

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM
AND COMMUNICATION**

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITRETURE

**INVESTIGATING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF
COOPERATIVE LEARNING AND THEIR CLASSROOM PRACTICE: THE
CASE OF BIRHAN GUZO AND KOKEBE TSIBAH SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

BY

GEZAHEGN WORKINEH

JUNE, 2014

ADDIS ABABA

**INVESTIGATING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTION
OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING AND THEIR CLASSROOM PRACTICE:
THE CASE OF BIRHAN GUZO AND KOKEBETSIBAH SECONDARY
SCHOOLS**

BY

GEZAHEGN WORKINEH

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITRETURE

**PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A
FOREIGN LANGAUGE**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

JUNE, 2014

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Gezahegn Workineh entitled: Investigating EFL teachers' perception of cooperative learning and their classroom practice and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign language complies with the regulations of the university and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the examining committee

Examiner Signature.....Date.....

Examiner.....Signature..... Date.....

Advisor.....Signature..... Date.....

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate EFL teachers' perception and to examine the degree they practice cooperative learning principles in their classroom. In order to achieve this objective descriptive survey research design method was employed. The subjects of the study were 20 EFL teachers who were selected by purposive sampling from BirhanGuzo and Kokebetsibahsecondary schools.

The data were gathered through, questionnaire, interview and classroom observation. The questionnaire has three parts, background information, teachers' perception about cooperative learning and teachers' classroom practice. The questionnaire with total 35 items were prepared and distributed to 20 EFL teachers and 19 of them were returned. Four teachers, two from each school who teaches grade 9 and 10 were selected randomly and interviewed and observed.

The results of the study showed that, EFL teachers' perception of cooperative learning is average with mean value of 3.22 and teachers practice cooperative learning sometimes. However, the study shows that there is mismatch between what teachers perceive about cooperative learning and what they actually practice in EFL classes. In order to fill the gap, short term/in-service training, continuous supervision and experience sharing programs should have to be given to the teachers.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and for most, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my almighty God, for all the grace and encouragement that enabled me to accomplish my study properly despite all the ups and down of life.

Secondly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Dr, AmanuelGebbru for his invaluable and constructive comments, suggestions and feedback. Without his constructive comments and suggestions, this study would not have been successful.

I would like to acknowledge the comments, suggestions and guidance that I got from Dr, Carolyn Cassale.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to my beloved girlfriend, Genet Megersa, for her support, appreciation, encouragement and love during the course of my studies despite a number of prevailing challenges, without her it would have been much tougher task to achieve the goals I set out for myself.

I would like to extend my thanks to the school administrators and teachers of MisrakGoh Secondary School (for pilot study), BirhanGuzo and Kokebtsibah secondary schools (for the main study), are appreciated for the contribution they made.

Finally, I would like to express my thanks for all my friends and people who have given me moral and material support in my carrier.

Table of Contents

PAGES

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgment.....	ii
Table of content.....	iii
Lists of Tables.....	iv
Lists of Appendices.....	v
CHAPTER ONE -----	1
1.INTRODUCTION	1
<i>1.1 Background of the study</i>	<i>1</i>
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY.....	6
<i>1.4 Significance of the study</i>	7
1.5 Scope of the study.....	7
1.6 Limitation of the study.....	8
1.7 Definition of terms and Abbreviations.....	9
CHAPTER TWO	10
2. Literature Review	10
2.1 Cooperative language learning.....	10
2.2 The essential elements of cooperative learning	11
2.2.1 Positive interdependence.....	12
2.2.2 Individual accountability.....	13

2.2.3 Promotive interaction.....	13
2.2.4 Interpersonal skills.....	14
2.2.5 Group processing and assessment.....	14
2.3 Types of cooperative learning.....	15
2.3.1 Formal cooperative learning.....	15
2.3.2 Informal cooperative learning.....	15
2.3.3 Cooperative base group.....	16
2.4 Commonly used cooperative learning methods.....	16
2.4.1 Structured team learning	17
2.4.1.1 Student team learning.....	17
2.4.1.2 Students teams Achievement	18
2.4.1.3 Teams Games Tournament.....	18
2.4.1.4 Team accelerated Instruction.....	19
2.4.1.5 Cooperative integrated reading and composition.....	19
2.4.2 Informal group learning methods	20
2.4.2.1 Learning together.....	20
2.4.2.2 Jigsaw.....	21
2.4.2.3 Numbered Heads Together.....	22
2.5 Benefits of Cooperative learning.....	22
2.5.1 The benefits of cooperative language learning	23
2.6 Teachers Perception to cooperative learning.....	29
2.7 Types of instruction.....	30

2.7.1 Competitive learning	30
2.7.2 Individualistic learning	32
2.7.3 Cooperative learning.....	33
CHAPTER THREE.....	34
3 Research design and methodology.....	34
3.1 Research Methodology.....	34
3.2 Sources of data	34
3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique.....	34
3.4. Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection.....	35
3.4.1 Questionnaire.....	35
3.4.1.1 Pilot testing.....	36
3.4.2 Interview	37
3.4.3 Observation	37
3.5 Data collection Procedure.....	38
3.6 Methods of data Analysis.....	38
CHAPTER FOUR.....	39
4. Analysis and interpretation of the data.....	39
4.1.1 Characteristics and background information of the respondents.....	39
4.1.2 Analysis of data obtained through questionnaire about teachers' perception of cooperative learning	41

4.1.3 Analysis and interpretation of the teachers' classroom practice of cooperative learning.....	48
4.2 Analysis and interpretation of data obtained through teachers' interview.....	52
4.3 Analysis and interpretation of data obtained through observation.....	55
CHAPTER FIVE	61
5 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	61
5.1 Conclusions.....	61
5.2 Recommendations.....	63
Bibliography	65
Appendices	70

LIST OF TABLES

Pages

Table 1	Frequency distribution and percentage	
	Of the age of the respondents.....	39
Table 2	Frequency distribution and percentage	
	Of the educational qualification of the respondents.....	40
Table 3	Frequency distribution and percentage of the	
	Total years of teaching experience of the respondent.....	40
Table 4	Frequency distribution and percentage of	
	The teaching load perceived by the Respondents.....	41
Table 5	Frequency distribution and percentage of	
	The average number of the students in the class	41
Table 6	Frequency distribution, percentage and	
	Mean of teachers' perception to CL.....	42-44

Table 7	Frequency distribution, percentage and mean of Teacher classroom practice to CL.....	48-49
Table 8	Classroom observation checklist for Teacher one.....	55
Table 9	Classroom observation checklist for Teacher two.....	56
Table 10	Classroom observation checklist for Teacher three.....	58
Table 11	Classroom observation checklist for Teacher four.....	60

LIST OF APPENDICES

Pages

Appendix A: Teachers' Questionnaire.....	.70
Appendix B: Teachers' Interview Guide	75
Appendix C: Classroom Practices Observation Checklist	76

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned declare that this thesis is my original work and has never presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have duly acknowledged.

Name

Signature

Date

This thesis has been submitted for examination by my approval as a university advisor.

Name

Signature.....

Date of submission.....

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

In traditional teaching approach, students are expected to work quietly and on their own for most of the school day and their performance is evaluated with tests regardless of group cooperation Putnam (1997). Traditional instructions, such as lectures, demonstrations, explanations, answers-question routines, assigned reading and guided practices focus exclusively on individual academic goals Seid (2012). This situation doesn't allow students to work together and cooperate by sharing ideas among themselves to achieve their common understanding rather they simply depend on the teacher. But cooperative learning creates a learning environment that maximizes the potentials of all students. Cooperative learning also enables students to use the target language more often, encourages communication with others in their language, creates an environment for stimulating classroom activities and gives variety to language learning (Johnson and Jonson, 1991).

Cooperative learning is a methodology that employs a variety of learning activities to improve students understanding by using a structured approach which involves a series of steps, requiring students to create, analyze and apply concepts (Kagan, 1990). The main purpose of cooperative learning is to actively involve students in the teaching learning process. It paves the way for active participation of the students in the teaching and learning process, rather than passive reception of knowledge from teacher. This active participation of students in language enables them develop their communicative competence. Since the goal of language teaching is to develop communicative competence, Hymes (1972) language teachers should give emphasis to this method and apply it in their classroom. When compared with traditional instruction, cooperative learning tends to promote productivity and achievement by providing more opportunity for communication (YanZhang, 2010).

The use of cooperative learning in language teaching is an extension of the principles of the communicative approach which is defined as the “systematic and carefully planned use of group based procedures in teaching as an alternative to teacher fronted teaching Rodgers (2001). The goal of using cooperative learning in language teaching is to provide maximum development of communicative competency by increasing authentic peer interaction and mutual support in groups.

Cooperative learning promotes positive interdependence which in turn helps to develop critical thinking skills, negotiation skills and communication skills. The interpersonal exchange among group members’ especially intellectual challenges resulting from conflicting ideas paves the way for critical thinking and cognition and meta cognition (Diana ,H&Amal Al-Nation, 2012)

Cooperative group learning increases language practice opportunities for students by creating ample opportunity to develop their skills. As to this, Brumfit (1984) states that; small group discussion will create possibility of interaction which is not normally observed in whole class approach. Such things in turn will reduce anxiety, increase awareness of possible solutions to problems and increase commitment to learning. So, as cooperative learning has the above mentioned advantages we have to apply this method in our schools and improve the students learning achievement. But to get the advantages of cooperative learning teachers’ knowledge of cooperative learning is very crucial.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In Ethiopia English is taught as a subject in primary schools and used as the medium of instruction in secondary schools, in colleges and universities (MOE, 1994). To improve the status of English and capacitate the English language teachers, Ethiopian government has given emphasis and established a center which are used to improve English language teaching skills of teachers at teacher training colleges, expanding English language departments at selected universities and establishing English language improvement programs etc.(MOE, 2012). Additionally, the government has introduced different teaching learning methodologies, changed

the former textbooks which didn't encourage students to communicate as effectively as possible. The current textbooks allow students to take more active participation.

This makes the students become confident and competent in using the language (MOE, 2005).It transforms teaching from teacher centered approach to student centered approach.

Cooperative learning is a systematic instructional method in which students work together in small group to accomplish shared learning goals. Research shows that when compared with competitive and individualistic efforts cooperation has more positive effects on academic achievements (Johnson and Johnson, 1991, slavin1995, Kagan, 1999). People operating in a cooperative learning activity attain higher achievement level than those who function under competitive and individualistic learning structure. Other findings in cooperative learning research shows cooperation has positive effects on relation among students, self –esteem, long term retention or depth of understanding of course material etc. It has been tested as one of the most effective and constructive teaching strategies (Yan Zhang, 2010).

In this method students take an increasingly greater responsibility for their own learning and their groups. This intern paves the way for the students to share their ideas with their classmates using the target language. Through cooperative learning learners can develop abilities like how to plan, make decision, converse and negotiate ideas with their group members (Putnam, 1997). For students to play their role properly teachers should create conducive environment. In order to do so they need to have knowledge about how to arrange their classroom.

In order to make teaching and learning process successful, language teachers have assumed several roles in communicative language teaching. The teacher has two main roles; the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all the participants in the classroom. The second role is, to act as an independent participant with in the teaching - learning group (Putnam, 1997).

The role of teacher in formal cooperative learning groups are making pre- instructional decisions, explaining the tasks and fostering positive interdependence, monitoring students learning in

group by intervening while students are discussing and assessing students learning (Johnson.W, Rodjer&Johnson, 1999).

As cooperative learning is part of communicative language teaching the teachers' role is nearly the same. It is impossible to think about cooperative learning without teachers' participation. Teachers need to know how to form best cooperative learning group, trying to change students' attitude about the method.

In order to perform the above mentioned role teachers need to have knowhow about the principles and advantages of cooperative learning.This shows us that in working with cooperative learning teachers' role are mandatory. Therefore, in order to accomplish cooperative learning properly teachers should be acquainted with necessary knowledge about the cooperative learning.

However, in relation to cooperative learning there were only few studies conducted locally. But there are many researches carried out internationally. Among international works KeritaMcLeish (2009) conducted a research on investigating attitude of students' towards cooperative learning method at Knox community college. The study, revealed that due to fears such as possible low grades students prefer to work on their own rather than within group due to various fears.

John and Ling-ling (2010) conducted a comparative study on the effect of cooperative learning on foreign language learning anxiety on Taiwanese and American university students. The study shows that, there were no significant correlation between foreign language anxiety and cooperative learning.

Additionally, PhamThi. H. Th.(2011) conducted a research to investigate the perception of Vietnamese teachers and students towards cooperative learning .The result points out that cooperative learning has become a common and preferred method of instruction in Vietnam .However, the functions of cooperative learning were often not understood correctly because the teachers and students maintained that cooperative learning mainly helped the students remember information rather than develop a deep understanding of the text they were studying.

Locally, the following are some of the researches which are carried out by; Gebremedhin Gidey (2011), Dejene Mendera(2011),Wossen Mekonenn (2011) and SeidMohammed (2012) .Seid Mohammed (2012)carried out an experimental research to see the effects of cooperative learning on reading comprehension achievement and social skills development of grade 10 students in EFL. His findingspoint out that cooperative learning has helped significantly to enhance students' reading comprehension achievement and social skills performance in EFL classes.

Gebremedhin Gidey (2011) investigated problems related to cooperative learning. The study revealed that high achievers dominance, use of mother tongue than target language, thetime allotted, misbehaving, the physical arrangement of the class and English language teachers' disregard during cooperative learning were some of the problems identified. Additionally, Dejene Mendera(2011) carried out a research investigating the role of cooperative learning in enhancing students writing performance. The findings of the study points out that the implementation of cooperative learning to English writing classes plays a great role for the enhancement of students writing performance. The research by Wossen (2011) was about assessing the perception of EFL teachers and students to cooperative learning at Haike general secondary school. The finding of the study shows that the majority of students and all EFL teachers had positive perception of most of cooperative learning tenets. However, in the actual implementation of cooperative learning both teachers and students were not effective.

Though local researches were carried out before on cooperative learning, most of them intended to investigate the practice and problems of cooperative learning. But, the research by Wossen was focused on investigating the perception of both teachers and students to cooperative learning. My research is different from the previous one in two reasons. Firstly, the current research deals with teachers' perception and classroom practice only.

Since Teachers' attitude to new instructional methodology influences the successful implementation of the methodology. Cuban, 1993 states teachers' attitude and belief has strong guiding influence on instruction with the exception of successive educational reforms and curriculum changes. Cuban underlines that to bring instructional changes, first teachers' beliefs must be changed. Therefore, in our cases we do not know what teachers know about cooperative

learning. So, as the main actor in the classroom teachers' perception and knowledge about cooperative learning has to be investigated. The researcher believes that knowing teachers belief is one of the most important means to know the degree of implementation. If someone has a wrong perception on something, it will lead him/her to wrong practices.

Secondly, the setting in which the research is carried out is totally different from Wossen's. The former research was done in Amara region Haike secondary school, whereas mine is in Addis Ababa. In general, this research is different from other similar researches by its scope.

Therefore, based on the assumption that teachers' perception may affect the implementation of cooperative learning, inspired the researcher to conduct this research. It is also believed that the research will fill this gap or answer the following research questions.

1. How do EFL teachers perceive cooperative learning and its principles?
2. Do EFL teachers practice cooperative learning in EFL classrooms?
3. Is there any relationship between teachers' perception of cooperative learning and their classroom practice and experience?

1.3 Objectives of the study

The main objective of the study was to investigate English language teachers perception of cooperative learning and their classroom practice; in the case of Birhan Guzo and kokebe Tsibah secondary schools.

The specific objectives of the study are;

- ☞ To assess English language teachers perception of cooperative learning.
- ☞ To examine English language teachers classroom practice of cooperative learning.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study, which focused on investigating teachers' perception of cooperative learning and their classroom practice, was hoped that the findings of the study are expected to have the following significance:

- ☛ It could widen the EFL teachers' understanding and implementation of cooperative learning. English language teachers could get the opportunity to understand the major concepts of Cooperative learning that could enable them to use different techniques of cooperative learning in EFL classroom appropriately.
- ☛ It will provide some methodological insights for EFL teachers to teaching methodology, which may enhance the awareness of teachers on implementation of cooperative learning.
- ☛ It is also expected to provide curricular contributions and serve those who wish to develop Curriculum and design ELT materials as a reference to incorporate CL Principles while preparing ELT materials.
- ☛ It will also serve as the initial work for other researchers who are interested to conduct similar or further studies on the same areas.

1.5 Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is delimited to Birhan Guzo and Kokebe Tsibah senior secondary schools. In Yeka sub city 6 government secondary schools are found but this study is delimited on two schools. The researcher believes that it may be appropriate to conduct the study in large scale. However, due to limited time and lack of adequate resources, the study is delimited to two secondary schools. The conceptual scope of the study is confined to EFL teachers' perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

The study is believed to have certain limitations. First of all, it is worth keeping in mind that the sample of the study is limited to two secondary schools EFL teachers. Students were not included in the study. This might create problem of giving conclusions on the basis of the research findings. Teachers might exhibit a new behavior which he/she might not do in another

time while class observation and being observed could be stressful situation. Hence, the presence of the researcher might cause modification of classroom behavior which may be aspects of teachers' perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning within a short period of time might be the possible limitation of the study. Moreover, the researcher also felt that it is difficult to demonstrate all aspects of teachers' perception to cooperative learning by this short questionnaire.

1.7 Definition of terms and Abbreviations used

Perception; The state of being or process of becoming aware of /understanding the

Principles of cooperative learning

CL; Cooperative learning

CLT; Communicative language teaching

EFL; English as a foreign language

ELT; English language teaching

CHAPTER TWO

2.LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

This part of the study is generally dealt with the theoretical as well as empirical evidence of cooperative learning. It begins with a discussion of the meaning of cooperative language learning; Essential elements of cooperative learning, commonly used cooperative learning methods, Benefits of cooperative learning, Teachers' perception of cooperative learning and Types of instruction.

2.1 Cooperative Language Learning

Cooperative learning(CL)started developing within the frame work of communicative language teaching and it is defined as an approach which encourages and promotes the maximum use of cooperative activities based on pair work and group work of learners in the classroom (Johnson ,Johnson and smith1991) .CL is defined differently by different scholars. For instance, Olsen and kagan (1992) define CL as “A group learning activity which is organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is responsible for his own learning, and is motivated to enhance the learning of others”. Other theorist (Fathman and Kessler 1993: Richards and Rodgers 2001) claim that CL is group work structured in such a way as to enable students interaction, the exchange of information, as well as cooperation rather than competition in learning. Salend (1994) also states that CL refers to a method for organizing learning, in which students are working with their peers towards a shared academic goal rather than competing or working separately from their peers. Since CL emerged from CLT, it encourages the development of critical thinking skills and communicative competence by means of carefully structured activities of social interaction.

Cooperative learning is different from other types of group work in that the activities are more structured and require students to participate more equally than in group work activities that do not assign specific roles to students or that give a simple directive such as “Discuss the following topic”.

Several researchers, such as Olsen and Kagan(1992),McGroarty (1989)and Ghaith and Yaghi(1998)have argued that more equal participation and opportunity for interaction is beneficial to second language learners and increases language acquisition as well as promotes the emotional wellbeing of learners.

2.2 The Essential Elements of Cooperative Learning

Not all groups are cooperative (Johnson and F,Johnson, 2009) placing people in the same room, seating them together telling them they are a group, doesn't mean they will cooperate effectively. To be cooperative and to reach the full potential of the group five essential elements need to be carefully structured into the situation. These are positive interdependence, individual and group accountability, promotive interaction, appropriate use of social skills and group processing (Johnson and Johnson, 1989, 2005, Putnam, 1997). Mastering the basic elements of cooperation allows teachers to:

1. Take existing lessons, curricula and courses and structure them cooperatively
2. Tailor cooperative learning lessons to unique instructional needs circumstances, curricula, Subject areas and students.
3. Diagnose the problems some students may have in working together and intervene to Increase the effectiveness of the student learning groups.

2.2.1 Positive Interdependence

Positive interdependence is the most important element of cooperative learning. Teachers must give a clear task and a group goal so students believe they “sink or swim together”.

Positive interdependence exists when group members perceive that they are linked with each other in a way that one cannot succeed unless every one succeeds. If one fails all, fail. Group members realize, therefore that each person’s efforts benefit not only him or herself, but all other group members as well. Positive interdependence creates a commitment to other people’s success as well as one’s own and is the heart of cooperative learning. If there is no positive interdependence, there is no cooperation. Regarding positive interdependence Putnam(1997) states that the essence of cooperative learning is the requirement that group members work together to accomplish a shared goal. Working together demands a coordination of individual actions through dialogue, planning, decision making and the give and take of negotiation. Each group member has a part to play in the group activity, although the tasks may vary from student to student. The mentality of the group should reflect a “we” rather than “me” type of thinking. Group members should take responsibility for the achievement and failure of the group member and interested on the performance of their group members. Competitive situations are often rewarding to the winning participant when competitors fail, because their failure is fundamental to one’s success such as when another student misses a word in the final stages of a spelling bee. On the other hand the cooperative experiences engender a sense of satisfaction when each person in the group is able to solve the problem and explain how they arrived at the solution. This is what we call positive interdependence. Unless this kind of thinking has not created among students in the class as well as the group it is impossible to think of cooperative learning(Johnson and Johnson, 1991).

2.2.2 Individual Accountability

The second essential element of cooperative learning is individual accountability. The group member in cooperative learning group must be accountable for achieving its goals. Each member must be accountable for contributing his or her share of the work which ensures that no one “hitch-hikes” on the work of others. The group has to be clear about its goals and be able to measure a) its progress b) the individual efforts of each of its members. Individual accountability exists when the performance of each individual student is assessed and the results are given back to the group and the individual in order to ascertain who needs more assistance, support and encouragement in completing the assignment. The purpose of this element of cooperative learning is to make each member of the group stronger and competent enough in his/her academic achievement. Additionally, it avoids the dependence of low and medium learners on the fast learners (Slavin, 1994, Johnson and Johnson, 1991).

2.2.3 Promotive interaction /face-to-face Promotive interaction

The third essential component of cooperative learning is promotive interaction. It occurs when members share resources and help; support; encourage and praise each other’s efforts to learn. In cooperative learning group members are expected to support each other both academically and on personal issues. There are important cognitive activities and interpersonal dynamics that can only occur when students promote each other’s learning. This includes, orally explaining how to solve problems, discussing the nature of the concepts being learned, teaching one’s knowledge to classmates and connecting present with past learning. It is through promoting each other’s learning face to face that members become personally committed to each other as well as to their mutual goals (Kagan, 1990, Slavin 1995).

2.2.4 Interpersonal Skills

The fourth element of cooperative learning is teaching students the required interpersonal and small group skills. In cooperative learning groups students are required to learn academic subject matter (task work) and also teach the interpersonal and small group skills required to function as part of a group. Group members must know how to provide effective leadership decision making, trust-building, communication and conflict-management and be motivated to use the prerequisite skills. Teachers have to teach teamwork skills just as purposefully and precisely as teachers do academic skills. Since cooperation and conflict are inherently related, the procedures and skills for managing conflicts constructively are especially important for the long-term success of learning groups.

2.2.5 Group processing and Assessment

Group processing exists when members discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintaining effective working relationships. Groups need to describe what member actions are helpful and unhelpful and make decisions about what behaviors to continue or change. Continuous improvement of the process of learning results from the careful analysis of how members are working together. Putnam (1997) calls group processing as group reflection and goal setting. In this part students are encouraged to reflect on how well they are achieving the group goal. They also consider how well they functioned as a team-focusing on their successes as well as areas that need improvement. If the group experiences a problem, members analyze the origin of the problem and propose courses of action to solve it. Goals for subsequent group work are set, preferably in writing, to guide and improve future learning. Teachers also provide students with feedback on the functioning of the groups. Together, students and their teachers build understanding about why groups function well and why they struggle and sometimes fail.

2.3 Types of Cooperative Learning

There are three common types of cooperative learning. They are discussed herby;

2.3.1 Formal Cooperative Learning

Formal cooperative learning is the type of cooperative learning in which the students in a group are working together for one class period to several weeks, to achieve shared learning goals and complete jointly specific tasks and assignments (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 2008). It is structured, facilitated and monitored by the educator over time and is used to achieve group goals in task work (e.g. completing a unit). Any course material or assignment can be adapted to this type of learning and groups can vary from 2-6 people with discussion lasting from a few minutes up to an entire period.

2.3.2 Informal Cooperative Learning

Informal cooperative learning group are those groups which are often temporary and can change from lesson to lesson. It consists of having students work together to achieve a joint learning goal in temporary ,adhoc groups that last from a few minutes to one class period (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec,2008).Informal cooperative learning incorporates group learning with passive teaching by drawing attention to material through small groups throughout the lesson or by discussion at the end of a lesson and typically involves groups of two.

During a lecture demonstration or film, informal cooperative learning can be used to focus students attention on the material to be learned, set a mood conducive to learning, helps set expectations as to what will be covered in a class session, ensure that students cognitively process and rehearse the material being taught, summarize what was learned and present in the next session, and provide closure to an instructional session. Teacher's role for using informal cooperative learning to keep students more actively engaged intellectually entails having focused discussions before and after the lesson and interspersing pair discussions throughout the lesson.

2.3.3 Cooperative Base groups

Cooperative base groups are long-term, heterogeneous cooperative learning groups with stable membership (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 2008). Members primary responsibilities are to a) ensure all members are making good academic progress b) hold each other accountable for striving to learn and c) provide each other with support, encouragement and assistance in completing assignments. In order to ensure the base groups function effectively, periodically teachers should teach needed social skills and have the group's process how effectively they are functioning. Typically cooperative base groups are heterogeneous in membership, meet regularly and last for the duration of the class or preferably for several years.

Cooperative base group is effective for learning complex subject matter over the course or semester and establishes caring supportive peer relationships, which in turn motivates and strengthens the students' commitment to the group's education while increasing self-esteem and self-worth. Base group approaches make the students accountable to educating their peer group in the event that a member was absent for a lesson. This is effective both for individual learning, as well as social support.

2.4 Commonly Used Cooperative Learning Methods

There are many different forms of cooperative learning. But all forms make students to be in a group and learn from one another and help each other (Robert Slavin). Cooperative learning methods fall into two main categories.

2.4.1 Structured Team Learning

Structured team learning which involves rewards to teams based on the learning progress of their members and they are also characterized by individual accountability, which means that team success depends on individual learning not group product. Cooperative learning methods which are categorized under structured team learning are;

2.4.1.1 Student Team Learning

Student team learning techniques were developed and researched at Johnson Hopkins University. All cooperative learning methods share the idea that students work together to learn and are responsible for one another's learning as well as their own. Student team learning methods, in addition to this idea, emphasize the use of team goals and team success which can only be achieved if all members' of the team learn the objectives being taught. That is, in student team learning the students' task is not to do something as a team but to learn something as a team.

Three concepts are central to all student team learning methods; team rewards, individual accountability and equal opportunities for success using student team learning techniques teams earn certificates or rewards if they achieve above a designated criterion. The teams are not in competition to earn scarce rewards all (or none) of the teams may achieve the criterion in a given week. Individual accountability means that the team's success depends on the individual learning of all team members. This focuses on the activity of the team members on explaining concepts to one another and making sure that everyone on the team is ready for a quiz or other assessment that they will take without teammate help. Equal opportunities for success mean that students contribute to their teams by improving over their own past performances. This ensures that high, average and low achievers are equally challenged to do their best and that the contributions of all team members will be valued.

2.4.1.2 Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD)

In STAD students are assigned to four member learning teams mixed in performance level, sex and ethnicity. The teacher presents a lesson and then students work with in their teams to make sure that all team members have mastered the lesson. Finally, all students take individual quizzes on the material at which time they may not help one another.

Students' quiz scores are compared to their own past averages, and points are awarded based on the degree to which students can meet or exceed their own earlier performances. These points are then summed to form team scores, and teams that meet certain criteria earn certificates or other rewards .The whole cycle of activities from teacher presentation to team practice to quiz, usually takes three to five class periods.

STAD has been used in a wide variety of subjects, from mathematics to language arts and social studies. Student team achievement is most appropriate for teaching well-defined objectives with single right answers (Slavin, 1978, 1986).

2.4.1.3 Teams Games Tournament (TGT)

Teams-Games tournament was the first of the John Hopkins cooperative learning methods. It uses the same teacher presentations and teamwork as in STAD, but replaces the quizzes with weekly tournaments. In these students compete with members of other teams to contribute points to their team scores. Students compete at three person tournament tables against others with similar past records in mathematics. A bumping procedure changes table assignments to keep the competition fair. The winner at each tournament table brings the same number of points to his /her team, regardless of which table it is.

2.4.1.4 Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI)

Team accelerated instruction shares with STAD and the other student team learning methods, the use of four member mixed ability learning teams and certificates for high- performing teams. But where STAD uses a single pace of instruction for the class,TAI combines cooperative learning with individualized instruction. TAI is designed to teach mathematics.

In TAI, students enter an individualized sequence according to a placement test and then proceed at their own rates. In general, team members work on different units. Teammates check each other's work against answer sheets and help one another with any problems. Final unit tests taken without teammates help and are scored by student monitors. Each week , teachers total the number of units completed by all team members and give certificates or other team rewards to teams that exceeds a criterion score based on the number of final tests passed ,with extra points for perfect papers and completed homework. Because students take responsibility for checking each other's work and managing the flow of materials, the teacher can spend most of the class time presenting lessons to small groups of students drawn from the various teams who are working at the same point in the mathematics sequence.TAI has many of the motivational dynamics of STAD and TGT. Students encourage and help one another to succeed. Individualaccountability is assured because the only score that counts is the final test scores and students take final tests without teammate help. Students have equal opportunities for success because all have been placed according to their level of prior knowledge. It is as easy for a low achievement to complete three long division units.

2.4.1.5 Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC)

Cooperative integrated reading and composition is the comprehensive program for teaching reading and writing in the upper elementary grades. As in the traditional reading programs in CIRC teachers use basal readers and reading groups. However, students are assigned to teams composed of pairs from two different reading groups.

While the teacher is working with one reading group ,students in other groups are working in their pairs on a series of cognitively engaging activities, including reading to one another; making predictions about how narratives stories will come out ;summarizing stories to one another ;writing responses to stories and practicing spelling ,decoding and vocabulary. Students also work in teams to master main idea and other comprehension skills. Lessons on writing skills such as description, organization use of vivid modifiers and on language mechanics skill are fully integrated into students’ creative writing. In most CIRC activities students follow a sequence of teacher instruction, team practice, team pre- assessments and quiz. Students do not take the quiz until their teammates have determined that they are ready. Team rewards are certificates given to teams based on the average performance of all team members on all reading and writing activities .Because students work on materials appropriate to their reading levels. They have equal opportunity for success .Students contributions to their teams are based on their quiz scores and final independently written compositions which ensures individual accountability (Robert Slavin, 1994).

2.4.2 Informal Group Learning Methods

The second set is – informal group learning methods which covers methods more focused on social dynamics, projects and discussion than on mastery of well specified content. The most commonly known informal group learning methods of cooperative learning are the following;

2.4.2.1 Learning Together

Learning together is the informal group learning cooperative learning method which was developed by David Johnson and Rodger Johnson at the University of Minnesota. The method involves students working on assignment sheets in four or five member heterogeneous groups. The groups hand in a single sheet and receive praise and rewards based on the group product. The method emphasize on a team building activities before students begin working together and regular discussions with in groups about how well they are working together.

2.4.2.2 Jigsaw

Jigsaw was originally designed by Elliot Aronson and his colleagues (1978). In Aronson's jigsaw method, students are assigned to six –member teams to work on academic material that has been broken down into sections. For example, a biography might be divided into early life, first accomplishments, major setbacks, later life and impact on history. Each team member reads his or section. Next, members of different teams who have studied the same sections meet in “expert groups” to discuss their sections. Then the student return to their teams and take turns teaching their teammates about their sections. Since the only way students can learn sections other than their own is to listen carefully to their teammates, they are motivated to support and show interest in one another's work.

In 1986 Slavin has developed the modification of jigsaw at John Hopkins University. This method is called jigsaw II, in which students of four or five members work together. Instead of each student being assigned a particular section of text, all students read a common narrative, such as a book chapter, a short story, or biography. However, each student receives a topic, on which to become an expert.

Students with the same topics meet in expert groups to discuss them, after which they return to their teams to teach what they have learned to their teammates. Then students take individual quizzes, which result in team score based on the improvement score system of STAD. Team that meet preset standards earn certificates. Jigsaw is primarily used in social studies and other subjects in which learning from text books are important. It is appropriate in subjects in which concepts rather than skills are the learning goals (Slavin 1994).

2.4.2.3 Numbered Heads Together

Number heads together is an engaging structure that promotes mastery of a declarative or procedural knowledge. It is effectively used for review before a test or quiz. Before instruction begins the teacher develops the question he/she will use and plans for how he/she wants students to respond. Then each team has own their own number ranging from 1 to 4. The teacher then poses a question and informs the teams how much time is available to answer. At each table the team members put their heads together discuss and decide on their answer. Each team member must be able to give and explain the teams answer because no one knows who will be called on to respond. When the time limit for answering is reached, the teacher calls time and team discussions stop. The teacher then randomly selects a number from one to four. The students with the called number will respond to the question when asking questions requiring demonstration of procedural knowledge, such as completing a mathematics problem it is wise to add a "write" step after the teacher poses the question and before the teammates put their heads together. This ensures that each individual is engaging in the process being assessed and reduces the opportunity for hitch hikers.

2.5 Benefits of Cooperative Learning

Benefits of cooperative learning are enhanced student achievement i.e. deeper learning and improved retention, higher order thinking skills improved teamwork skills, learning how to learn, learning independence and interdependence (shared responsibility for learning) self-direction, self-confidence, self-esteem shared decision making skills and improved knowledge transfer skills. Additionally, cooperative learning blends individual strengths and a weakness into strong fabric for learning simulates the "real work world" shifts teacher and students roles and allows for extended project assignments. The instructor becomes a learning coach and students must take individual and collective responsibility for their own learning and must demonstrate that learning.

2.5.1 The Benefits of Cooperative Language Learning

Cooperative language learning has gained broad acceptance in many language learning, since it contributes in improving productivity and achievement and providing more opportunities for communication. Cooperative learning has many benefits for language learning (Yanzhang, 2010). Some of them are;

A. Providing the Chances of Input and Output

Cooperative language learning provides much more opportunities for learners to comprehensible input and output and the process of negotiation. As cited by Yanzhang, 2010, Ji'a 2003 states that effective language learning depends on structuring social interaction to maximize the needs of communication in the target language. For instance students divided into six groups in a class can get six times as many opportunities to talk as in full –class organization. Cooperative language learning creates natural, interactive contexts, where students listen to each other, ask question and clarify issues. Group interaction assists learners in negotiating for more comprehensible input and in modifying their output to make it more comprehensible to others (Crandall, 1999; Kagan, 1995).

In cooperative group setting, when communicating in group work, students need to make them understood so they adjust their language to suit the members of that group. As a result, there is much higher proportion of comprehensible input. In cooperative learning students will speak in different way on the same topic, ensuring students to listen to and comprehend language from various sources and to obtain modeling and feedback from their peers. There is a principle that interaction drives learners to produce more accurate and appropriate language which itself provides input for other students, therefore cooperative language learning is valuable in the oral practice and listening comprehension.

B. Creating Effective Climate

It is vital to establish a social and affective climate in which students are not restricted, aggressive, or feared in language classes, rather there should be place for individuals where they can practice communication (Stern 1991). Cooperative learning offers a relaxed climate in the classroom, while it also increases student motivation (Brown, 1994; Crandall, 1999), as cited in Yanzhang, 2010. Students have opportunity to rehearse their answers before being asked to offer them in front of the whole class so their anxiety and fear of failure may reduce. Time to think and receive feedback from group members, and the greater likelihood of success reduce anxiety and can result in increased participation in learning language.

Therefore, more participation will inevitably increase learners' self-confidence and self-esteem. Another effective benefit of cooperative learning is an increase in students' motivation. Motivation leads to more extensive use of language and the development of greater language proficiency. In the cooperative groups, face to face promotive interaction and resource, reward role interdependence can be powerful supports and encouragements for the insecure students. Learners are thus motivated to pursue larger academic success.

C. Increasing a Variety of Language Functions

Cooperative language learning allows learners more chances to produce language in a functional manner. In traditional classroom, discourse is usually initiated by the teacher in an artificial setting, but cooperative learning can be used to create a mimic real life social settings in which language is normally used. For specific purpose in accomplishing the group task, cooperative groups can be helpful to students in developing their social abilities. In cooperative learning students may find themselves involve in requesting clarifying, making suggestions, encouraging, disagreeing, negotiating of meaning, exchanging conversation during group work. Working in cooperative learning groups will foster learner discourse control and thereby ensures opportunities for language learning.

D. Fostering Learner Responsibility and Independence

The main aim of cooperative learning is to make each student a stronger individual through doing work cooperatively. It places responsibility for action and progress on each of the members of the group somewhat equally. Positive role and goal interdependence helps student become more autonomous and self-controlled and less dependent upon outside authority, and overtime they will gradually move from interdependence (Johnson and Johnson, 1991). Cooperative activities around the curricular content can provide more opportunities for use of the new items and lead to the development of both academic language and social language.

In addition, studies indicate that there are beneficial effects of cooperative learning in higher level reasoning. More frequent generation of new ideas and solutions, and greater transfer of what is learned within one situation to another than did competitive or individualistic learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1991). When appropriately implemented cooperative learning enhance students' achievement. The primary outcomes of cooperative learning are academic achievement, social relationships and self-esteem.

The other educational outcomes of cooperative learning are increased academic achievement, improved intergroup relations, improved self –esteem, higher level reasoning strategies and increased critical reasoning competencies, greater ability to view situations from others perspectives, greater intrinsic motivation, more positive attitudes towards teachers, principals and school personnel, less disruptive and more –on task behavior, greater collaborative skills and attitudes necessary for working with others, greater collaborative skills and attitudes necessary for working with others, greater feeling of individual control over ones success in school, increased altruism and supportive behaviors towards others, increased pro social behavior, improved skills at resolving conflicts and increased attendance(Putnam, 1997).

Dr, spencer Kagan (Kagan online magazine winter 1999) presents the following seventeen pros and cons of cooperative learning. The pros of cooperative learning are;

1. **Academic achievement;** over 500 research studies back the conclusion that cooperative learning produces gains across all content areas, all grade levels and among all types of students including special needs, high achieving, gifted urban, rural and all ethnic and racial groups. In terms of consistency of positive outcomes cooperative learning remains the strongest researched educational innovation ever with regard to producing achievement gains.
2. **Ethnic /race relations;**not as many studies here, but the effect sizes are even greater and more consistent than with academic achievement. Heterogeneous cooperative teams are the single most effective tool we as educators and we as a nation have to transform race relations in positive ways. In classrooms without cooperative learning, there is increasing polarization along race lines overtime. In classrooms with cooperative learning, there is increasing cross- race friendships and mutual understanding.
3. **Self –esteem;** students in cooperative teams increase in feelings social and academic esteem. These increases in self-esteem are realistic as the students in fact do better academically and are accepted more by their peers.
4. **Empathy;** students in cooperative learning teams increase in feelings social and academic esteem. These increases in self-esteem are realistic as the students in fact do better academically and are accepted more by their peers.
5. **Social skills;** cooperative learning increases a long list of social skills, including listening ,taking turns, conflict resolution skills, leadership skills and teamwork skills. Students coming from cooperative learning classrooms are more polite and considerate of others.
6. **Social relations;**students in classrooms in which there is cooperative learning feel accepted, liked and cared for.Again, these feelings are realistic in fact cooperative results in more mutual acceptance and caring among students. They have more friends.
7. **Class climate;** cooperative learning leads to increased liking for schools, class, academic, contentandthe teacher.

8. **Responsibility;** cooperative learning is related with enhanced internal sense of control. Students feel more like origins than pawns. They take more initiative and feel more responsible for the outcomes they receive. They feel more effective. Their increased sense of efficacy is realistic because in cooperative learning they make more choices and have more input into what and how to study what they do make a difference.
9. **Diversity skills;** as a result of working in heterogeneous cooperative teams, students learn to understand and work with others who differ from themselves. These skills are essential for the 21st century as we are becoming more and more diverse.
10. **Higher level thinking skills;** one of the main roads to higher level thinking is interaction with points of view different from one's own. Each of us carries our own set of information and way of interpreting that information. We tend to persist in our own way of interpreting that information. We tend to persist in our own way of thinking until we are challenged by interacting with someone with different information and/or a different way of interpreting the information. At that point we are pushed to higher level synthesis, interaction in heterogeneous teams, therefore creates higher level thinking.
11. **Individual accountability;** in traditional classroom a student can dream, knowing they will not be held accountable if only they don't raise their hand to be called on. In cooperative learning team there is not the luxury to slip through the cracks. As we do a Round robin for example each student in turn is held accountable to make a contribution.
12. **Equal participation;** volunteer participation leads to some always raising their hands, and others volunteering seldom or never. In cooperative learning structures there is not the luxury to slip through the cracks, making participation more equal.

13. **Increased participation;** if we call on students one at a time even if we said nothing and transitions were done in no time in a class of 30 it would take 30 minutes to give each student one minute to share his or her point of view. In pairs the same amount of participation can be accomplished in two minute! Overall, therefore students in cooperative learning are engaged a far higher percent of the time.
14. **Social orientation;** in the traditional classrooms students see each other as an obstacle. They know there are a limited number of top grades, and the success of another decreases their own probabilities of success. In cooperative learning students know the success of a team mate (mastering the material, for example) will increase the probability of their own success. They begin to see others as someone to work with rather someone to beat.
15. **Learning orientation;** too often students in traditional classrooms do their assignments for a grade. In cooperative learning they more often do their work for the joy of working with others, accomplishing a challenging goal and being of worth to their teammates and classmates.
16. **Self-knowledge and self –realization;** students in interaction with others learn about themselves. If I am dominant, shy, rude or overly- helpful. I do not discover that until interact with and get feedback from others. This self-knowledge leads to change and growth so I am more likely to realize my potential. Alone in an important sense, we are stuck, in interaction we grow.
17. **Work place skills ;** students learn how to work in teams, preparing them for the interdependence learn –based work place of the 21st century in which increased technology and complexity demands increasing use of interdependent teams.

2.6 Teachers Perception to CL

According to Lindsey and Norman (1977), perception is the process by which organisms interpret and organize sensation to reduce meaningful experiences of the world. Sensation refers to the result of stimulation of sensory receptors in the eyes, ears, nose, tongue or skin .perception on the other hand describes one's ultimate experiences of the world and typically involves further processing of sensory input. Thus perception in humans describes the process whereby sensory stimulation is translated into organized experiences. That experience is the joint product of the stimulation and the process itself. Also, perception can be defined as a process by which people translate sensory impressions into coherent and unified view of the world around them ([http. www.business dictionary.com](http://www.businessdictionary.com)). A large part of learning is accomplished through perception. In the first place we learn directly about things by observing them (wossen, 2011).

Teacher perception of differentiated instruction may assist in gaining information about teacher resistance to implementing the differentiated instructional approach. Difficulty lies in shifting from an area of comfort to an area of change in both belief and practice (Edward etal. 2006). Teacher resists adaptations when functioning under a specific pattern of behavior. Regardless of successive educational reforms and curriculum changes, teachers' attitude and beliefs remain the single strongest guiding influence on instruction (Gorsuch, 2000).

The research has done on perception shows that teachers' perception has paramount effect on students' achievement. E.oAdu, 2007 has conducted research on the teachers' perception of teaching as correlates of students' academic performance. The result shows the relationship between teachers' perceptions and students' performance is positive and significant that is, the perceptions of teachers have effect on students, performance. On the same paper Omah(2002) said that it is uncommon to discover that teachers are sabotaging the efforts of government via their perception and characters towards their profession , the result of which has adverse effect on the academic performance of the students. It is unanimously agreed that teachers' perception and attitude have remarkable effect on students' achievement.

On the other hand, within any single subject areas teachers' perception will influence a range of teaching skills, styles, models and approaches that comprise a teaching repertoire and this will provide a clear framework for describing the teaching activities.

Marina Bandera Alexo, 2003, has conducted research on perception of Brazilian teachers to CLT. The study reveals that teachers' awareness of CLT principles prevented them from properly creating and developing communicative activities. Due to the lack of training and understanding of CLT, Teachers couldn't deal with the complexity of classroom interactions prescribed by the communicative approach to language teaching. Adapting material's, dealing with classroom conditions and creating communicative activities were some of the problems teachers' encountered.

In addition teachers' awareness of CLT principles was also perceived as a constraint. Teachers failed to recognize their own misconceptions about CLT principles, thus preventing them from properly implementing communicative activities in the classroom.

2.7The Types of Instruction

Teachers structure lessons in every classroom in any subject area or age of students either collaboratively, competitively or individualistically. Teachers will select the instruction based on the objectives they have planned to present (David w. Johnson and Roger. T Johnson,1987). The three types of instruction are discussed as follows;

2.7.1 Competitive Learning

In competitive learning teachers structure lessons in which students work against each other to achieve a goal that only one or few students can attain. Students are graded on a curve, which requires them to work faster and more accurately than their peers. In competitive situation there is a negative interdependence among goal achievements; students perceive that they can obtain their goals if and only if the other students in the class fail to obtain their goals.

Thus, students seek an outcome that is personally beneficial but detrimental to the others with whom they are competitively linked.

When students try to outperform one another they are engaged in competition. In true competition, the goal is to be the best. So there are always winners and losers. Student performance is evaluated by comparison, as with normative evaluation, resulting in a range of outcomes from highest to lowest. It is expected that students will differ in their capacity to learn and perform, and that some will succeed more than others. Competition enables individuals to make comparison and identify their own strengths and weaknesses, to pin point specific errors, and ultimately to improve performance.

Competitive goal structure, results in an oppositional pattern of student –student interaction. Oppositional interaction is defined as individuals discouraging and obstructing each other's efforts to achieve. It promotes rejection of class mates' obstruction of each other's work avoidance of information exchange or communication, low achievement motivation psychological withdraw and avoidance.

The negative interdependence created by competitive goal structure results in students' having a vested interest in obstructing one another's learning. There are two ways to win a competition – to do better than anyone else from doing better than you. This is known as a good offense and a good defense. In a classroom, however, defending against classmates' learning more than you can create destructive interaction patterns that decrease learning for everyone (David Johnson and Roger Johnson, 1987, Joanne putnam1997).

2.7.2 Individualistic Learning/ Learning alone

Jonson calls individualistic learning whereas Putnam calls learning alone. So individualistic learning is a learning situation in which students work by themselves to accomplish learning goals unrelated to those of the other students. Individual goals are assigned each day, students' efforts are evaluated on a fixed set of standards, and rewards are given accordingly. Each student has a set of materials and works at his or her own speed, ignoring the progress of other students in the class. In individualistic learning situations students' goal achievement are independent; students perceive that the achievement of their learning goal is unrelated to what other students do.

Whether or not students accomplishes the goal has no influence on whether other students achieve their goals in an individualistic learning situation. Thus a student seeks an outcome that is personally beneficial and ignores as irrelevant to the goal achievement of other students.

When students learn alone the teachers role is primarily to help the students understand the assignment and plan the activity, and then to provide feedback and performance evaluation when the task is completed. Individualistic learning in schools requires that the teachers and students interact, although minimally, when the teacher explains the assignment or activity and when feedback is given occasionally, teachers and students communicate during the task, if the students need assistance.

Learning alone doesn't involve other students'; the focus is on achieving independently. Consequently, in individualistic learning situations no opportunity exists for learning or practicing social and collaborative skills, such as communication skills or leadership skills. Teachers should provide opportunities for students to read, write, create and reflect by themselves.

The classroom atmosphere supportive of such activities should be reasonably quiet and calm, enabling students to think without great distraction. Other areas of the school, such as libraries or learning centers, or the home environments can be havens for students seeking a refuge from the hustle and bustle of classrooms.

For the past half –century, competitive and individualistic goal structures have dominated American education. Students usually come to school with competitive expectations and pressures from their parents. Many teachers have tried to reduce classroom competition by switching from a norm –referenced to criteria- referenced evaluation system (David Johnson and Roger Johnson, 1987, Joanne putnam1997).

2.7.3 Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is a goal structure in which students work together to accomplish shared goals. Students are assigned to small groups and instructed to learn the assigned material and to make sure that the other members of the group learn the assigned material. Individual accountability can be checked randomly by selecting a paper from each group to grade. A criterion –referenced evaluation system is used.

In cooperative learning situations there is a positive interdependence among students' goal attainments; students perceive that they can reach their learning goals if and only if the other students in the group also reach their goals. Thus, students seek outcomes that are beneficial to all those with whom they are cooperatively linked. Students discuss the material with each other, help one another understand it, and encourage each other to work hard. Yet, if cooperative relationships are the only way students interact in school, they may never learn to compete appropriately for fun or have the opportunity to follow a learning trail on their own (David Johnson and Roger Johnson, 1987, Joanne putnam1997).

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

As mentioned above, the main purpose of this study was to investigate EFL teachers' perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning. Thus, this chapter describes the methods that were employed to achieve the research objective, the sources of data, the sample and sampling techniques used, instruments and procedures used in data collection and method of data analysis used in the study.

3.1 Research Methodology

The fundamental aim of the study was to investigate English language teachers' perception of cooperative learning and their classroom practice. Thus, in order to achieve this objective both qualitative and quantitative research design methods were employed. This method was used recognizing that all methods have their own limitations the researcher felt that biases related in any single method could cancel the biases of other methods. Since the researcher aims at describing the teachers' perception and classroom practice descriptive survey method were used. The researcher believes this method might enable him to describe the current status of the issue under study.

3.2 Sources of Data

In conducting this research the sources of data were 20 EFL teachers who are teaching at Birhan Guzo and Kokeb Tsibah secondary schools. The schools were selected purposely as they can help the researcher to collect data easily since they are found in nearby school and can represent the sub city.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

The populations of the study are an English language teacher who teaches in Birhan Guzo and Kokebe Tsibah secondary government schools in Yeka sub city. There are six secondary government schools in Yeka sub city.

The schools are selected as sample purposely as they can be the representatives of the sub city. It accounts 33.3% of the total government schools which are found in the sub city. All EFL teachers teaching in the schools were included in the study. According to Cohen and Manion(1994), the nature of the population and purpose of the study determines the sample size.

Thus, the nature of the population is attributed to homogeneous group and the purpose is limited to EFL teachers teaching in two schools. So, it is believed that the existing sample is sufficient for the study.

3.4 Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection

In order to gather the necessary data three instruments were employed by the researcher.

These were questionnaire, interview and observation. Each of them was discussed as follows;

3.4.1 Questionnaire

Selinger and Shohamy(1989) noted that questionnaire is widely used in second language research to elicit information about certain conditions and practices; in particular it is used in collecting data on phenomenon which are not easily observed such as perception and self-concept. It is also used to obtain background information about the research subject. With regard to questionnaire the researcher prepared close ended questionnaire. The technique was used to gather teachers' perception on cooperative learning and their classroom practice. The questionnaire was composed of 35 items of likert scale type. The first 18 items were intended to assess teachers' perception to cooperative learning with the rating from "1" strongly disagree to "5" strongly agree. The Second 17 items focuses on gathering data about the teachers' practice of cooperative learning in their classroom with rating from "1" never to "5" always to check the frequency of use of the activity.

The questionnaire has three parts. They are;

1. Personal information; which are used to provide accurate description of the participants.
2. Items used to assess teachers' perception to cooperative learning; designed to assess

Teachers' perception of cooperative learning principles and benefits.

3. Classroom practice; designed to assess the level of use of cooperative learning activities by the teachers in the classroom.

Before the researcher started collecting the necessary data he made face to face contact with the school principals. He introduced the purpose of the investigation, facilitating conditions for data collection activities and arranged time and place to come back for the activities. On the promising day, the researcher distributed the questionnaire for the teachers with the help of department heads by explaining the purpose of the study and date of submission of the questionnaire. After three days the researcher collected the filled questionnaires. Luckily, of 20 questionnaires distributed 19 questionnaires were returned.

3.4.1.1. Pilot testing

Before the main questionnaire was in use, piloting was made. Pilot testing is essential in development of instruments. One secondary school namely, MisrakGoh secondary school was chosen randomly to test the instrument in small scale to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. About 10 EFL teachers were selected randomly and the instrument was distributed. The researcher found valuable feedbacks which commented and suggested the weakness and strength of the instrument. With the help of the feedbacks given, the necessary improvements and modifications have been made and the instruments were prepared for the main study. Using cronbach alpha method the reliability of the measuring scale of the instrument was found 0.65. To validate the items, the researcher made discussion with educators who own MA degree in geography and environmental study and principal in one of the government school in Arada sub city, Addis Ababa, and one PHD candidate at Addis Ababa

University. Accordingly, certain items were discarded and modified based on the comments given by them. Thus, the result was found reliable to continue the next step and the questionnaire was administered.

3.4.2 Interview

The required data was gathered by an interview in addition to questionnaire. Interview is the verbal questioning that the researcher used to collect data. The information gathered from the respondent provides the insights into the nature of social reality. Interview is a necessary tool to understand deep feeling, perceptions values or the people interpret world around them. Since the main aim of this study is to investigate teachers' perception about cooperative learning, employing this technique was important to collect information about teachers' perception to cooperative learning and their classroom practice. The structured interview was used as it helps the researcher to guide the questions. Interview was carried out with four teachers two from each school. Before the interview was begin program was set with the selected teachers at the date of appointment the researcher carried out the interview. The interview session takes from 25-30 minutes. After the interview the interview data were analyzed qualitatively.

3.4.3 Classroom observation

Observation is the data collection instrument which is mostly employed to collect data which are not easily collected by other instruments. Because of the richness and credibility of information it can provide observation is desirable types of data collection instrument, Hancock (1998). According to Lewy (1977), as cited by Gebremedhin, observation is a useful instrument to indicate how classroom lesson is divided into varieties' of activities like role play, discussion problem solving, individual work and others. The observation was used to check whether teachers practiced the principles of cooperative learning or not. It also helps to cross check what they respond in the questionnaire and how the actual lesson going on in their classes. Since it was difficult to observe all the teachers in the schools the researcher conducted observation to four teachers teaching grade 9 and grade 10 in sample schools.

3.5 Data collection procedure

The data were collected using self-administered questionnaire, interview and classroom observation. The questionnaires were prepared in English. It was piloted and reviewed by different people before it was administered. The questionnaire data collection process was followed by interview. The researcher carried out interview with four EFL teachers. Finally following the interview classroom observation was carried by the researcher in order to make sure that all the data gained through the questionnaire and interview are true.

3.6 Method of data analysis

The data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively as the study was mixed. The data gathered by questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively. The teachers response under each item were tabulated under five rating scales that range from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1) for perception and always (5) to never (1) for classroom practice. Then the data were analyzed using descriptive statistics; frequency, percentage and mean. The analysis was made for each single item based on the sample teachers. For the sake of analysis the five point likert scales were condensed into three parts. These were: 1:00-2.49= low, 2.50-3.49 = medium and 3.5-5:00 = high. The, data which are gathered by interview and observation was analyzed qualitatively.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter mainly deals with the presentation and analysis of data collected by different instruments. The main objective of this study, as mentioned in chapter one was to investigate EFL teachers' perception of cooperative learning and their classroom practice. The data are discussed in the light of the objectives mentioned above. In this section of the study, the data which are collected by questionnaire, interview and observation are analyzed, presented and discussed. In general the chapter consists of presentation of the statistical results obtained from questionnaire, interview and classroom observation of the teachers.

4.1 Characteristics and Background Information of the Respondents

In this section, the summaries of the characteristics of the respondents are going to be discussed before discussing and presenting the data related to the major questions of the study. Because describing the general characteristics of the respondents might help to say something about their perception on cooperative learning and their classroom practices.

Table 1 frequency and percentage of the age of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
20-29	6	31.6	31.6	31.6
30-39	6	31.6	31.6	63.2
40-49	6	31.6	31.6	94.7
50 and above	1	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	19	100.0	100.0	

As can be seen from Table 1 above 31.6% of the respondent's age varies from 20-29, at the same time 31.6% of the respondents age varies from 30-39 additionally, 40-49 age group respondents accounts also 31.6% and 5.3% of the respondents are above 50 years old. So, this shows that the respondents' age proportion is almost equal. As it can be seen on the above Table the majority of the respondents are young teachers. This may be important for the implementation of CL.

Table.2Qualification of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
BA	17	89.5	89.5	89.5
MA	2	10.5	10.5	100.0
Total	19	100.0	100.0	

As can be seen from the Tables 2 above 17 of the respondents (89.5%) hold BA degree, but 2 of them (10.5%) have MA degree. As the qualification of most of the teachers' are BA degree this might have its own impact for the practices of best cooperative learning activities.

Table 3Total years of teaching experience of the respondents.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
5 and less than 5 years	6	31.6	31.6	31.6
6 - 10 years	4	21.1	21.1	52.6
11 - 20 years	4	21.1	21.1	73.7
more than 20 years	5	26.3	26.3	100.0
Total	19	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 above shows that 31.6 % of the respondents have 5 and less than 5 years of experience, 21.1% of the respondents have 6-10 years of teaching experience, and 26.3% of them have more than 20 years of teaching experience. The most of the teachers' who are included in the study are fresh graduates with teaching experience of 5 and less than 5 years. Certain activities which they exhibit shows that those teachers have better perception of cooperative learning as they are trained at university by this method.

Table.4 Teaching load per week of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
10 and less than 10	1	5.3	5.3	5.3
11 – 20	18	94.7	94.7	100.0
Total	19	100.0	100.0	

The above Table 4 shows that 94.7% of the respondents have 11-20 period load of teaching. This may help the teachers to create different additional teaching materials which will help them to practice cooperative learning. The teaching load that teachers have per week varies from 10-20 periods per week. This small teaching load might help them to plan better cooperative learning classes than other teachers with high teachingload.

Table .5Average number of students in one class

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	31 – 40	4	21.1	21.1
	41 – 50	12	63.2	84.2
	51 -60	3	15.8	100.0
	Total	19	100.0	100.0

Table 5 above depicts that the average number of students in the class ranges from 41-50 which is 63.2%. This number might help the teachers to practice cooperative learning activities easily in their classroom since the number is manageable.

4.1.2 Analysis of data obtained through questionnaire about teachers

perception to cooperative learning

In this part of the research the teachers' response about their perceptions of cooperative learning were calculated and presented. The questionnaire is presented in table form which consists of the options, responses infrequency, percentage and mean.

Table 6Frequency distribution of the teachers' perception of cooperative learning

R01	Items	Strongly agree		Agree		undecided		disagree		Strongly disagree		Total	Mean
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	
1	Communicative language teaching is the best approach to language teaching.	6	31.6	9	47.7	4	21.1	0	0	0	0	19	4.1
2	Cooperative learning is exactly the same with group work.	5	26.3	9	47.7	2	10.5	1	5.3	2	10.5	19	3.74
3	Cooperative learning minimizes the occurrences of unpleasant situation and maximize the learning and learning satisfaction	2	10.5	3	15.8	7	36.8	7	36.8	0	0	19	3.00
4	By increasing the amount of students talking time, cooperative learning can develop communicative competence	3	15.8	5	26.3	5	26.3	6	31.6	0	0	19	3.26

5	The main role of teacher in cooperative classes is facilitating learning and empowering students to learn.	0	0	11	57.9	8	42.1	0	0	0	0	19	3.58
6	Cooperative learning approach makes learners to be responsible for their learning and their peers.	2	10.5	4	21.1	7	36.8	6	31.6	0	0	19	3.12
7	Cooperative learning increases students' motivation.	1	5.3	10	52.6	5	26.3	3	15.8	0	0	19	3.47
8	In cooperative learning, learners learn from one another, learn the content at a deeper level and feel better about themselves and their interactions 'with their peers.	2	10.5	6	31.6	7	36.7	4	21.1	0	0	19	3.32
9	In cooperative learning, learners learn valuable social skills such as resolving conflict, solving problems and critical thinking.	3	15.8	7	36.7	4	21.1	5	26.3	0	0	19	3.42
10	Formal cooperative learning group is type of cooperative learning which lasts for several weeks.	0	0	4	21.1	10	52.6	5	26.3	0	0	19	2.95

11	Informal cooperative learning group is type of cooperative learning which can be changed from lesson to lesson.	1	5.3	6	31.6	9	47.4	3	15.8	0	0	19	3.26
12	Cooperative base group is long -term cooperative learning group with stable membership.	0	0	3	15.8	11	57.9	5	26.3	0	0	19	2.89
13	When compared with Competitive and individualistic learning cooperative learning promotes higher levels of self -esteem.	2	10.5	10	52.6	3	15.8	4	21.1	0	0	19	3.53
14	I have understood cooperative learning and i can implement it successfully.	4	21.1	7	36.8	7	36.8	1	5.3	0	0	19	3.74
15	The costs for implementing cooperative learning are great.	6	31.6	4	21.1	2	10.5	6	31.6	1	5.3	19	3.42
16	Cooperative learning holds fast learners back.	4	21.1	7	36.8	3	15.8	4	21.1	1	5.3	19	3.47
17	Cooperative learning increases students' academic achievement.	2	10.5	4	21.1	9	47.37	4	21.1	0	0	19	3.21
18	Cooperative learning fosters equal participation in the classroom.	4	21.1	8	42.1	4	21.1	2	10.5	1	5.3	19	3.63
	Average Total	5.5	28.93	6	31.59	5	26.32	2.22	11.71	0.28	1.47	19	3.22

As can be seen from Table 6 above, with regard to the issue of communicative language teaching is the best approach to language teaching.” 31.6% of the respondents strongly agree, 47.7% agree. However, 21.1% of them do not decide whether communicative language teaching is the best approach. When this is described in terms of mean, the mean value of the responses for this item is 4.1, which is the highest value. The majority of the respondents’ (47.7%) perceive communicative language teaching as the best approach to language teaching. As cooperative learning is part of communicative language teaching we can conclude that they accept CL as the best method for language teaching.

In item 2 which deal with “cooperative learning is exactly the same with group work.” 26.3%, 47.7% of the respondents strongly agree and agree respectively. But 10.5% of the respondents are undecided, 5.3% disagree and 10.5% of them are strongly disagreeing with the issue. When we describe this item in terms of mean, the mean value of the item is 3.74 .As the item is unfavorable item /item which is not directly related with cooperative learning, unlike the other items highest percentage to agree and mean value doesn’t show the teachers’ high perception rather teachers’ low perception. For item number 3, the mean value is 3.00.10.5% of the respondents strongly agree that cooperative learning minimizes the occurrence of unpleasant situation and 15.8% of the teachers are agreed with the idea. But 36.8% respondents are undecided and disagree.

For item number 4, teachers’ response shows that 15.8% of them strongly agree, 26.3% of them agree with the ideas. But, 26.3% of the respondents are undecided and 31.6% are disagreeing with the idea. When we see the mean value of the item, its’ mean value is 3.26. Regarding the teachers’ role in cooperative learning 57.9% of the respondents agree as the teachers’ main role in cooperative learning is facilitating learning, empowering students to learn and 42.1% of them are undecided with the idea. When we describe the item by mean, the mean value of the item is 3.58.

Item number 6 says “cooperative learning approach makes learners to be responsible for their learning and peers.” It was not widely supported by the teachers. As can be seen in the 4.2.1 the mean value of their responses is 3.12. 10.5% of the teachers’ said that they strongly agree, 21.1% agree with the idea. However, 31.6% disagree and 36.8% of them are undecided with the idea. For item number 7 the mean value of the response is 3.47. 5.3% of the respondents strongly agree upon the issue, 52.6% of them agrees. However, 26.3% of the teachers are undecided about the idea and 15.8% of them disagree as cooperative learning increases students’ motivation.

Teachers’ response for item number 8 on Table 6 above shows that 10.5% of the respondents strongly agree, 31.6% agreed that learners can learn from one another, learn the content at deeper level and feel better about themselves and their interactions with their peers. However, 36.7% of the respondents are undecided about the issue and 21.15% of them disagree with the idea. The mean value of the item is 3.32. Item number 9 says “in cooperative learning learners learn valuable social skills such as resolving conflict, solving problems and critical thinking”. 15.8% of the respondents strongly agree and 36.7% of them agree. However, 21.1% of them are undecided about the issue and 26.3% of them disagree. The mean value of the item is 3.42.

Item number 10 is about formal cooperative learning, 21.1% of the respondents strongly agree with the definition of formal cooperative learning. But 52.6% of them are undecided and 26.3% of them disagree. The mean value of the item is 2.95. In response to item number 11, which deals with, “informal cooperative learning group is type of cooperative learning which can be changed from lesson to lesson. 15.8% and 31.6% of the respondents showed their strong agreement and agreement respectively. However, 47.4% and 15.8% of the respondents are undecided and disagree about the item respectively. When we describe by their mean, the mean value of the item is 3.26. This means that the majority of the teachers’ have no clear idea about informal cooperative learning. When we see the response of the teachers for item number 12, 15.8% of the respondents agree. But, 57.9% of them are undecided and 26.3% of the teachers’ disagree about the idea. The mean value of the item is 2.89.

Item number 13, which deals with the comparison with competitive and individualistic learning, cooperative learning promotes higher levels of self-esteem. 10.5% of the respondents are strongly agreed, 52.6% of them agree with the idea. But 15.8% of the teachers are undecided, 21.1% of them disagree as cooperative learning promotes higher levels of self-esteem. The mean value of the item is 3.53.

When we see the teachers' response for item number 14, which is about whether teachers' understood cooperative learning and implement it successfully. 21.1% of them strongly agree, 36.8% agree. However, 36.8% of the respondents are undecided and 5.3% disagrees. To describe in terms of mean, the mean value of the item is 3.74.

In response to item number 15, which deals with the costs for implementing cooperative learning is great 31.6% of the respondents strongly agree, 21.1% agree. However, 10.5% of the teachers are undecided 31.6% disagree and 5.3% strongly disagree. When we describe the item by mean, its' mean value is 3.42. Unlike other items high mean value for the item doesn't show teachers' high perception about the issue. It is vice versa, since the item is unfavorable /not directly related with cooperative learning. In response to item number 16 which deals with cooperative learning holds fast learners back, 21.1% of the respondents strongly agree, 36.8% of them agree. However, 15.8% of them are undecided, 21.1% of the respondents disagree and 5.3% strongly disagree. The mean value of the item is 3.47% .this item is similar with item number 15/unfavorable item. For item number 17, 31.6% of the respondents strongly agree, 21.1% of them agree. But, 37.8% of the respondents are undecided and 10.5% of the teachers disagree. The mean value of the item is 3.74. In response to item number 18, which deals with cooperative learning, fosters equal participation in the classroom 21.1% of the respondents strongly agree, 42.1% of them agree. However 21.1% of the respondents are undecided, 10.5% disagree, and 5.3% strongly disagrees.

Generally, concerning teachers' perception to cooperative learning, the teachers' responses demonstrate that the average mean value of their response is 3.22; and this implies that the

majority of the respondent teachers 63.16% have average perception of cooperative learning in language teaching. This shows that the teachers' perception of cooperative learning is average.

4.1.3 Analysis and interpretation of the teachers' classroom practice of cooperative learning

In this part of the paper the data which are collected by the questionnaire about teachers' classroom practice of cooperative learning are going to be presented using table. The table consists of the frequency, percentage and mean value of each item in the questionnaire.

Table 7 Frequency distribution and percentage of the teachers' classroom practice

Ro l.n	Items/activities	Cases													
		Always		Usually		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Total			
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	Mean	
1	I make my classroom attractive by encouraging my students to be in group and discuss.	2	10.5	5	26.3	7	36.8	5	26.3	0	0	19	100.0%	3.21	
2	I give time for activities which help my students to sharpen their interpersonal skills.	1	5.3	6	31.6	7	36.8	5	26.3	0	0	19	100.0%	3.16	
3	I advise my students to support and encourage each other, listen carefully to the ideas of others.	0	0	4	21.1	7	36.8	8	42.1	0	0	19	100.0%	2.79	
4	I use group/pair work assignments.	2	10.5	5	26.3	8	42.1	4	21.1	0	0	19	100.0%	3.26	
5	I give detailed instruction to my students.	6	31.6	7	36.8	4	21.1	2	10.5	0	0	19	100.0%	3.89	
6	I make students to share responsibility among their group mates.	0	0	4	21.1	9	47.4	6	31.6	0	0	19	100.0%	2.89	

7	I encourage my students to use the target language /English while working in group/pair work.	5	26.3	6	31.6	6	31.6	2	10.5	0	0	19	100.0 %	2.78
8	I provide useful words, phrase and patterns related to the task to get students attention.	3	15.8	3	15.8	6	31.6	7	36.8	0	0	19	100.0 %	3.1
9	I provide an orientation about team work and explain the advantages of cooperative learning.	1	5.3	4	21.1	6	31.6	3	15.8	5	26.3	19	100.0 %	3.1
10	I constructively critique the initial work of my students, to provoke critical thinking.	3	15.8	6	31.6	7	36.8	3	15.8	0	0	19	100.0 %	3.47
11	I make students to evaluate each other's work and give constructive feedback to each other.	4	21.1	3	15.8	9	47.4	3	15.8	0	0	19	100.0 %	3.42
12	I in force students to contribute ideas during pair/group work.	2	10.5	6	31.6	4	21.1	7	36.8	0	0	19	100.0 %	3.15
13	I involve students in role play, simulation or kind of drama.	5	26.3	1	5.3	7	36.8	6	31.6	0	0	19	100.0 %	3.26
14	I engage students in conversation and discussion on some debatable issues.	3	15.8	2	10.5	8	42.1	5	26.3	1	5.3	19	100.0 %	3.05
15	I use formal cooperative learning group.	2	10.5	4	21.1	5	26.3	5	26.3	3	15.8	19	100.0 %	2.84
16	I implement informal cooperative learning group			2	10.5	7	36.8	6	31.6	4	21.1	19	100.0 %	1.58
17	I use base group cooperative learning groups in my classroom.	1	5.3	3	15.8	4	21.1	7	36.8	4	21.1	19	100.0 %	2.47

Average Total F&%											19	100.0 %	2.71
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	------------	------

The above Table 7 shows the frequency and the mean values of the activities practiced by the teachers in their classroom. According to the data obtained from the teachers under the study 10.5% of them said they make the classroom attractive by encouraging students to be in group and discuss always, 26.3% usually, 36.8% sometimes and 26.3% uses the activity rarely in the EFL classes. The mean value 3.21 of the responses indicates that this activity is used sometimes in the classroom. Regarding item number 2, 5.3% of the teachers' give time for activities which help students to sharpen their Interpersonal skills; 31.6% usually, 36.8% sometimes and 26.3% of the respondents use this activity rarely. The mean value, which is 3.16 shows that teachers' use this activity some times. When we see the teachers' response for item number 3, 21.1% of the teachers' advise their students to support each other and encourage each other, listen carefully to the ideas of others' usually, 36.8% of them sometimes and 42.1% of them advise and encourage students to listen to each other and listen carefully to ideas rarely. The mean value 2.79 of the responses shows that this activity is used sometimes in the classroom. 10.5%, of the teachers give group/pair work assignments to the students always, 26.3% of them usually, 42.1% sometimes and 21.1% of them said that they give group/pair work assignments rarely. The mean value 3.26 of the respondents indicates that this activity is used sometimes. Teachers' response for item number 5 shows that 31.6% of them give detailed instruction to students always, 36.8% of the teachers give detailed instruction usually, 21.1% of them some times and 10.5% of the teachers use the activity rarely. The mean value 3.89 of the responses indicates that teachers give detailed instruction to students in EFL classes usually. On the other hand 21.1% of the respondents make their students to share responsibility among their group mates usually, 47.4% sometimes and 31.6% rarely. The mean value of the responses is 2.89. The above Table 8 shows that 26.3% of the teachers' encourage students to use the target language while working in group/pair work always, 31.6% usually and sometimes. But 10.5% of them use the activity rarely. The mean value 2.78 of the responses indicates that teachers use the activity sometimes in EFL classes.

Similarly, the results of item number 8(I provide useful words, phrases and patterns related to the task to get students attention), shows that 15.8% of the respondents use the activity always and usually, 31.6% respondents use sometimes and 36.8% rarely. The mean value 3.1 of the responses indicates that teachers give useful words, phrases and patterns to the students in their EFL classroom.

Teachers' responses for item number 9 shows that ,5.3% of the respondents provide orientation about team work and explain the advantages of cooperative learning always, 21.1% usually ,31.6% sometimes. However, 15.8% of them use the activity rarely and 26.3% never use the activity. The mean value 3.1 of the responses show that teachers' provide an orientation about team work and explain the advantages of cooperative learning to their students sometimes. 15.8% of the respondents provide constructive critique to the initial work of students, to provoke critical thinking always, 31.6% usually. However, 36.8% of the teachers use the activity sometimes and 15.8% of them rarely.

The mean value 3.47 of the responses indicates that the teachers use the activity sometimes in their classroom. At the same time, 21.1% of the teachers make students to evaluate each other's' work and give constructive feedback to each other always, and 15.8% of them usually. However, 47.4% of the respondents use the activity sometimes, and 15.8% of them rarely. The mean value 3.42 of the responses shows that the teachers use the activity some times. On the other hand 10.5% of the teachers enforce the students to contribute ideas during pair/group work always, 31.6% usually, 21.1% sometimes and 36.8%of the respondents use the activities rarely. The mean value of the response is 3.15. Regarding, involving students in role play, simulation or drama, 26.3% of the teachers always involve students in such kinds of activities, 5.3% usually, 36.8% sometimes and 31.6% rarely. The mean value 3.26 of the responses indicates that teachers use the activity sometimes.15.8% of the respondents said that they engage students in conversation and discussion on some debatable issues always, 10.5% usually, 42.1% sometimes, 26.3% rarely and 5.3% does not engage students in the activity.

The mean value 3.05 of the responses shows that teachers use the activity sometimes. 10.5% of the respondents use formal cooperative learning group always, 21.1% usually, 26.3% sometimes and 15.8% of them never use formal cooperative learning group in their classroom. The mean value 2.84 of the responses indicates that teachers use the activity sometimes. Whereas, 10.5% of the teachers implement informal cooperative learning group usually, 36.8% sometimes, 31.6 rarely and 21.1% of them never use informal cooperative learning group in their classroom.

The mean value 1.58 of the responses indicates that teachers use the informal cooperative learning group rarely. At the same time 5.3% of the respondents said that they use base group cooperative learning groups in their classroom always, 15.8% usually, 21.1% sometimes. But, 36.8% of the teachers use the activity rarely, 21.1% of them never use the activity in their classroom. The mean value 2.47 of the responses shows that teachers use the activity rarely

Generally, the results obtained from the teachers' response for the classroom practice imply that most teachers tend to favor employing non-cooperative learning methods of EFL teaching. The grand mean value of their response is 2.7; and this implies that the majority of the respondent teachers practice cooperative learning method sometimes in their classroom.

4.2 Analysis and interpretation of data obtained through teachers interview.

In this part of the study, the researcher have attempted to present the data which are gathered from the teachers' about their perception and practice on cooperative learning in EFL classes using interview. The data which are gathered by interview are going to be analyzed and presented hereby;

To begin with, the researcher raised the question whether they have taken any training either, short-term training /on job training or at universities and colleges. Most of the respondents do not take any training on cooperative learning. But one of the respondent said that he has got training about cooperative learning when he was at university. He emphasized also as the training has helped him to teach his students to work with each other as a team and advised them to develop their leadership skills. In general, regarding the training most of the teachers does not take any training .so; this makes the practice of cooperative learning difficult.

Item two; how do you perceive cooperative learning?

Concerning the teachers' perception of cooperative learning. Almost all of the teachers have perceived cooperative learning positively. They agree as cooperative learning is a good method. They felt that cooperative learning helps slow learners to learn from the fast learners, it motivates the students to learn from each other and help them develop their speaking skill. But it can be seen that the perception that the teachers have is not deep, it doesn't based on scientific base/. One of the respondents said that cooperative learning is similar with group/pair work, which is not correct.

Item three; which types of cooperative learning methods/types do you use most?

Concerning the above question, all the teachers explained that the type of cooperative learning methods/type used most are totally different. Their responses show that teachers do not know more about different types of cooperative learning. One of the respondents replied as he uses group work and pair work. The other teacher said I use mixed cooperative learning groups. Though, the question is about the three types of cooperative learning, their responses are totally different.

Item four; Do you think that cooperative learning is beneficial to students' academic and social skills development?

Concerning the above question all the teachers explained that cooperative learning is important for both academic and social skills development of the students. As the teachers stated, cooperative learning helps students to share experiences from each other. Generally, teachers said that cooperative learning is beneficial for the students' academic and social development. But to get the academic and social benefits of cooperative learning all stakeholders should work together some times students are unwilling to work in cooperative learning activities as it is intended to be.

Item five; To what extent do you use /implement cooperative learning like jigsaw, learning together, etc.?

Concerning the above question, most of the teachers were unable to describe the extent to which they use cooperative learning activities like jigsaw, learning together and etc. one of the respondent replied that it is difficult to describe the method for him. Generally, teachers felt difficulty for describing the method they use in their classroom.

4.3 Analysis and interpretation of data obtained through observation

Data which are gathered by observation are going to be discussed hereby; four teachers were observed, two from grade 9 and the rest from grade 10. Two teachers' from each school were observed.

School name **Birhanguzo** Teachers name **teacher 1**

No of students M **11** F **21** T **32** Date of observation **24th April**

Topic **reported speech** grade and section **10th 06**

Table 8 classroom observation checklist teacher 1

Rol. no	Activities	Availability on the task	
		Yes	No
1	More teacher oriented activities are observed.	✓	
2	The teacher encourages students to work in pair/group.		✓
3	Provide corrective feedback to students to stimulate concept formation.		✓
4	Are students practice the specified behaviors?		✓
5	Do students accept positive interdependence and individual accountability?		✓
6	The interaction among the students is high.		✓
7	The classroom situation is suitable for cooperative learning activities.	✓	
8	Classroom activities maximize cooperation activities like drama, debate, dialogue.		✓
9	Facilitating and monitoring class activities.	✓	
10	The availability of five CL principles in the classroom.		✓

☛The teacher write the question on the blackboard and make students to change the sentence into reported speech and write their response on the blackboard.

☛The teacher doesn't motivate students to discuss in group or pair.

☛The teacher himself is not motivated.

School name **Birhanguzo** Teachers name **teacher 2**

No of students M **13** F **17** T **30** Date of observation **25th April**

Topic **reading endangered animal** grade and section **9th 04**

Table 9 Classroom observation teacher two

Rol.no	Activities	Availability on the task	
		Yes	No
1	More teacher oriented activities are observed.	✓	
2	The teacher encourages students to work in pair/group.	✓	
3	Provide corrective feedback to students to stimulate concept formation	✓	
4	Are students practice the specified behaviors?		✓
5	Do students accept positive interdependence and individual accountability?		✓
6	The interaction among the students is high.		✓
7	Theclassroomsituation is suitable for cooperative learning activities.	✓	
8	Classroom activities maximize cooperation activities like drama, debate, dialogue.		✓
9	Facilitating and monitoring classroom activities.		✓
10	The availability of five CL principles in the classroom.		✓

- ☛ The teacher motivates the students to be in group and pair work activities.
- ☛ The students are unwilling to focus on the main topic of discussion
- ☛ The teacher was trying to make the classroom interactive by making students to be in group of four and let them to discuss on certain questions. However, the group discussion was ineffective, students were unwilling to discuss. Some students are using their mother tongue.
- ☛ Students are less motivated to be in group and share their ideas in the group.

Classroom observation check list 1

Background information

School name **kokebetsibah** Teachers name **teacher 3**

No of students M **25** F **21** T **46** Date of observation **17th April**

Topic **B10.3writing** grade and section **10th 02**

Table 10Classroom observation checklist teacher three

Rol.no	Activities	Availability on the task	
		Yes	No
1	More teacher oriented activities are observed.	✓	
2	The teacher encourages students to work in pair/group	✓	
3	Provide corrective feedback to students to stimulate concept formation	✓	
4	Are students practice the specified behaviors?		✓
5	Do students accept positive interdependence and individual accountability?		✓
6	The interaction among the student is high.		✓
7	Theclassroom situation is suitable for cooperative activities.		✓
8	Classroom activities maximize cooperation activities like drama, debate, dialogue.		✓
9	Facilitating and monitoring classroom activities.	✓	
10	The availability of five CL principles in the classroom		✓

☛The teacher introduces the daily lesson and give correction for the previous lesson and ordered students be in group and after five minutes he asked the answer for exercises. But students are not discussing on the topic they are asked to do so and use Amharic rather than the target language.

☛The teacher asks students to complete the passage about energy with words. Students attempt to answer by raising their hands. The teacher encourages students to answer the question.

School name **kokebetsibah** Teachers name **teacher 4**

No of students M **25** F **19** T **44** Date of observation **18th April**

Topic **prefixes?** Grade and section **9th 07**

Table 11 Classroom observation checklist teacher four

Ro l.n o	Activities	Availability on the task	
		Yes	No
1	More teacher oriented activities are observed.	✓	
2	The teacher encourages students to work in pair/group.		✓
3	Provide corrective feedback to students to stimulate concept formation.	✓	
4	Are students practice the specified behaviors?		✓
5	Do students accept positive interdependence and individual accountability?		✓
6	The interaction among the students is high.		✓
7	The classroom situation is suitable for cooperative learning activities.		✓
8	Classroom activities maximize cooperation activities like drama, debate, dialogue.		✓
9	Facilitating and monitoring classroom activities.		✓
10	The availability of five CL principles in the classroom		✓

☛ The teacher relied on the textbook and makes students to answer the question by raising their hands.

☛ The teacher doesn't motivate students to learn in group and in pair. The student-student interaction is very low.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter of the study consists of the conclusions and recommendations of the research findings. After conclusion, some possible recommendations are given.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this study was intended to investigate the EFL teachers' perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning. So, to achieve the overall objective of the study, three types of data gathering instruments namely questionnaire, interview and classroom observation were used. After a pilot study was conducted, the data were gathered by the above mentioned instruments and were presented, analyzed and discussed in chapter four. Based on the analysis and discussion, the following conclusions and recommendations are made.

5.1 Conclusions

The majority of the teachers (94.7%) teaching load per week is 11-20. This average teaching load will help them to practice cooperative learning effectively. Additionally, 79% of the teachers have accepted communicative language teaching as the best approach to language teaching. The research findings revealed that despite EFL teachers, medium perception about the features of cooperative learning. Meanwhile, the findings indicates that average /medium number of the EFL teachers in terms of mean score from the teachers questionnaires about their perception about cooperative learning ranges from 2.58-4.1 and yielded a total mean score of 3.22 which is around the point of medium. While the result from the teachers' questionnaire about their classroom practice ranges from 1.58-3.89 and yielded a total mean score of 2.71 which is around the point of sometimes. Generally, from all the results we can conclude that teachers have positive and medium perception about cooperative learning and practice cooperative learning sometimes.

In relation to teachers' interview, the results revealed that for most items which have direct relation with cooperative learning, the response of all teachers didn't positive and good as expected. For instance, teachers didn't perceive cooperative learning properly. Some of the teachers consider cooperative learning as a group/pair work without considering the principles. The data also shows that as teachers are not clear with types and methods of cooperative learning and they cannot implement cooperative learning effectively, though they perceive cooperative learning as a good approach for improving students' academic, social and communicative competence because of low participation of the stake holders.

The data obtained from classroom observation indicates that there is a clear mismatch between what teachers perceive about cooperative learning in the questionnaire and what they actually practice in their classroom. As can be seen in chapter three, the results of the observation shows that teachers were failed to practice cooperative learning activities in their classroom. Because during classroom observation most teachers relied on teacher directed instruction, most teachers didn't accept positive interdependence and students –student interaction is low. Generally, most classes didn't exhibit the characteristics of cooperative leaning classroom i.e. high student-student, student- teacher interaction. Therefore, the actual implementations of cooperative learning were not effective.

To sum up, the overall findings of this study indicates that, though teachers seem to have medium level of understanding for most of cooperative learning activities and benefits, in reality they failed to practice it in EFL classrooms effectively. This shows that there is a clear mismatch between what they perceive about cooperative learning and what they actually practice.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn above, the following recommendations are made.

☛ Teachers have medium perception about the characteristics, advantages and principles of cooperative learning. Therefore, in order to improve teachers understanding about cooperative learning it is important to prepare in-service training like refreshment courses, workshops etc. so that the use of cooperative language learning method will be enhanced.

☛ Given this research findings that teachers lack practical application knowledge (skill) of cooperative learning principles and techniques, teachers should be given the opportunity to acquire knowledge about cooperative learning related to planning, implementing and assessing. To this end, it is suggested that teacher education programs, which aim at in-depth training about language teaching methodologies should properly deal with both the strength and weakness of cooperative learning as an instructional method ranging from basic principles to specific techniques.

☛ The school management also needs to have a better know –how about cooperative learning, as this might help them to enforce teachers in regard to the effective implementation of cooperative learning.

☛ The implementation of cooperative learning needs lots of skill and patience. Therefore, continuous supervision and follow up must be given for English language teachers to encourage them to practice cooperative learning activities frequently and properly.

☛ It is advisable that teachers and other stakeholders ought to deliver a piece of orientation to the learners about cooperative learning principles and their importance to arouse their interest before trying to implement the method.

☛ Experience sharing programs must be prepared for the teachers so that they can share their experience among each other. This intern might motivate the teachers to use the method in their classroom.

☛ Finally, this study is not intended to make any generalization, so any concerned and interested body can use this study as a way for further studies.

Bibliography

Brown, H.D. (1994). Principle of language learning and teaching. (3rded) Englewood cliff, Nj;Prentice Hall.

Brumfit.(1984). Communicative methodology in language teaching: Cambridge University press: Cambridge.

Cohen,E,G.(1994).Designing group work; strategies for the Heterogeneous classroom. New York; teachers' college press.

Crandall,J.(1999). Cooperative language learning and affective factors.In J. Arnold (Ed.), Affect in language learning. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.

Cresswell, J.W.(2009). Research design; Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed methods approach (3rd edition).London; sage publication Inc.

Cuban, I. (1993). How teachers taught; constancy and change in American classroom. New York; teachers college press.

David JohnsonRodgerT. Johnson. (1987). learning together and alone: cooperative, Competitive and individualistic learning. 2nd edition: Prentice hall.

David ,W.JohnsonRoger.T.Johnson. (1999). Theory into practice. Building community Through cooperative learning. Vol.38,No.2.

DimaHijazi and Amal Al-Nation.(2012).Interdisciplinary Journal of contemporary research in business. Vol.13.no.12 Alyarmouk university.

DejeneMendera. (2011).An investigation of the role of cooperative learning in enhancing Students writing performance.Unpublished MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

E.O Adu.(2007).Teachers perception of teaching correlates of students' academic performance in oyo state, Nigeria. Essay In education vol.20 spring 2007.

Fathman, A. K., & Kessler, C (1993).Cooperative language learning in school contexts. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13.

Greta J. Gorusch.(winter,2000). EFL educational policies and educational culture: Influences on teachers' approval of communicative affairs. TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 34, No. 4 (winter, 2000),

Gebremedhin Gidey. (2011). Investigating problems related to cooperative learning in English classes.Unpublished M A Thesis. Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

Hymes, Dell,(1972). On communicative competence. In sociolinguistics, edited by John, B U.K. Penguin.

H.H Stern. (1991). The fundamental concepts of language teaching. Seventh edition, oxford University press.

Jia Guan jie. (2003). Psychology of foreign language education (2nd edition). Nanning; Guangxi education press.

Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T (1991). Cooperative learning lesson Structures.Edina.MN: Interaction books.Pergamon,oxford.

Johnson .D.W,Johnson,R.T and Smith, k.(1991). Cooperative learning: increasing College Faculty instructional productivity.ASHER.ERIC higher education Report no.4. Washington, DC the George Washington University, school of educational and human development. Retrieved December, 2013 from <http://www.science direct.com>.

Johnson, D.W and Johnson, R.T. (1991). Cooperative learning and classroom and school climate. In educational environments eds B.J. Fraser and H.J Walberg.

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

Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, (1990). Circles of learning: cooperation in classroom. (3rd ed). Edina, MN, Interaction.

John G. D and L. Tsi. (2009). The effect of cooperative learning on foreign language learning anxiety.

Johnson, D.W, Johnson, R., Holubec, E. (2008). Cooperation in the classroom (7th ed). Edina, MN; interaction book company.

Justus Inonda Mwanje with Butte Gotu. (2001). Issues in social science research. Research Methodology series. Printed In Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.

Kagan, S. (1990). The structural approach to cooperative learning. Educational leadership.

Kagan. (1999). The seventeen pros and cons of cooperative learning plus ten tips for success. Kagan online magazine winter 1999.

Kerita, Mc. (2009). Investigating attitude of students towards cooperative learning method. Knox community college press.

Marina, B., Alexo. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching use in Brazil. Morgan town. West Virginia.

McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative arrangements in second instruction. NABE. The Journal for the national association for bilingual education 13. vol. 2.

- Ministry of Education. (1994). Education and training policy of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.
- Olsen, R. E. W. B., & Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.) Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Putnam, J.(1997) cooperative learning in diverse classrooms. PrenticeHall.
- Pham ,THi.H.(2011). Perception of Vietnamese teachers and students towards cooperative learning.
- Richards, c. and Rodgers, T.(2001). Approaches and methods in language teaching Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Robert Slavin.E. (1990).Cooperative learning;Theoryresearchandpractice.Need hams Heights, Massachuset.
- Robert Slavin .E (1995). Cooperative learning. (2nded). Boston:Allyn and Bacon.
- Robert Slavin .E .(1994). A practical guide to Cooperative learning.Boston:Allyn& Bacon.
- Roger, T. and W. D. Johnson. An overview of cooperative learning (online). <http://www.co-operation.org/pages/overviewpaper.html>.
- Salend ,s.J.(1994). Effective main streaming; creating inclusive classroom (2nded.) New York .Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Selinger,H,W and Shohamy,E.(1989). Second language Research methods. Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Seid Mohammed. (2012).Effects of cooperative learning on reading comprehension Achievement in EFL and social skills of grade10 students. Unpublished MA, thesis Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

Shlomosharan. (1990). Cooperative learning: theory and research

Preager publisher. Printed in United States.

Steven G ,MccaffertyGeorgom, Jacobs, Anna Christina Dasilva.(2006).

Cooperative learning and second language teaching. Cambridge university press.

WossenMekonenn. (2011). Assessing students and teachers perception and classroom

Practice of cooperative learning in EFL Classes. Unpublished MA thesis.

Addis Ababa University.

Yanzhang. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and

teaching. Journal of language teaching and research.vol.1.no.Academy publisher, Finland.

APPENDIX A

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate studies

Department of Foreign languages and literature

Teachers' questionnaire

Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire is designed to investigate the perception and classroom practice of English language teachers about cooperative learning. It is one of the instruments which the researcher uses to collect the necessary data for his MA Thesis in the teaching of English as a foreign language.

Thus, I kindly request you to give the required information genuinely. Your contribution is highly important for the success of this study. The researcher would like to assure you that all the responses you give will be kept confidential and used only for the research purpose.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Part 1: Personal information

Direction 1: Please give information about yourself for each of the categories below. Put a tick (✓) mark in the appropriate box.

1. Name of the school -----
2. Age a/ 20-29 [] b/30- 39 [] c/ 40- 49 [] d/ 50 and above []
3. Sex a/ male [] b/ female []
4. Qualification a/ BA [] b/ MA [] c/ PHD []
5. Total years of teaching experience a/ 5 and less than 5 years []

b/ 6- 10 years [] c/ 11- 20 years [] d/ more than 20 years []

6. Your teaching load per week.

a/ 10 and less than 10 [] b/ 11- 20 [] c/ 21- 30 []

7. Average number of students in one class

a/ 30 and less than 30 [] b/ 31- 40 [] c/ 41- 50 [] d/ 51—60 [] e/ above 60 []

Part 2: Items related to perception, knowledge and beliefs about cooperative learning are presented below. Please give your response to each item based on your understanding and experience. Think about the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below and put a tick [✓] mark to give your responses on relevant spaces.

Key: 5= Strongly agree

3= Undecided 2= Disagree

4= Agree

1= Strongly disagree

Item no	Statements	5	4	3	2	1
1	Communicative language teaching is the best approach to language teaching.					
2	Cooperative learning is exactly the same with group work.					
3	Cooperative learning minimizes the occurrence of unpleasant situations and maximizes the learning and learning satisfaction.					
4	By increasing the amount of students' talking time, cooperative learning can develop communicative competence.					
5	The main role of teacher in cooperative classes is facilitating learning and empowering students to learn.					
6	Cooperative learning approach makes learners to be responsible for their learning and their peers.					
7	Cooperative learning increases students' motivation.					

8	In cooperative learning, learners learn from one another, learn the content at a deeper level and feel better about themselves and their interactions with their peers.					
9	In cooperative learning, Learners learn valuable social skills such as resolving conflict, solving problems, critical thinking.					
10	Formal cooperative learning group is type of cooperative learning which lasts for several weeks.					
11	Informal cooperative learning group is type of cooperative learning which can be changed from lesson to lesson.					
12	Cooperative base group is long –term cooperative learning group with stable membership.					
13	When compared with competitive and individualistic learning cooperative learning promotes higher levels of self –esteem.					
14	I have understood cooperative learning and I can implement it successfully.					
15	The costs for implementing cooperative learning are great					
16	Cooperative learning holds fast learners back					
17	Cooperative learning increases students’ academic achievement					
18	Cooperative learning fosters equal participation in the classroom.					

Part Three:The following questions are intended to investigate teachers' classroom practice of cooperative learning in the teaching of English. Please read the items carefully and put a tick [✓] mark indicating the level of your classroom practice.

Key: 5=Always 4= Usually 3= sometimes 2= Rarely 1= never

RoI .no	STATEMENTS	5	4	3	2	1
1	I make my classroom attractive by encouraging my students to be in group and discuss.					
2	I give time for activities which help my students to sharpen their interpersonal skills.					
3	I advise my students to support and encourage each other, listen carefully to the ideas of others.					
4	I use group/pair work assignments.					
5	I give detailed instruction to my students.					
6	I make students to share responsibility among their group mates.					
7	I encourage my students to use the target language/English/ while working in group/pair work.					
8	I provide useful words, phrases and patterns related to the task to get students' attention.					
9	I provide an orientation about team work and explain the advantages of cooperative learning.					
10	I constructively critique the initial work of my students, to provoke critical thinking.					

11	I Make students to evaluate each other's work and give constructive feedback to each other.					
12	I enforce students to contribute ideas during pair or group work.					
13	I Involve students in role play, simulation or a kind of drama.					
14	I Engage students in conversation and discussion on some debatable issues.					
15	I use formal cooperative learning group					
16	I implement informal cooperative learning group					
17	I use base group cooperative learning groups in my classroom					

APPENDIX B

Addis Ababa University

School of graduate studies

Department of Foreign languages and literature

Interview for teachers

1. Have you ever taken training on cooperative learning?

1. How do you perceive cooperative learning?
2. Which type of cooperative learning methods /types do you use most?
3. Do you think that cooperative learning is beneficial to students' academic and social skill development?
4. To what extent do you implement cooperative learning like, jigsaw, learning together, student team learning and etc.?

APPENDIX C

Addis Ababa University

School of graduate studies

Department of Foreign languages and literature

Classroom observation checklist

Background information

School name

Teachers name.....

No. of students M.....F.....T.....

Date of observation..... topic

Grade and sectionlength of observed period.....

Time of observation.....

Ro. no	Statements/activities	Availability on the task	
		Yes	No
1	More teacher oriented activities are observed.		
2	The teacher encourages students to work in pair/group.		
3	Provide corrective feedback to students to stimulate concept formation		
4	Are students practice the specified behaviors?		
5	Do students accepted positive interdependence and individual accountability?		
6	The interaction among the students is high.		
7	The classroom situation is suitable for cooperative activities.		
8	Classroom activities maximize cooperation opportunities /drama ,debate, dialogue		
9	Facilitating and monitoring classroom activities.		
10	The availability of five cooperative learning principles in the classroom		

