Following this explanation, students in both groups were given an oral exam to collect data for the pre-

test. These pre-tests were conducted individually. In these tests, students from both groups were presented with topics and they were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the given statements by explaining their reasons. These sessions were audio-recorded. After all the pre-test sessions were completed, the researcher and the Speaking Coordinator of the English Preparatory School at EUL separately graded students' speaking skills out of five according to the speaking criteria used at the university (see Appendix B). During the experiment, the researcher used more than one variable to arrange the students into heterogeneous groups. These variables can be listed as sex, age, personality, language proficiency and ethnicity. During the teaching period as a part of the experiment, none of the CLL structures were used because of having a limited time period. Therefore, only CLL techniques were used. These techniques can be listed as jigsaw, think-pair-share, round-robin, buzz groups, talking chips and three step interview (see Barkley, Cross & Mayor, 2005 for more detail). At the completion of the experiment, the post-test was applied to both groups in the same way after one semester (three months) of teaching and results were analysed using the SPSS data analysis software.

3.5. Materials

The CLL activities, used with the experimental group, were mostly adapted from four different sources: The New English File Beginner Level Teachers' Book, New English File Elementary Level Teachers' Book, English for Life Beginner Level Teachers' Book and Say Yes Student's Book 3. In addition, some other activities were adapted from Hamidan (2005). From the New English File Beginner Level Teacher's Book, information gap activities (n = 3), role play activity (n = 1), description (n = 1), asking and answering activities (n = 3), finding the similarities and differences (n = 1) and games (n = 1) were used. On the other hand, from New English File Elementary

Level Teachers' Book, information gap activities (n = 3), games (n = 5), asking and answering activities (n = 1) and finding the common things (n = 1) activities were taken. Pictures for the jigsaw activity (n = 1) were taken from Say Yes Student's Book 3. From English for Life, information gap activities (n = 6) were used. From Hamidan (2005), discussion (n = 1) and finding the differences (n = 1) were adapted. In total, 29 CLL activities were used during the three months of teaching period. These activities were generally designed as pair work (n = 16) and group work (n = 13) activities. Pair work activities included information gap activities (n = 12), finding the common things (n = 1), finding the similarities and differences (n = 1), asking and answering questions (n = 2). On the other hand, group work activities included role play (n = 1), games (n = 6), jigsaw (n = 1), description (n = 1), asking and answering (n = 2), finding the differences (n = 1) and discussion (n = 1).

For the pre- and post-tests, data was collected through individual oral exams. In both of these tests, the experimental and the control group students were presented with topics (see Appendix C) and the students were asked to explain whether they agreed or disagreed on the given topics by giving reasons. The criteria for evaluating students' oral performances was used at this stage (see Appendix B).

3.6. Data Analysis

In this research, the collected data was analysed quantitatively by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

The data, which was gathered through the pre- and post-tests, were graded out of five and were entered into SPSS 18.0. Paired Samples t-tests and Independent Samples t-tests were used to analyse the data and to find out if there were any significant differences between the experimental group and the control group in terms of their oral performances.

3.7. Reliability and Validity

Reliability is one of the important aspects of any research. Joppe (2000) defines reliability as:

> the extent to which results are consistent over time and an accurate representation of the total population under study is referred to as reliability and if the results of a study can be reproduced under a similar methodology, then the research instrument is considered to be reliable (p. 1).

To ensure that the students' oral performances were graded in a reliable way, inter-rater reliability was used. In this method, in addition to the researcher, the English Speaking Coordinator at EUL evaluated the pre- and post-test data and gave marks to the participants' oral performances based on the Speaking Marking Criteria (see Appendix B). Then, the arithmetic average of the marks given by both evaluators was taken and later used for statistical analysis on SPSS.

As this study was a quasi-experimental design, internal validity was used. Two groups were assigned for this study. One of them was the experimental group and the other group was the control group. At the beginning of the semester students in both groups were given the speaking topics by the researcher herself and asked to state their opinions as a pre-test and when all the students in both groups took the pre-test the researcher started the experiment. During the experiment the students in the experimental group studied with the Cooperative Language Learning activities whereas the students in the control group studied with non-Cooperative Language Learning activities. At the end of the semester all the students in both groups were given the post-test and the results were analysed by using SPSS. The researcher herself was the English teacher of both the experimental group and the control group, therefore, no differences occurred in terms of teacher experience or approach to teaching in this study.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

Before conducting the study, permission was obtained from the participants verbally to record their voices for the pre- and post-tests. Participants were also assured that their voices would be kept strictly confidential and would not be listened to by any other people except the researcher herself and the Speaking Coordinator.

The procedures used in this study were carefully designed not to cause any psychological distress for the participants. Yet, it may be debated that by using CLL activities with the experimental group only, students in that group had an advantage in improving their oral performances, simply because they had more opportunities to speak in the classroom. On the other hand, it can be argued that the control group only studied with traditional learning method, which was different from the experiences of the students in the experimental group. However, it can also be argued that such differences may also occur in non-experimental settings, simply due to other relevant factors, such as differences in teachers' approach to teaching English and/or their previous experiences. In the classroom environment, different teachers use different teaching methods according to their preferences, creating differences in students' learning experiences. Therefore, it is believed that the procedures used in this study are ethically designed and are very similar to students' everyday learning experiences.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

4.0. Introduction

In this chapter, the results from the pre-test and the post-test of the students' oral performances will be presented. As described in the previous chapter, the data collected from these tests were analysed on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 18.0 by using paired sample t-test and independent sample t-tests. The outcomes of the analysis will be explained in detail and will be discussed with regard to other research findings in the field.

4.1. Pre-Test and Post-Test

As it was explained in the previous chapter, students in both the experimental and the control group were given an oral test as part of the data collection procedures to constitute the pre-test data before starting the experiment. There were 22 students in both groups. The speaking pre-test included only one task, where students were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the given statements and give reasons for their answer. The students' oral performances were graded out of five. At the end of one semester (three months) of using cooperative language learning (CLL) techniques with the learners in the experimental group, another oral test was given to the learners in both groups as a post-test. The contents of the pre-test and the post-test were the same (see Appendix C).

4.2. Findings

The paired sample t-test used to compare the means of two variables and this test computes the difference between the two variables for each case and tests to see if the average difference is significantly different from zero. Table 4.1. indicates the pre- and the post-test mean differences for the experimental group. According to the outcomes of this analysis, the mean scores of the pre-test for the experimental group is 1.4545 and this score has increased to 3.8636 in the post-test. The results of paired samples t-test highlighted that the students' post-test scores improved significantly.

Table 4.1. Pre-Post-test Results for the Experimental Group

		Mean	N	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Experimental Group	Pre-test	1,4545	22	,59580	,12703
	Post-test	3,8636	22	,63960	,13636

Table 4.2. shows the t-test analysis of the mean differences for the experimental group. According to the outcomes of paired samples t-test, the difference between the pre- and post-test scores of the participants was found to be significant (p<0.05).

Table 4.2. Significance Test for Pre-Post Test Scores of the Experimental Group

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Experimental Group	Pre-test – Post-test	-2,40909	,73414	,15652	-2,73459	-2,08359	-15,392	21	,000

Table 4.3. indicates the pre- and post-test mean differences for the control group. The mean score of the pre-test for the control group is 1.2727 and this score has increased to 2.5455 in the post-test.

Table 4.3. Pre-Post Test Results for the Control Group

		Mean	N	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Control Group	Pre-test	1,2727	22	,55048	,11736
	Post-test	2,5455	22	,67098	,14305

Table 4.4. shows the results of the paired t-test analysis based on the differences of mean scores for the control group. According to the outcomes of paired samples t-test, the *t* value is $t = -8.498(21)$. This score was found to be significant ($p < 0.05$), which means that the difference between pre-test and the post-test scores of the control group is significant as well.

Table 4.4. Significance Test for Pre-Post Test Scores of the Control Group

		Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Control Group									
	Pre-test-Post-test	-1,27273	,70250	,14977	-1,58420	-,96126	-8,498	21	,000

At this point, it can be seen that both the control group and the experimental group have significantly improved their scores in the post-tests when compared to their scores in the pre-tests. However, the experimental group's students had a higher mean score in the post-test, which means that they showed a greater improvement when their post-test mean values are considered. Table 4.5. indicates the pre-test and post-test results for both the experimental and the control group. According to these results, the mean scores for both groups seem to be lower than 1.5 for the pre-test. The mean value of the control group is 1.2727 and the mean value of experimental group is 1.4545. On

the other hand, their post-test results seem to have increased to 2.5455 for the control group and 3.8636 for the experimental group.

Table 4.5. Mean Differences between pre-test and post-test of experimental group and control group

	Group Name	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Pre-test	Control Group	22	1,2727	,55048	,11736
	Experimental Group	22	1,4545	,59580	,12703
Post-test	Control Group	22	2,5455	,67098	,14305
	Experimental Group	22	3,8636	,63960	,13636

To better understand whether this difference in post-test scores was statistically significant and meaningful when the two groups are compared, an independent samples t-test was done. In Table 4.6, the results of the independent samples t-test are presented. This analysis showed that there isn't any significant difference between the pre-test results of the two groups ($p > 0.05$, $t(42) = .299$). On the other hand, the t-test for post-test scores showed that there is a significant difference between the groups ($p < 0.05$, $t(42) = .000$).

Table. 4.6. Significance Test between Experimental Group and Control Group Post-Test Scores

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| | | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
									Lower	Upper
Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	1,737	,195	-1,051	42	,299	-,18182	,17294	-,53083	,16720
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,051	41,740	,299	-,18182	,17294	-,53090	,16726
Post-test	Equal variances assumed	1,321	,257	-6,670	42	,000	-1,31818	,19763	-1,71702	-,91934
	Equal variances not assumed			-6,670	41,904	,000	-1,31818	,19763	-1,71705	-,91931

This result suggests that the difference in the mean scores of the two groups in the post-test is statistically significant. Since the experimental group, who studied speaking using CLL techniques, scored higher than the control group (see Table 4.5) in the post-test, it is concluded that CLL activities were useful in increasing the oral performances of adult EFL learners at European University of Lefke.

4.3. Students' and Teacher's Reflections on the Research Process

Apart from the statistical analysis of the test results, it is worth pointing out some significant information related to the process through which the research was undertaken. At the beginning of the experiment, students in the experimental group were informed about the procedures and they were assigned into groups of 4-5. At first, shy students appeared to have difficulties in getting used to working in groups. After the first two weeks, however, they seemed to enjoy working in cooperative groups with their teammates. After finishing a role play activity that focused on acting like a waiter/waitress and a customer, one of these shy students asked me to bring more role play activities like this because he said that these kinds of activities were really enjoyable and useful. He also expressed that he needed such kind of activities to learn the language and the required expressions that he could use in his daily life. Since such role play activities gave them a different persona to act out, they were able to produce language with lower levels of anxiety. Students who were initially shy and passive were observed to participate more in the activities. The researcher also observed that their social skills have improved during the activities. They started to socialise and spend more time with their teammates outside the classroom. For instance, a group of students who were assigned to work together in class hired a car to visit the historical places in North Cyprus. Another group of students registered to the theatre club of the university and made new friends. They claimed that the role-play activities in particular motivated them to initiate such activities. As students in the experimental group were working together, it was observed that the amount of students' use of English language had also increased. They seemed to use different linguistic discourses, such as making jokes or encouraging each other, in English while working in groups.

The activities that seemed most enjoyable for the students were the jigsaw activities, group games and role-plays. During these activities, students seemed to have

fun and they frequently asked for activities like these because they wanted to have oral practise about what they have learnt during the lesson. In contrast, students in the control group mostly worked on matching and completion activities. Initially, they seemed to enjoy doing controlled activities like these where they did not have to take any risks to produce the language. However, towards the end of the semester, these students seemed to be bored with this type of activities and they asked me to bring activities focusing more on speaking and less on sentence completion. Thus, it can be understood that activities associated with traditional methods of language teaching are boring for students despite the fact that the students find them "safe" for a certain amount of time. This was something that we did not experience with the experimental group. Their motivation and enjoyment with the course seemed to increase with time.

4.4. Discussion

The results of the current study clearly indicate that CLL is an effective technique to be used in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts with adult learners to improve students' oral performances. Similar results were reported in the literature on other language skills. These findings seem to support Law's (2008) study on the impact of CLL on second graders' reading comprehension. In that study, learners in CLL groups (Student Direct Learning Instruction classes which is a new instructional reading programme in which students learn how to understand text through cooperative learning activities) were compared with traditional instruction groups and the results revealed there is a statistically significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups in favour of the experimental groups in which CL activities were used. Moreover, according to Kitchakarn (2012), the use of cooperative learning approach positively affected the writing skills of students. Wichade (2005) conducted a study aiming to investigate the impact of CL on English reading skill development of

first-year students at Bangkok University. The results revealed that students got higher reading comprehension scores in the post-test when compared to the pre-test scores. Similarly, Syafini and Tengku (n. d.) conducted a survey to examine the impact of CL in improving the writing performance of students in an urban school in Malaysia. Students were evaluated on five components of writing, which were content, vocabulary, organization, grammatical accuracy and mechanics. The results of this survey also revealed that the students performed better in writing after engaging in CL activities. These findings show us two things. First, CLL techniques are useful for improving different language skills, i.e. reading comprehension and writing skills from a text in the students' native language and improving oral communication skills in a foreign language. The second thing is that CLL can be used with different age groups, i.e. young learners and adult learners, and the results of instruction seem to be positive in terms of targeted learning areas.

Talebi and Sobhani (2012) conducted a research study, which aimed at finding out if using CL method brings about significant improvements in English language learners' oral proficiency. The results revealed that the experimental group outperformed the control group in the post-test. The results also highlighted that the experimental group performed significantly higher than the control group on the oral proficiency test. Similar to Talebi and Sobhani's (2012) study, the findings of this study also revealed that the students in the experimental group outperformed the control group in the post-test. This implies that CLL is an effective method to improve students' oral proficiency when compared with the traditional way of learning.

As opposed to these positive findings, Qaisara, Sheikh, Azhar and Manzoor (2011) found that the post-test results of the experimental group and the control group did not differ in terms of academic achievement for 8th grade students in the subject of social sciences. Therefore, CL was not found as an effective teaching method when

compared to routine method of instruction on the subject of social sciences. This finding implies that CL may not be as useful in subject matter areas, i.e. social sciences in this case, as it is in language teaching.

According to a research study, conducted by Hsiung (2012) which investigated the comparison of the learning effectiveness of CL and traditional learning approaches and the comparison of the effectiveness of using CL activities both in the classroom and out of the classroom settings, students who were engaged in CL activities both in an out of the classroom settings performed better in homework and unit tests. Similarly, the students in the experimental group of the current research study were observed to perform well in their homework tasks. Although these were not statistically analysed, it can be argued that they performed better not only in their speaking skills but in their homework as well.

Jalilifar (2010) conducted a research study, aiming at investigating the impact two CLL structures, which were Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) and Group Investigation (GI) on students' reading comprehension achievement in EFL. In this context, he had two experimental groups and one control group. STAD and GI were used as CLL structures in the experimental groups (A and B) respectively and in the control group Conventional Instruction (CI) technique, which is also known as the traditional approach, was used as a teaching method. According to the results of Jalilifar's study, STAD was found to be a more effective technique in enhancing EFL learners' reading comprehension achievement while GI and CI were not found to improve EFL learners' reading comprehension significantly. According to Jalilifar (2010) in the STAD team, rewards played an important role. Therefore, this might have had a strong effect on EFL students' performances in reading comprehension. The results of Jalilifar's (2010) study imply that not all CLL structures have positive effects

on students' reading comprehension achievements and further studies need to be done specifically on the effectiveness of specific CLL structures in different skills.

Shihab's (2011) study, which was conducted in Al Amal School in Amman and aimed at finding out the effectiveness of using CL with Jordanian students who have learning disabilities, compared traditional teaching methods with CL on students' performances in mathematics. The findings of Shihab's study highlight that there were no statistically significant differences between the control group and the experimental group in the pre-test scores. On the other hand, there were statistically significant differences between the control group and the experimental group in accordance with the post-test results in favour of the experimental group. Gupta (2004) conducted a research study to find out if CL improved students' performances in physical sciences and the results revealed that CL was very well received by the students and they expressed their enthusiasm to take part in CL groups not only in physical sciences but in other courses as well. In the current research study, similar attitudes were observed among students in the experimental group, where they expressed enjoyment in taking part in CLL activities. When considered in the light of the findings of the current study, Shihab's (2011) and Gupta's (2004) results imply two things. The first thing is that CL is an effective method not only to teach language learning similar to this research study but also other subjects, i.e. mathematics and physical sciences, in this case. The second thing is that CL is an effective method for every student profile, i.e. students who have learning disabilities and students who do not have learning disabilities.

4.5. Conclusion

As it is clear from the findings presented in this chapter, both the experimental group and the control group have shown significant improvements in their speaking skills as a result of their exposure to instruction in English. However, the independent

samples t-test results showed that students in the experimental group performed higher in the post-test and this result was found to be both significant and meaningful in favour of the experimental group. It can be said that CLL techniques appear to be effective in improving university students' oral communication skills in EFL contexts. The improvements in the oral performances of the students in the control group can be explained by their exposure to English language during the course for three months and this improvement is thought to be a natural outcome of this instruction. However, the difference between the experimental group and the control group in the post-test scores suggests that the improvement in the performances of the participants in the experimental group is due to the treatment, i.e. use of CLL activities in the classroom. Related literature also shows that in terms of improving language skills, CLL techniques are useful and effective while in other subject areas, the debate is unresolved. In the following chapter, conclusions based on the findings presented here will be drawn and recommendations for further research will be made.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0. Introduction

This chapter presents the summary and conclusions of the conducted research study. Following the conclusions, recommendations for further research will be made.

5.1. Summary

The aim of this study was to examine the effectiveness of Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) in increasing students' success in foreign language learning in terms of speaking skills. The purpose was to investigate whether there is a correlation between learners' participation in cooperative group work or pair work activities in the classroom and their success in oral performances.

In this research study, the gathered data was analysed on SPSS 18.0 by using the independent sample t-test and paired samples t-tests. Paired samples t-tests showed that both groups had significant differences in their pre-post test results. However, it was observed that performances of the students in the experimental group have increased in the post-test when compared to their performances in the pre-test. This difference was also found to be statistically significant. Further independent t-test analysis showed that the difference between the post-test results of the experimental group and the control group was both significant and meaningful in favour of the experimental group. This means that the experimental group, which was exposed to CLL activities, had higher scores than the control group, which was exposed to traditional language teaching activities and it was concluded that students in the experimental group scored higher than the control group and their speaking skills improved more than the students in the control group. According to the paired samples t-test results, the scores of the students

in both groups increased significantly. However, the statistically significant difference between the post-test scores of the groups suggest that in the case of the experimental group, the participants' speaking skills improved due to the CLL activities used in the classroom. In case of the control group, the reason for this increase could be due to mere exposure to English language for three months.

It can be said that CLL is an effective way of teaching speaking to adult students in contexts where English is a foreign language (EFL). Students who engage in CLL activities learn better in heterogeneous cooperative groups from their peers who are exposed to non-cooperative language learning activities.

5.2. Conclusions

Meaningful interaction is an essential tool in order to have communication with other people. Meaningful interaction can only happen if there is an information gap between people. This information gap can only be completed by asking questions and answering each other's questions. CLL is one of the ways in which such information gaps can be created within classroom settings, providing the opportunity to students to interact in meaningful ways. By engaging in CLL activities, students' self-esteem, problem solving skills, higher order thinking skills, team building skills, communication skills and social relations are also improved (Gupta, 2004; Iqbal, 2004; Law, 2008; MacArthur, Schwartz & Graham, 1991; Servetti, 2010; Veenman, Kenter & Post, 2000; Yager, Johnson & Johnson, 1985). Along with its potential advantages in developing social skills by interacting with each other in order to complete their tasks, CLL is also an important method that enables learners to improve language skills (Gupta, 2004; Iqbal, 2004; Law, 2008; MacArthur, Schwartz & Graham, 1991; Servetti, 2010; Talebi & Sobhani, 2012; Yager, Johnson & Johnson, 1985). As Talebi and Sobhani (2012) highlighted in their research, CLL is effective to improve students' speaking skills

because it provides students with activities in which learners are required to help each other's learning and become motivated to work together as a team in cooperative learning groups.

Along with these research findings, the findings of this research study highlight that the students in the experimental group, who were exposed to CLL activities in heterogeneous cooperative groups, scored higher than the students in the control group who were exposed to non-cooperative activities in the classroom. Therefore, the findings of this research study also make it clear that CLL is an effective way of improving students' oral performances in classroom settings when it is compared to the traditional way of teaching.

5.3. Recommendations for Further Research

As this study was conducted within a certain time period (three months) and with a limited group of students (students in Pre-School Teaching Department) at European University of Lefke (EUL), further studies can be done on the same topic including the students in Pre-School Teaching Departments in other universities in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) to obtain more detailed information about the effectiveness of CLL on students' oral performances and the results of the collected data can be compared with each other to be able to generalise the findings to the whole of TRNC. In addition, if the experiment is applied for a longer period of time, and several pre- and post-tests are applied, it is argued that the results may provide a better understanding of the effectiveness of this method.

Since the results of this study suggested positive effects on the learning of students, similar studies can be designed to investigate the effectiveness of CLL in teaching other language areas, i.e. reading, writing, and listening, as well as grammar and pronunciation. Moreover, further studies may be carried out to find out the

effectiveness of cooperative learning structures, strategies, principles and activities to teach other subjects to the same students in the department of Pre-School Teaching at EUL. This will enable instructors to develop cooperative tasks where students can learn from each other, help them improve their knowledge in the field by sharing information and create a more cooperative working environment throughout the department.

5.4. Conclusion

Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) builds bridges between two or more people and meets the needs of those people by providing great opportunities to fill the information gap between them and therefore, allows for meaningful communication. As the results of this research suggest, CLL is an effective method to be used in EFL contexts where students lack the opportunities to practice their language learning outside the classroom context. Therefore, it is suggested that CLL should become a part of everyday teaching practices of EFL teachers.

References

Adams, S., & Powell, M. J. (1994). Classroom compass: Cooperative learning. *Southwest Consortium for the Improvement of Mathematics and Science Teaching*, 1(2), 1-10.

Baloche, L. (1998). *The cooperative classroom: Empowering learning.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P. & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative learning techniques*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, H. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Campbell, C. M. & Ortiz, J. (1991). Helping students overcome foreign language anxiety: A foreign language anxiety workshop. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Yougn (Eds.) *Language anxiety: From theory, and research to classroom implications*. (pp. 153-168). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chafe, A. (1998). Cooperative learning and the second language classroom. Retrieved June 18, 2011 from: http://blog.naver.com/seorow/40042892503

Chamot, A. U. & O'Malley. J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach.* San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

Coelho, E. (1996). *Learning together in the multicultural classroom*. Scarborough, Ontario, Pipping Publishing Corporation.

Cohen, E. G. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom (2nd ed.)*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cragon, J. F., Wright, D. W. & Kash, C. R. (2008). *Communication in small groups: Theory, process, skills* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by collaborative learning?. In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.) *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches*. (pp. 1-19) Oxford: Elsevier.

Dorneyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 482-493.

Duxbury, J. G. & Tsai, L. (2010). The effects of cooperative learning on foreign language anxiety: A comparative study of Taiwanese and American universities. *International Journal of Instruction*, *3*(1), 3-18.

Gabbert, B., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1986). Cooperative learning, group to individual transfer, process gain, and the acquisition of cognitive reasoning strategies. J*ournal of Psychology, 120*, 265-278.

Garder. H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York. NY: Basic Books.

Gokhale, A. A. (1995). Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, *7*(1), 22-30.

Gupta, L. M. (2004). Enhancing student performance through cooperative learning in physical sciences, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *29*(1), 63-73.

Hagman, S. (1990). The community of inquiry: An approach to collaborative learning. *Studies in Art Education*, *31*(3), 149-157.

Hamidan, F. (2005). *The effects of using collaborative learning activities in second language learning*. Unpublished MA thesis, Near East University, Lefkoşa.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. London: Pearson.

Hartup, W., Glazer, J., & Charlesworth, R. (1967). Peer reinforcement and sociometric status. *Child Developmen*t, *38*, 1017-1024.

Hiçyılmaz, A. (2005). Neuro linguistic programing. Retrieved June 18, 2011 from:

http://www.yde.yildiz.edu.tr/uddo/belgeler/inca-hicyilmaz-cooplearn.htm

Hutchinson, T. (2007). English for life beginner teacher's book, Oxford, OUP.

Hsiung, C. (2012). The effectiveness of cooperative learning. *Journal of Engineering Education, 101*(1), 119-137.

Iqbal, M. (2004). *Effective of cooperative learning on academic achievement of secondary school students in Mathematics*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University Institute of Education and Research, Arid Agriculture University, Rawalpindi.

Jacobs, G. (n. d.). Cooperative learning: Theory, principles, and techniques. Retrieved June 15, 2011 from http://www.georgejacobs.net

Jacobs, G. M., Power, M. A. & Loh. W. I. (2002). *The teacher's sourcebook for cooperative learning: Practical techniques, basic principles, and frequently asked questions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Jacobs, G., & Hannah, D. (2004). Combining cooperative learning with reading aloud by teachers. *International Journal of English Studies*, *4*(1), 97-117.

Jalilifar, A. (2010). The effect of cooperative learning techniques on college students' reading comprehension. *System*, *38*, 96-108 Retrieved June 10, 2012 from http://www.sciencedirect.com

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning* (5th ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T., (1999). Making learning work. *Theory into Practice*, *38*(2), 67-73.

Johnson, D. W. (1980). Group processes: Influences of student-student interactions on school outcomes, In J. McMillan (Ed.), *Social psychology of school learning* (pp.123-168). New York: Academic Press.

Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R. T., (n. d.), Cooperation and the use of technology. p.785-811 Retrieved May 10, 2011 from http://tesiscito.googlecode.com/svn/trunk/lyx/papers/johnson.pdf

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1981). Effects of cooperative and individualistic learning experiences on interethnic. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *74*, 454-459.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1983). The socialization and achievement crisis: Are cooperative learning experiences the solution? In L. Beckman (Ed.), *Applied Social Psychology Annual* 4 (pp. 119-164). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1991). *Learning together and alone* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (n. d.). Introduction to cooperative learning: An overview of cooperative learning. Cooperative Learning Institute and Interaction Book Company. Retrieved June 2, 2011 from: ww.co-operation.org/?page_id=65

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T., (1989). *Leading the Cooperative Learning School*. Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson R. T. & Smith, K. A. (1992). *Cooperative learning: Increasing college faculty instructional productivity.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education Washington DC. George Washington University, Washington, DC, School of Education and Human Development, ERIC Identifier: ED 347871. Retrieved May 15, 2011 from www.ericdigests.org/1992-2/cooperative.htm

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. & Holubec, E. (1998). *Cooperation in the classroom*. (7th ed). Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). *Exhibit B - cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis.* Retrieved June 10, 2011 from www.tablelearning.com/uploads/File/EXHIBIT-B

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Maruyama, G. (1983). Interdependence and interpersonal attraction among heterogeneous and homogeneous individuals: A theoretical formulation and a meta-analysis of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, *53*, 5-54.

Johnson, D. W., Skon, L., & Johnson, R. (1980). The effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goals structures on student achievement on different types of tasks. *American Educational Research Journal*, *17*, 83-93.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2002). Learning together and alone: Overview and meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *22*(1), 95-105.

Joppe, M. (2000). *The research process.* Retrieved June 3, 2011 from http://www.ryerson.ca/~mjoppe/rp.htm

Kagan, S. & Kagan, M. (1998). *Multiple intelligences: The complete MI book*. San Clemente: Kagan Publishing.

Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. San Juan Capristrano, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Kessler, C. (1992). *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Killen, R. (1992). *Student-centred teaching strategies.* Newcastle, NSW: University of Newcastle.

Killen, R. (1993). *Student-centred teaching strategies (2nd ed.).* Newcastle, NSW: University of Newcastle.

Kitchakarn, O. (2012). The impact of cooperative learning approach on students' writing skills. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *33*(1), 110-118.

Kogut, L. S. (1997). Using cooperative learning to enhance performance in general chemistry. *Journal of Chemistry Education*, *74*(6), 720-24.

Kohonen, V. (1987). Towards experimental learning of elementary English. A theoretical outline of an English and Finnish teaching experiment in elementary learning. University of Tampere: Reports from the Department of Teacher Training in Tampere. Finland.

Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.

Laughlin, P. & Jaccard, J. (1975). Social facilitation and observational learning of individuals and cooperative pairs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 873-879.*

Laughlin, P. (1965). Selection strategies in concept attainment as a function of number of persons and stimulus display. J*ournal of Experiment Psychology, 70, 323-327.*

Laughlin, P. (1972). Selection versus reception concept attainment paradigms for individuals and cooperative pairs. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 63, 116-122.*

Laughlin, P., McGlynn, R., Anderson, J., & Jacobson, E. (1968). Concept attainment by individuals versus cooperative pairs as a function of memory, sex, and concept rule. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 410-417.*

Law, Y. (2008). Effects of cooperative learning on second graders' learning from text. *Educational Psychology*, *28*(5), 567-582.

Lightbown, M. P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (2nd ed.), Oxford: OUP.

Mandal, R. (2009). Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skill. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(2), 94-102.

Marr, M. B., (1997). Cooperative learning: A brief review. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *13*(1), 7-20. doi:10.1007/s10802-006-9049-4

McArthur, C. A., Schwartz, S. S., & Graham. S. (1991). Effects of a reciprocal peer revision strategy in special education classrooms. *Learning Disabilities Research, 6, 201-210.*

McGlynn, R. (1972), Four-person group concept attainment as a function of interaction format. *Journal of Social Psychology, 86, 89-94.*

McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal*, *13*(2) 127-43.

Michealsen L. K. (1992). Team learning: A comprehensive approach for harnessing the power of small groups in higher education to improve the academy. *To Improve the Academy*, *11*,107-122.

Mitchell, H. Q., & Sott, J. (2001). *Say yes, student's book 3*, Great Britain: MM Publications.

Newman, F. & Holtzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist.* New York: Routledge.

Oxenden, C., Latham-Koening, C., Hudson, J., Hamilton, G., & Jay, D. (2009). *New English file, beginner teacher's book,* Oxford: OUP.

Oxenden, C., Latham-Koening, C., Seligson, P., Clandfield, L., & Target, F. (2004). *New English file, elementary teacher's book*, Oxford: OUP.

Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 443-56.

Panitz, T. (1996). A definition of collaborative vs cooperative learning. Retrieved February 17, 2011 from: www.londonmet.ac.uk/deliberations/collaborative-learning/panitz-paper.cfm

Pate, G. S. (1988). Research on reducing prejudice. *Social Education*, *52*(4), 287-289.

Pica, T. (1994). Review article. Research on negotiation: Who does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning*, *44*(3), 493-527.

Qaisara, P., Sheikh, T. M., Azhar, M. & Manzoor, A. (2011). Effect of cooperative learning on academic achievement of 8th grade students in the subject of Social Studies. I*nternational Journal of Academic Research*, *3*(1), 950-954.

Qin Z., Johnson D. W. & Johnson R. T. (1995). Cooperative versus competitive efforts and problem solving. *Review of Educational Research, 65*(2), 129-143.

Roberton, T. (2011). Reducing affective filter in adult language learning classrooms. Unpublished MA thesis, The Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington.

Robinson, P. (Ed.). (2002). *Individual differences and instructed language learning*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Servetti, S. (2010) Cooperative learning groups involved in a written error-correction task. A case study in an Italian secondary school. *European Education*, *42*(3), 7-25.

Shachar, H., & Sharan, S., (1994). Talking, relating, and achieving: Effects of cooperative learning and whole-class instruction. *Cognition and Instruction*, *12*(4), 313-353.

Sherman, L. W., & Thomas, M. (1986). Mathematics achievement in cooperative versus individualistic goal-structured high school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research*, *79*, 169-172.

Shihab, I. (2011). The effects of using cooperative learning on Jordanian students with learning disabilities performance in Mathematics, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *25*(2), 251-259.

Siegel, C. (2005). Implementing a research-based model of cooperative learning. *The journal of Educational Research*, *98*(6), 339-349.

Skon, L., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1981). Cooperative peer interaction versus individual competition and individualistic efforts: Effects on the cognitive reasoning strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *73*, 83-92.

Slavin, R, E., & Madden, N. A. (1989). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis. *Educational Leadership*, *46*(5), 4-13.

Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Research and practice.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. E. (1989). Cooperative learning and student achievement, In R. E. Slavin (Ed.), *School and classroom organization* (pp.129-151). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Madden, NA, (Eds.). (1989). *Effective programs for students at risk*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. E., Leavey, M., & Madden, N. A. (1984). Combining cooperative learning and individualized instruction: Effects on student mathematics achievement, attitudes, and behaviors. *Elementary School Journal*, *84*, 409-422.

Spurlin, J., Dansereau, D., Larson, C., & Brooks, L. (1984). Cooperative learning strategies in processing descriptive text: Effects of role and activity level of the learner. *Cognition and Instruction, 1,* 451-463.

Stevens, R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading Composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *22*, 433-454.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Syafini, B. I. & Tengku, N. R. B. T. M. M. (n. d.) The effects of Cooperative Learning in Enhancing Writing Performance, Retrieved January 20, 2013 from http://www.ukm.my/solls09/Proceeding/PDF/Shafini.pdf

Talebi, F., & Sobhani, A. (2012). The impacts of cooperative learning on oral proficiency. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(3). 75-79.

Veenman, S., Kenter, B. & Post, K. (2000). Cooperative learning in Dutch primary classrooms, *Educational Studies, 26*(3), 281-302.

Vermette, P. J.(1988). Cooperative grouping in the classroom. *Social Studies*, *79*(6). 271-273.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

White, R. & Dinos, S. (2010). Investigating the impact of mediated learning experiences on cooperative peer communication during group initiatives. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *32*(3), 226-238.

Wichade, S. (2005). The effects of cooperative learning on English reading skills and attitudes of the first year students at Bangkok University. Retrieved June 14, 2011 from

http://www.bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/epaper/july_dec2005/saovapa/pdf

Woolfolk, A. (2001). *Educational psychology.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Yager, S., Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1985). Oral discussion, group to individual transfer, and achieve in cooperative learning groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*, 60-66.

Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and Teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(1), 81-83.