ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

THE PRACTICE AND CHALLENGES OF 1 TO 5 COOPERATIVE GROUP LEARNING IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN AKAKI KALITY SUB-CITY, ADDIS ABABA

By

GASHAW ALGANEH

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

December 2017

The Practices and Challenges of 1 To 5 Cooperative Group Learning in Government Secondary Schools in Akaki- Kality Sub-City, Addis Ababa

By

Gashaw Alganeh

A Thesis Submitted to

The Department of Educational Planning and Management

Presented in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

December 2017

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to gratefully acknowledge my advisor Dr.Getnet Tizazu. I am thankful for his support, guidance, useful suggestions and constructive comments, and encouragement. I would thank him for his support in providing me with guidelines and relevant articles.

I would also like to extend my deepest gratitude to my best friends, Abreham Muluye and Wuntu Ayselech, for their support in editing the paper and making constructive comments and suggestions.

Additionally I would like to extend my deepest appreciation and thanks to my family and relatives particularly to Hanna Alganeh, Aysheshim Mekonnen, and Askale Mekonnen for their continuous support and encouragement throughout the completion of my research.

Moreover, I acknowledge my colleagues, Bekele Demelw, Tilaye Mengista, Habtamu Zewda, and Ashenafie Debebe for their continuous encouragement and support in data collection process.

Finally, my thanks go to all my respondents for providing me with the necessary information. Without all of the above supports, it would have been difficult to complete my study successfully.

Abbreviations

AAEB- Addis Ababa Education Bureau

AKSc- Akaki-Kality Sub-city

CGL – Cooperative Group Learning

CL – Cooperative Learning

EDPM- Educational Planning and Management

MoE- Ministry of Education

PGDT- Post Graduate Diploma Training.

Table of Contents

List of Table

Abstract

The objective of the study was to assess 1 to 5 cooperative group learning (study program) in some selected government secondary schools in Akaki kality sub-city, Addis Ababa. More specifically, student' and teachers' attitudes towards 1 to 5 cooperative group learning (study program) and their views about the value of 1 to 5 cooperative group study program were assessed. Moreover, it was concerned with the implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group-learning tasks expected from students, teachers, and school principals for effectiveness of the program. Factors hindering effectiveness in implementation of 1 to 5 study program were examined. Three schools randomly were selected from the seven government secondary schools found in the sub city. 228 respondents chosen from these sample schools (180 students, and 45 teachers, and 3 principals) took part in the study. While the students and teachers were randomly, selected principals were purposively chosen due to their position and intimacy to manage and facilitate the overall activities in 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Both quantitative (survey questionnaire) and qualitative data techniques (interviews)and quantitative and qualitative data were collected to attain the objectives The quantitative data were tabulated and presented in percentages, mean, and average mean of teacher and student respondent groups. The qualitative data were presented to complement the quantitative data. The findings indicate that teachers and students do not have favorable attitudes towards implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group study program. However, it is viewed as moderately important. The study, however, indicated that there is a consensus among respondents that 1 to 5 cooperative group learning is poorly implemented. Unwillingness of teachers and students, poor coordination and large group size, and uncomfortable seating arrangements were mentioned factors highly influencing the effectiveness of the program. Moreover, understanding and training gaps, and lack of principals attention and reluctance of teachers to give feedback on time moderately affect its implementations. The overall recommendation of the study is that the government should give high emphasis and use ultimate efforts to shape the attitude of stakeholders towards 1 to 5 cooperative group study (learning) program. It was also recommended that further investigations should be conducted including other issues or tasks directly related with the program like teacher trainings on 1 to 5 CGL, access to essential resources.

CHPETER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Under this chapter background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objectives (general and specific), significance of the study, scope, limitation, and organization of the study as well as definition of key terms were presented.

1.1Background of the Study

Cooperative learning is student centered pedagogical approach through which small group of students are responsible for their own and other group members learning. It consists of structured group works (activities) like worksheets and group assignments and project works or presentation papers. Such practices are believed to enhance students to develop the act of interdependence among all members of the group as well as individual accountability for their individual and groups learning (Ali, 2011; Johnson, et al; 2014). In cooperative learning, class students in the same group interact to each other to acquire, practice and to add individual contribution to solve a problem and complete a given task to achieve an intended goal. For Slavin, (1991), cooperative learning is also described as a structured and systematic method of teaching in which students work in their small groups to reach on a common goal.

According to Siegel, (2005), cooperative group learning is a pedagogical approach through which two or more students acquire knowledge when they involve themselves in a group task. Cooperative group learning is a learner-centered method of teaching. It focuses on the interaction of students' within the group and an increase in the number of public schools is the root cause for its introduction in united states in 1960s and 1970s (Slavin,1995).

Even though cooperative learning is defined differently, it could be argued that its focus is academic success. It is believed that students engaged in cooperative learning can gain both academic and social benefits. Due to this, the focus towards cooperative learning has increased over the last three decades (Johnson & Johnson, 2002; Slavin, 1996).As noted by Pate,(1988), cooperative learning allow students from different ethnic groups & with different backgrounds who are working together to develop positive felling and better understanding as well as mutual respect within the group.

According to Pantiz, (1996), cooperative teaching- learning is a fruit full method through which students with different backgrounds and abilities collected. The students organize themselves into small groups to engage on common academic activities to understand a subject (content). Nowadays cooperative learning is expected to be most common pedagogical approach that teachers' must use in class to address the goals of their lesson in advance. Our country Ethiopia has been characterized by diversified ethnic society in terms of culture, language, religion and economic backgrounds and their livelihood or way of life. Having this, teachers have to develop approaches or strategies that are suitable for students who differ in their backgrounds, ways of learning, achievements, and interests. The school cultures also need to be friendly with such diversified backgrounds and interest of the society. The critical issues here are how teachers can take good care of their students and construct a well-integrated and effective teaching-learning environment for students. Hence, cooperative-learning strategies is claimed to effectively address this challenge (Johnson & Johnson, 1990).

According to Iqbal (2004), cooperative learning is more effectual as a teaching learning method for subjects like mathematics and English as compared to traditional teaching method. Haberyan (2007) and others have reported that team based learning is motivating, attractive and enhance students to enjoy on the teaching learning process , and has been utilized in different disciplines with positive results.

Based on these it is possible to conclude that cooperative group learning is an opportunity to promote heterogeneity in classes by encouraging learners to learn from one another. In turn it develop interaction among learners which can lead to increased understanding and acceptance of all members of society, a benefit of cooperative learning that expand beyond the walls of the school itself.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Learning involves discovery of meaning, acquisition of new knowledge or experience. This is possible and effective only with the involvement of individual learner through cooperation (Combs. et al, 1971). As Xuan Ling, 2015, although, a number of educational institutions, around the world are practicing cooperative learning method as one of active teaching method. Many classroom teachers are facing challenges due to large class size, students' low interest and

awareness problem, as well as lack of their readiness' to apply either in their regular class or after class time.

Nowadays implementation of cooperative group learning or study program especially after regular class time is considered as a burning issue in our schools. As noted by Addis Ababa Education Bureau,(2006), not only the class room teaching learning process but also each and every activities to be conducted in the educational institutions should be supported by 1 to 5 cooperative groups. The AAEB justify this cooperative group work programs became an opportunity to help to each other for the effectiveness of the task to achieve the intended objectives. In relation to this, there are different documents like 1 to 5 cooperation and work guidelines that formulated by regional administrative bodies to be use as a guideline to order and facilitate schools to apply after class cooperative group learning. In addition to this, all schools in Ababa Education Bureau are expected to have a third vice principal assigned to facilitate students 1 to 5 cooperative group learning and cooperative work in schools'. Teacher trainees have also some experience during their in colleges. For example, Hawassa College of teachers' education has produced a training manual for study group coordinators (Geremew, 2005). Having the social and academic value that students gain from cooperative learning in to account, the Ministry of Education promotes to develop the students problem solving-capacity & competencies (MoE, 2002).

According to Seid, (2012), in Ethiopia the practical implementation of cooperative learning was introduced to secondary schools in 1994.That was done with the belief that teacher-centered method of teaching has been found to be ineffective since it makes students passive learners. There are different unpublished materials or documents, and practical activities, which shows the attention given to 1 to 5 cooperative group learning(CGL)like 1 to 5 cooperation guideline that was produced by regional administrative bodies to use as a guideline to practice 1 to 5 cooperative group learning as one of active pedagogy. Such documents state that it should be carried out after or before regular class to support students learning of regular class. Contrary to this, different literatures state cooperative learning as one of active pedagogy to be used in a regular class.

However, educational experts (Lue, 2000; Plass, 1998) suggest that there are factors that may hinder the implementation of 1 to 5 CGL like a large class size, classroom organization, teacher training, and problem of teaching materials. Concerning people's attitude and belief Richardson, (1996), stated as "Attitudes and beliefs are a subset of a group of constructs that name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person's actions." According to this saying ones belief and attitude determines the success or failure of a task. However, no local investigations are made specifically regarding 1 to 5 cooperative group learning, the findings of a local study on practice and attitude of Bulbula school community towards implementation of active learning indicates the existence of misperception of teachers towards active learning (Betel. 2011).

1 to 5 cooperative group learning is one aspect of active learning. Regarding this, a preliminary investigation and the researchers' own experience revealed that the implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning varies from school to school. In some schools, 1 to 5 cooperative group learning practiced before or after the regular class to facilitate students to work different activities together. This program is termed as students 1 to 5 cooperative group study program and there are teachers assigned as facilitators of the program for each class. There are also schools in which 1 to 5 cooperative group learning is implemented during the regular class as one of active pedagogy based on the interest of the teacher. 1 to 5 cooperative group learning implementation guideline state that students 1 to 5 cooperative group learning or study program should be implemented after or before regular class. Nevertheless, such gaps in the schedule and procedure of implementation programs make the issue non- formal and to cultured as voluntary task especially for teachers and schools as institution. Actually, it is an additional activity to be implemented to support students learning and such procedural gaps will hinder the interest of both teachers and students to use effectively. Moreover, in most cases the teachers attention to support and facilitate students during 1 to 5 cooperative group learning (after or before class) is very low. Students also loss there time simply by talking on issues out of the points of discussion. Many teachers and students attend the program for formality. This makes the teaching learning environment worse to achieve the intended goals of the institution in terms of students' academic performance and behavioral change. Sometimes teachers and other staff workers are ordered to discuss on issues that seem to non-educational agendas. This also has high impact on teachers' interest to have meaning full involvement on students 1 to 5

cooperative group-learning tasks and to implement various strategies to improve the students learning.

The researcher was motivated to conduct this study to investigate the practices and challenges of cooperative group learning in government secondary schools in Akaki Kality sub city. Because the researcher has observed 1 to 5, cooperative group learning is a common agenda in different meetings. The sub-city and woreda level education office heads and sometimes experts commonly blame school principals. When new (regional) supervisors come to school 1 to 5 CGL is a common issue that they move up. In addition to this no investigation was done on this study area specifically on1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Moreover, the researcher has observed that teachers commonly refuse and give different oral reflections about 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Having these reasons, the researcher is interested to investigate about the practices and challenges of 1 to 5 CGL in government secondary schools in Akaki-Kality Sub-city.

1.3. Basic Questions

To accomplish this investigation the researcher used the following basic questions as a guide.

1. What is the perception of teachers and students about 1 to 5 cooperative group learning in government secondary schools of Akaki-kality sub-city?
2. To what extent did 1 to 5 CGL tasks practiced (implemented) in government secondary schools of Akaki-kality sub-city?
3. What factors hinder the implementation of 1 to 5 CGL programs in government secondary schools of Akaki-kality sub-city?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1. General Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study was to assess the practice and challenges of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning in government secondary schools of Akaki-kality sub-city.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives of the Study

Specific objectives of this study are,

- To assess the perception of teachers and students'about1 to 5 cooperative group learning in government secondary schools in Akaki-Kality sub-city.
- To assess the extent of practice or implementation of1to 5 CGL tasks in government secondary schools in Akaki-Kality sub-city.
- To identify the factors that hinders the effectiveness in implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

1.5. Scope of the Study

This study was conducted in the southern part of Addis Ababa city administration Akaki-Kality sub-city government secondary schools in 2016/2017. It was carried out on three secondary schools Ethio-Japan hidasie secondary school, Fitawrary Abaynehe, and Kality secondary schools. It was intended to assess 1 to 5 cooperative groups learning focusing on 1to 5cooperative group learning after class study program.

1.6. Significance of the Study

This is study was hoped to have the following significance:

- It helps to assess and aware the current level of practice (implementation) and challenges hindering effectiveness of its implementation.
- It may enhance the teachers' and students' involvement on 1 to 5 cooperative group learning by showing its social and academic value
- It might make teachers, students, principals, and supervisors, to have awareness about existing level of practice and seat a new strategy for its effectiveness.
- It may give some idea for professional researchers to do further investigation on other issues related to 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.
- Based on its findings, this study may help the school principals, supervisors, and educational experts to give high emphasis or contribute what is expected from them as a stakeholder for effectiveness of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning program and to

recommend on the factors affecting the effectiveness of its implementation. In addition to this, it suggests about how to enhance the attitude of teachers and students regarding 1 to 5 CGL, it attempts to give a clue for researchers to do further investigation related to implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

This study has certain constraints. The major limitation of this study is that it does not have detail discussion of the local investigations and empirical studies. Because it was difficult to access local and empirical studies directly focus on 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

1.8. Definition of Key Terms

1 to 5 group–refers to a collection of six students having varied ability with the aim of studying or working together to help each other.

Perception–refers to feeling or view of teachers and students regarding 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

Cooperative Learning - refers to a learner-centered pedagogical approach through which students are responsible for their own and others learning in their small group.

Hindering Factors- are challenges that limit or influence the implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

1.9. Organization of the Study

This research paper has five chapters. The first chapter contains the introductory part of the study (background of the study, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objective, scope, significance, and limitation of the study as well as definition of key terms). The second chapter is all about review of literature and the third chapter deals with research design and methodology. Chapter 4 contains data analysis and interpretation. Provided in the last chapter are summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

CHPETER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Concept of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative group learning is a teaching learning situation where students are collected in to small groups to create an environment that enables students to improve both individual and group members (collegial) learning (Johnson et. al, 1994). It is also defined as a teaching learning process through which students engage active on different group tasks with the aim of achieving their common goals (Liang et.al; 2005).

According to Agashe, (2004), an instructional method allows students of a group to develop positive interaction to each other, create an opportunity for learners to have clear understanding on a specific content of the lesson that they are working together. In relation to this, cooperative ways of learning is described as a method of teaching that students hold a lion share of responsibility for their individual and group members learning. It is teachings learning process through which students create an opportunity to lead and enhance their learning to develop their self-esteem, self-confidence and promote to involve through all aspects of the teaching learning process with high team effort (Liang; 2002, p. 17).

As Liang; (2002, p.6), it is not only a matter of learners' active participation in classroom cooperative base group learning, but it is an essential method of teaching that encourage students to help to each other to cover and clarify academic contents. Similarly, Simsk, (2013.p.5); also described cooperative group learning as the most essential method of teaching which raise academic achievement of students. According to Simsk, (2013.p.5), cooperative learning is used to increase academic achievement, and it enhances the learners' interest to be active during the lesson to acquire basic points of the lesson. Cooperative group learning is a teaching–learning methodology where students with different backgrounds (academic, ethnic or racial, linguistic, religious etc.) are grouped and work together and gain both academic and social benefits (Tsai, 1998; Wei, 1997; Yu, 1995).

"Cooperative learning (CL) refers to students working in teams on an assignment or project under conditions in which certain criteria are satisfied, including that the team members be held individually accountable for the complete content of the assignment or project" (Felder & Brent, 2007, p.1). According to Felder and Brent, (2007), cooperative learning is a structured group based teaching- learning approach that needs to be considering different conditions /pre-requisites/ to apply. It is described as an essential teaching learning approach that increase students learning satisfaction by creating suitable learning environment that promote students learning through group work. It helps to create students with high self- esteem, high self-confidence, and high problem solving ability, critical thinking, and analytical skills.

As stated by Arends, (1997), cooperative learning is one of the most important teaching learning approaches characterized by its own task, goal, and reward structures. Unlike that of the other instructional methods cooperative learning tasks, goals, and rewards provided in a way that promotes students to cooperate and help to each other rather than running alone. It also changes the teachers' support or working behavior from completely class-wide communication to small groups to address academic and social needs of the students' /society/.

Generally, the concept of cooperative learning can be stated as a pedagogical approach where students with mixed ability (high, medium, and low achieving students) are organized in to small teams consisting of two- to- several members who are responsible for their individual and groups learning and hold a lion share of responsibility for success or failure of the group. It is a teaching learning process where students to help to each other to learn /acquire knowledge/ when they are working together but not to do everything always together. It is an instructional environment where there is a structured task, group goal and group based reward system. (Slavin, 1995).

2.2. Theoretical and Empirical Supports of Cooperative learning

There are different theories and empirical studies that have contributed to development and the implementation of cooperative learning from the perspective of its socio-cultural and academic values. To that end, two major theories (social constructivists' theory and motivational theory) are briefly reviewed. Added to that, a brief review on the works of two great scholars (Vygotsky and slavin) who advocate cooperative learning is also made are reviewed. That is followed by review of some empirical studies.

2.2.1. Social Constructivists Theory

As indicated earlier, constructivists' theory is one of the major theories that contributed to the growth of cooperative leaning. According to Li & Lam; (2013), constructivists theory is a theory developed by Vygotsky, (1896-1934) and it describes learning as a socio-cultural phenomenon and cooperative learning as a means through which people can interact and learn to each other. Here social interactions were explained as a process by which parents, teachers, and peers order and/or support children to take their culture as a source where knowledge is explored in more simple way. Since students are expected to generate, construct and develop their knowledge instead of receiving all from others, social interaction and there cultural environment can be used as a source where they generate, construct and develop their knowledge by their own. (Li & Lam, 2013)

According to Vygotsky (1978), a gap in between "potential and actual level of development of children in their domains and termed as Zone of Proximal Development." As to Vygotsky (1978), students working together in small groups formed by collecting students of heterogeneous skill level are more effective and can be successful in completing the same activity than those who work individually. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that cooperation in small groups to work together is an opportunity to reach on success than working alone. Without the interaction of student in Proximal Development Zone, it is impossible to have effective learning and at the same time, learning extends the scope or level of interaction with their environment (Vygotsky, 1978). According to this view, there is a strong two-way relation between social interaction and learning. Learning is important to value social interaction and social interaction is essential to have successful learning that results for cognitive development.

2.2.2. Motivational Theory

Motivational theory is also another theory, which promotes the development of cooperative learning. It is a theory where motivation is considered as a part of teaching learning process.

As stated by Slavin, (1995), advocators of motivational theory, group based rewards enhance students to participate in-group tasks actively. The individuals' success depends on the group achievement. Having this idea all students develop the necessity of interdependence to help and promote to each other to play their own role for group success and reward. According to David

and Roger Johnson, (1998), the level of learning that the students attained was evaluated and they were rewarded based on the result that they have scored as a group not on individual bases. They argue that students who have internalized the value of group success are motivated to work in teams. Slavin, (1995); also stated that each individual learner is responsible for group members learning and reward that they are honored as a group.

Moreover, Slavin, (1995pp. 5-7); also argue that cooperative group based rewards encourage individuals to engage actively in their cooperative learning groups to contribute their alternatives since the success and reward of a team is dependent on individual scores recorded individually on tasks like quizzes, tests, exams, assignments.

2.2.3. John Dewey, Herbert Thelan

According to Arends, "Cooperative behavior was viewed by Dewey and Thelan as the foundation of democracy, and schools were seen as laboratories for developing democratic behavior" (1997.p.114)

Arends (1997), on his part, argues that there are verities of problems that the society is facing to enhance the development of democratic culture through scientific process. To create an opportunity for students to learn principles of democracy, teachers play critical role to enhance students to cooperate and work together within their learning environment. However, it was full of different social problems (Dewey, 1916; Thelan, 1954, 1960); also stated classroom as a learning environment where the most important social and interpersonal issues were investigated for building democracy. As both Dewey, (1916), and Thelan, (1954, 1960), argued that to reach on an intended out comes or ultimate objectives, it is important to have well-structured classrooms and use well- organized lesson activities which are most supportive. Related to this they have stated cooperative based group work as an opportunity to build persistent democracy within the community in terms of students learning.

According to theoretical and empirical framework, group based cooperative learning creates an opportunity for people to learn from experience when they communicate with others. In addition to this, it helps students to share basic social skills when they are participating in their learning small groups and they get opportunity to develop democratic attitudes and logical thinking skills (Arends, 1997. pp 14-18).

2.3. Methods of Cooperative Learning

According to Slavin, (1991), and Arends, (1997), there are different methods and unique activities were considered to apply cooperative learning in classroom. It involves a critical planning activity that helps to shift the teaching learning approach from class-wide simple presentation to small- group based discussion. In relation to this, the major planning activity that attracts the attention of teachers to implement cooperative learning in their class is selecting an approach that through which students can understand and complete learning activities or contents of the lesson. As argued by Slavin, (1991); and Arends, (1997); there are different cooperative learning approaches such as, student team learning (STL), jigsaw method (JM), group investigation (GI), learning together (LT). As Slavin, (1995), Li, & Lam, (2013), cooperative learning methods were classified in to two groups as, "**structured team learning** and **informal group learning methods." Structured team learning** includes methods as student team achievement division (STAD), team games tournament (TGT), cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC); and **informal group learning methods** which compose methods given by Slavin, (1991); and Arends, (1997); stated above including think-pair-share method" (p. 15).

2.3.1. Student Team Learning (STL)

STL is one of the most commonly used structured team based approachof cooperative learning investigated and developed by Slavin, (1983); and his colleagues at university of Johns Hopkins (Slavin, 1995; Arends, 1997).

According to Muraya and Kimamo, (2011); Arends, (1997); and Slavin, (1995); to apply this method of teaching in to classroom it is important to change the setting arrangement of students in to small-groups with 4-5 members having mixed ability (performance level) as well as students with different ethnic backgrounds and both sexes. As described by Slavin, (1995); and Li, & Lam, (2013); there are different student team learning approaches as; student team achievement division (STAD), team games tournament (TGT), which are suitable and can be applied for any subjects like mathematics, language, geography, art, science etc. regardless of grade level difference. Moreover, cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC), and team-assisted individualization (TAI) are used selectively based on the nature of the subject matter contents.

Generally, in STL method students are important not only to engage on common tasks but also to acquire knowledge from the activities what they are doing in groups. However, students learn in teams but teachers have to evaluate individually and group success depends on individual achievement. All individual learners are equally responsible and accountable for group success and reward or certification (Slavin, 1995).

2.3.2. Jigsaw Method

As described by Arends, (1997) it is informal cooperative group learning method where 5-6 students with heterogeneous ability groups are engaged on academic contents. According to Slavin, (1995), it is a pedagogical approach primarily formed by Aronson and his colleagues at University of Texas in (1987) and revised by Slavin, (1994) at Johns Hopkins University. It is an instructional method, which involves classification of academic contents in to sections, and a small group of students discusses on and distributed to the other groups to present /share their learning (Adams, 2013; Ward, 1987; Arends, 1997). As argued by Slavin, (1995), Li, & Lam, (2013), jigsaw method was identified as an appropriate pedagogical approach for subjects as language, literature, and social studies.

2.3.3. Group Investigation

According to Arends, (1997), no instructional task is conducted by individual learner and there is no one who tries to work alone to become successful. As stated by Arends, (1997); group investigation is a cooperative learning approach where students work together throughout all steps ranging from planning to investigation procedures. As Arends, (1997), Sharan and Sharan, (1976), and Sharan and his colleagues, (1984), argue that there are six procedures where students should consider and involve to use this cooperative learning approach (GI). These include; Prioritizing, ⟶ planning, ⟶ practicing (implementation), ⟶ investigation, ⟶ reflection, ⟶assessment.

Generally, Slavin, (1995); Li,& Lam, (2013); state group investigation as a cooperative learning approach which involves methods as; team planning & discussion where two-to-six students work together in small groups in a way that enable them to organize and develop their own conclusions theories about their learning and make their group reflections to the class.

2.3.4. Learning Together

Slavin,(1995); states that learning together is a cooperative learning method through which four-five students having different level of academic performance are allowed to work on the same academic contents or activities; can be work-sheet (assignment) and individual success depends on their group performance. As described by Slavin,(1995); and argued by Adams, (2013); and Li, & Lam, (2013), it is a pedagogical approach explained by the two-way interaction and interdependence of group members, active participation of the group members throughout all instructional processes, and direct interaction of members which promote learning and success of others. In addition to this, all students within the group are accountable for individual/ their own and group achievement. Slavin, (1995); also stated this as a cooperative learning approach which is practiced while students are awarded and the groups are developed in a way that helps students to complete their tasks.

2.4. Benefits of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning has varieties of advantages that the learners can gain when cooperative group learning are managed and implemented. These goals and outcomes that the students achieve and incorporate in to their real life through cooperative learning can be related to academic success, tolerance, and development of social skills in their diversified living environment (Arends, 1997, p.111)

2.4.1. Academic Success

Walmsley and Muniz, (2003); described cooperative learning as an important pedagogical approach that enable students to improve academic achievement. According to Walmsley and Muniz, (2003), cooperative learning is a teaching- learning situation where students are allowed to interact with group members having a variety of experiences and abilities related with subject matter content under discussion to discuss, debate, and explain to help to each other. Arends, (1997, p.111); also argue that cooperative learning is a teaching-learning process that occurs when students with different abilities (High, Medium, & Low achiever) come together to work on a common academic tasks for a common objective to be achieved after completion of the task. This is an opportunity for all students within the group to help to each other for individual and group achievement. It changes the classroom norm from one-way communication in to

interactive discussion where students are highly responsible for their own and group members learning and achievement. In cooperative learning class, high achiever students are equally advantageous with low achievers. Because when they tutor and explain a subject matter content to low achieving students (group members), they develop language and communication skill, develop their subject matter knowledge related to the content that they are tutoring since it requires critical and deep thinking analytic skill.

As Li, & Lam, (2013); Slavin, (1990), also stated that cooperative group learning students develop positive attitude towards learning a subject(s), interaction with their teachers as well as classmates that intern encourage students to success academically.

Generally, as argued by Arends, (1997); Walmsley and Muniz, (2003); Li, & Lam, (2013), cooperative learning enhances the academic achievement or success of students at all levels ((High, Medium, & Low achievers). Because it is a learning environment, where students interact and help to each other to complete academic tasks. In addition to this, it creates an opportunity where teachers address more students' than lecture method and students communicate and get high from their teachers.

2.4.2. Acceptance of Diversity

As Arends, (1997), stated cooperative learning groups can be formed by collecting students with different backgrounds and abilities with the purpose of working for a common goal. Each group is collection of students with of different sex, religious, linguistic, ethnic (racial), and academic backgrounds. Even though they are multi diversified in their identity they strive to accomplish, their common tasks achieve ultimate goals. They focus on academic contents how much they are different in their background (Allport, 1954). As argued by Arends, (1997); this is an opportunity to develop the attitude of students to understand any of their identity differences and helps to make them to accept and promote tolerance of diversity.

2.4.3. Development of Social Interaction

As stated by Li & Lam; (2013), social constructivism theory that was developed by Vygotsky (1896-1934); states learning as a socio-cultural phenomenon and cooperative learning as a means through which people can interact and learn to each other. Cooperative learning helps students to

develop and make effective social interaction with skills enabling them to work together in teams without making boundary in any aspects for individual and group success. In this way students get an opportunity to value and develop the essence of social interaction (cooperation) and collaborative skills (Arends, 1997).

2.4.4. Job Opportunity & Success

Walmsley and Muniz, (2003.p.114); classified the benefits of cooperative learning as "short-term and long-term benefits." As the short-term benefit, they have described it as it enables students to have increases learning, retention, and critical thinking skills. It also develops the value that students give for themselves. Students who have enjoyed cooperative learning are proud of by their learning, they have high self-esteem, and they give high self-respect.

The long-run benefits of cooperative learning are related with job opportunities and success at work places. According to Walmsley and Muniz, (2003), cooperative learning serves as a tool to develop effective communication skill, positive interpersonal interaction as well as to have sense of responsibility and motivation to conduct a given task successfully. Cooperative learning prepares students to enjoy better job opportunity and success when they are at any position or career levels (Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

Generally, as stated by Sadker, and Sadker, (2003), cooperative learning has a multi-verity of values for students' current and future life in relation to academic and non- academic areas. In academic areas, initially it enhances students' interest and self-esteem to learn and to be successful in academic achievement. In non- academic areas, it develops students' social interaction and success at any of career positions initially by developing positive relationship with students having different backgrounds (ethnic/ racial, religious, linguistic, etc.) which will extend beyond their classroom to their work environment. As Muraya and Kimamo, (2011), cooperative learning is an important method, which provides an opportunity for students to have meaningful participation on academic tasks to raise their role to improve their achievement. Effandi and Zanaton,(2007); described cooperative learning as an instructional approach which gives high emphasis towards using more learner- centered approach to enable students to improve their problem solving ability, and critical thinking skill, as well as self-confidence, and self-esteem.

2.5. Elements of Cooperative Learning

According to Liang, (2002 p.31), teachers are the main responsible persons to create a teaching learning environment (condition) which promotes the practical implementation and effectiveness of cooperative learning. As stated by Liang, (2002), there are five basic elements determine the effectiveness of cooperative learning revolves around. Li & Lam, (2013 p.3); also described these elements as both "principles and elements" which are essential to implement cooperative learning lessons. Cooperative learning needs to have unique criteria's or pre-requisites to be considered for its effectiveness. Based on this, Johnson et al, (1994); has developed five basic elements that are important to practice cooperative learning in class successfully (effectively).

2.5.1.Positive Interdependence

As stated by Muraya and Kimamo, (2011), in cooperative teaching class the success and/or failure of any student depends on group members individual learning and achievement intern the success of the group is determined by the individuals contribution that they make on each task. The group success is measured in terms of individual learning when they are working together, and their achievement that they score individually in quizzes, tests, and assignments. The sum/ average effort and contribution of individuals helps to achieve the group goals and in cooperative learning class, students get reward as a group (Arends, 1997). Due to this, all students promote and help to each other for individual and group success. Group goals and rewards are the pillars that encourage students to develop positive interdependence which essential for individual learning and achievement (Li & Lam, 2013).

The presence of positive interdependence is realized when there is a strong bond that connects the learning and achievement of individuals with their classmates' in the group focusing on academic efforts. This bond is group base goal and reward (Johnson & Johnson, 1991).

2.5.2. Face- to-Face Interaction

Group reward is one of the features of cooperative learning that can be determined by individuals' success as a group member; it promotes to have face-to-face interaction within the group members with the aim of helping to each other (Muraya and Kimamo, 2011. p. 730-31). To ensure effective implementation of intended group works students should interact in a way

that ensures each other's learning in the group (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). In cooperative learning however, there are activities or tasks which will be performed by each student alone those activities and individual learning's need to come together to share for other members. Therefore, to achieve this interaction of students within the group is mandatory to combine the individuals learning and make it group learning by sharing experiences (Li & Lam, 2013). However, the effectiveness of interaction among group members is the result of the degree to which students are organized into small groups and their skill to share their learning and support to each other (Liang, 2002). As argued by Liang, (2002), there is a two- way relationship which Sims like cause-effect relation between face-to-face interaction and students learning. A cooperative learning classroom environment is a situation that enhances both academic and behavioral development of students. This was achieved with the presence of supportive communication and interaction of the group members. However, the interaction of students within the group has the aim of accomplishing their academic tasks to reach on their ultimate shared goals; it helps to develop face-to-face interaction among students in a way that enhances their learning in different aspects (Aschettino, 1993).

2.5.3. Individual Accountability

According to Liang,(2002 p, 32)students which are collected to form a small group with the aim of working in team to accomplish a given task which is important to attain their common goal are individually responsible and expected to add their own valuable contribution for their team work. (Slavin, 1990), also argue that the success or group achievement is highly determined by the degree /level of individuals learning and goal attainment. Cooperative learning groups are rewarded based on individuals learning and achievement that they score on quizzes, tests, and assignments and students are graded based on both individual and group performance. Therefore, all students in the group are accountable for their individual and other members' learning and success (Muraya and Kimamo, 2011; Li & Lam, 2013).

2.5.4.Interpersonal & Small Group Skills

According to Johnson & Johnson, (1994), cooperative learning is a pedagogical approach that requires students to have effective interpersonal and group skills to lead the lesson in appropriate way and complete the intended tasks /activities/ of the lesson. Because in cooperative learning

the teaching learning process is lead by students, it is learner centered. As stated by Johnson, D. & Johnson,R. (1990), it is essential to develop different interpersonal and social skills of students to maintain their interest to cooperate and work in-group. As argued by Johnson et al, (1990), the existence of various methods to develop social and interpersonal skills to be used to enhance students cooperation to work together. In relation to this Cowei, Smith, Boulton, & Laver, (1994), argued that teachers are the main responsible personnel to change and enable students to have both interpersonal and social skills by making their relationship more friendship or collegial.

Generally, Muraya and Kimamo, (2011); Li & Lam, (2013), stated the existence of a two-way relationship between the effectiveness of cooperative learning and the learning and development of interpersonal & social /group skills. As stated by Muraya and Kimamo, (2011), cooperative learning by itself is a best opportunity to learn/ develop interpersonal and group skills that are important for success of students in and out of the school.

2.5.5. Group Processing

In cooperative learning group, processing involves activities and procedures that teachers and students play to ensure the effectiveness of students learning and achievement (Ijal, 2010, p.79).

As stated by Johnson, (1998, 1999), group process is the interaction and interdependence of students to help to each other during the teaching learning process to work or learn together. It is also described as the practice of presentation that they share their learning or points agreed by the group members to the whole class. Moreover, it is defined as the procedural distances that they move, actions and procedures that they follow to identify, and fill the gaps on students learning and achievement are considered as group process (Johnson, 1998, 1999). According to Arends, (1997), cooperative learning is a teaching-learning process in which small groups of students with heterogeneous ability are engaged on common activities for a group goal.

In turn, group processing is one aspect of cooperative learning involving other aspects as, interdependence, interaction, and accountability. It is the activity or process that includes tasks like; assessment & evaluation of effectiveness of the program in terms of the students interdependence, face-to-face interaction, and accountability and responsiveness for their own

individual and others learning as well as interpersonal and social skill learning and seating solution for gaps if any (Muraya and Kimamo,2011,p 731).

Generally, these cooperative learning elements are the principles and/or features that must exist in cooperative learning class and the tools to be taken for effective implementation of cooperative learning (Johanson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin, 1996).

2.6. Perception of Cooperative Learning

According to Liang (2015), teachers and students have diversified perception regarding cooperative group learning. Some of the teachers and students have positive perception for cooperative learning and there are teachers and students who does not perceive as such.

As scholars agree that perception is a requisite for practice and without perception, practice would be unguided and without practice, perception would serve no purpose. Perception is the process by which organisms interpret and organize sensation to produce a meaningful experience of the world. Perception on the other hand describes one's ultimate experience of the world and typically involves further processing of sensory input. Animate practice requires both perception and practice and perception and practice can be described as "two sides of the coin". (http://www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/perception).

2.6.1. Perception of Students towards Cooperative Learning

As cited by Hagose (2012), Burden (2004) showed that a positive attitude would motivate learners to achieve their learning goals. Many research works have been conducted on students' perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning. According to Fahad (2009), a study students' attitude and perceptions towards the effectiveness of mobile learning, the result indicates that many students perceive that cooperative learning important to improve their retention in the teaching and learning process. In addition, it makes students effective in implementing cooperative learning activities. Fahad (2009) also cited Caroline et al. (2007) study conducted on "perceptions of low ability students on cooperative learning." Moreover, they argue that low performer students perceive cooperative learning as powerful method of teaching to enhance interaction and competition with each other. In the actual implementation of Cooperative group learning, except in a few cases, students were effective. Thanh (2008) also

argued on a research "CL Teams: perception of accounting students." In the study, majority of students felt that they were part of a team that allowed them to interact well with other students and the instructor. The students accepted their role as active learners whereas the instructors' role was relatively passive. The students also accept the principle of cooperative learning as a means to enhance academic achievement, self-esteem, attitudes towards learning and developing positive relationship among others.

2.6.2. Perception of Teachers towards Cooperative Learning

As cited by Yeabsira (2015) related to the perception of teachers' towards cooperative learning Thanh (2008), described on the study regarding the role of teachers in implementing educational innovation the case of implementing cooperative learning, many teachers in Vietnam have a serious problem in implementing cooperative learning. This was due to their low perception towards cooperative learning. The study argues that principles of cooperative learning conflict with the traditional perceptions of Vietnamese teachers regarding the nature of teaching and learning. As cited in Wossen (2011), Veenman (2001) has conducted a research on teacher's perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning and the findings indicate that the majority of teachers subscribed to cooperative learning to achieve both academic and social goals and showed readiness to use cooperative learning in their future lessons.

According to Wossen (2011), a study on the assessment of teachers' and students' perception and classroom practice of cooperative learning, the majority of the students and teachers had positive perception for most of cooperative learning structures. However, Wossen states that teachers does not pay due attention for cooperative learning activities. This indicates that the interest of teachers was medium. Berhanu (2000), also stated on a study which deals about the practice of cooperative learning in-group work, indicates that the practice of cooperative learning is not frequent and many of the elements of the cooperative learning lessons are not well practiced.

CHPETER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

A research design is an integrated system and justification for technical decisions in planning a research project created with the purpose of carrying out systematic and rigorous enquiry to address a particular problem arising from a gap in knowledge (Cresswell & Blaikie, 2003). It serves as a blue print for conducting the research.

Research design mainly focuses on the product and the research problem while the methodology focuses more on the process, the tools, and procedures to be used in the research (Bobbie and Mouton, 2001).

The purpose of this study was to assess the practices and challenges of cooperative group learning in government secondary schools in Akaki-Kality sub-city in Addis Ababa City administration educational bureau.

The researcher has used mixed (qualitative and quantitative) approach focusing on descriptive survey. The researcher used quantitative and qualitative data in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the research problem. In this design, the researcher was collected both forms of data during the study and integrated the data during the interpretation of the overall results.

Best and Kohn (1989) explained that descriptive survey method describes, analyzes and interprets conditions that exist. Therefore, this method was focused, because it is acceptable to dig out major problems and to describe what is currently going on and due to its importance that to get detail of data from many respondents. Moreover, it was selected because it serves to reach on the intended purpose of assessing the practices and challenges of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. As stated by Sidhu (1985), it is a method that describes and interpret what exists at present form of practice, effects, attitudes, etc. (Sidhu, 1985).

3.2 Study Population and Sampling Technique

3.2.1 Study Population and Sources of Data

InAkaki-kality sub-city (AKS) there were 7secondary schools. Since the focus of this study was to assess cooperative group learning in government secondary schools in Akaki-Kality sub-city focusing on 1 to 5 cooperative group learning or study program, the data were collected from principals, teachers, and students in three sample secondary schools. To conduct the study the researcher focused on primary sources of data. That is, questionnaires were used to gather data from students and teachers, and interviews were administered for principals and vice-principals.

3.2.2 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The study was conducted in government secondary schools in AKS. Among the seven government secondary schools, the researcher has selected only three (3) schools randomly.

Since it is difficult to include all the population of these three (3) schools, the researcher selected only 180 (5.84%) students from 3081 total students, 45teachers (23.68%) from a total of 190 teachers, and 3 principals using simple random sampling method. The number (size) of the participants also fixed randomly. Three of the principals were purposively selected due to their position and intimacy to lead and facilitate the implementation of 1to5 cooperative group learning. The researcher has taken equal number of participants from each school. The total number of the population of the sample schools is nearly equal.

Table 3.1. Summary of total population, sample size, and sampling technique

No	Types of Participants	Total population	Sample size		Sampling technique
			No	%	
1	Students	3o81	180	5.84	Simple random sampling
2	Teachers	190	45	23.68	Simple random sampling
3	Principals	12	3	25	Purposive
	Total	3281	228	6.95	

3.3. Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection

3.3.1 Instruments

The quantitative and qualitative data were obtained using different instruments. That was done with the belief that employing multiple methods of data collection is important to combine the strengths and amend some of the inadequacies. The researcher has used two data collection instruments in this study. These are questionnaire, and interview. The first data collection instrument was questionnaire. A questionnaire is a written document in survey research comprising a set of questions handed out to respondents or used by a researcher to ask questions and record the answers (Neuman, 2000). According to Cohen et al., (2000), a questionnaire is a widely utilized and useful being able to be administered even without the presence of the researcher, and often being relatively straightforward to analyze.

Questionnaire is prepared to collect more information by both closed ended and open- ended questions from teachers. It is considered a source of more information as respondents feel comfortable to express their ideas. In this study, a questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. It has been aimed to investigate the respondents' selected to fill the questionnaire. Selected respondents fill questionnaire with the designed items: Items to which respondents had to respond by selecting from the following options: strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The questionnaires were contained of five parts as; introductory part consisting of background information about respondents. The remaining four sections consisted of items designed to achieve objectives of the study focusing on basic research questions. In relation to this the 2^{nd} and 3^{rd} part deals about the views and there level of agreement on the value of 1 to 5 CGL accordingly. The fourth section was about the extent to which 1 to 5 CGL activities expected from students, teachers, and school management were practiced. The last section was about the factors hindering implementation of 1 to 5 CGL.

According to Cohen et al, (2000), since a questionnaire is being an intrusion into the respondent's life, it is unethical to force respondents to completing it. Nevertheless, the researcher might strongly encourage them, but it is entirely up to the respondents to decide whether to become involved and when to with draw from the study.

In this study, the researcher was used simple random sampling method to select 180 students and 45 teachers from the three of the sample schools. Thus, the researcher was arranged three different days for these schools after that the researcher has told them about the purpose of the study and tried to persuade that their information was dealt only for research purpose.

The second data collection instrument was Interview. It was selected in order to validate the data gathered from the questionnaire. Moreover, in conducting an interview, the researcher would get the chance to raise different issues that will not address through the given questionnaire. Furthermore, interviews are one of the most commonly known forms of qualitative research. Cohen et al., (2000) identify the following three purposes of a research interview: It may be used as the main method of collecting data having a direct bearing on the research objectives. Before starting the interview, the respondents were informed about the purpose of the study clearly. In addition to this, for the purpose of ethical consideration, they were informed that no harm would come to them because of their participation in the study.

In this study, interviews were conducted with three (3) principals mainly those who have direct role of facilitating 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Purposive sampling was used to select principals for interview. The main purposes of interviewing the principals intended to understand their opinions regarding the real practice and related factors of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

3.3.2. Procedures of Data Collection

In this study, the researcher has was used both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods (questionnaires and interview). The researcher used the following procedures to collect data. While appropriate data collection, instruments prepared and participants of the study particularly three of schools sample schools were identified the researcher has dealt with principals of each sample school to get voluntariness to use the institution as a sample study area. After this, the researcher has selected the sample population and selected respondents of questionnaire and interviewee orientations were given about the purpose of the questionnaire and interview or study. In addition to this, ethical considerations were dealt with participants of the study. After all the data, collecting instruments 42 close ended for 180 of sample students as well as 42 close ended and 5 open ended questionnaire for 45 of teacher respondents accordingly.

3.4. Methods of Data Analysis

Neuman (2003:331) states that, in quantitative data analysis, a researcher provides the charts, graphs, and tables to give readers a condensed picture of the data. The charts and tables allow the readers to see the evidence gathered by the researcher and learn for themselves what this study is in it. Based on this the researcher has used frequency tables to illustrate the overall response of teachers and students. The collected data was interpreted and analyzed separately. In this study, both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods were used since both methods were used to collect data.

The quantitative data gathered through close-ended questionnaire were presented and analyzed using tables as frequency, percentages; mean and average mean value of the two respondent groups. The analysis of qualitative data was treated by organizing and sorting the data at different stages of the analysis and explaining in line with quantitative data. Qualitative data analysis involves verbal argumentations and explanations. Since analysis of qualitative data occurs simultaneously with data collection, the first step in data analysis is to manage the data so that it can be studied. Managing data means organizing the collected data. The researcher has to ensure that he has dated, organized, and sequenced all field notes.

Therefore, data collected through open-ended questionnaires, and interviews were analyzed qualitatively by narration to complement the main data. Based on the data analysis, interpretations were made to arrive at certain findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter deals with analysis and interpretation of major findings of the study collected through questionnaires, and interviews. The data collected was examined, compiled, and analyzed to address the basic research questions. The questionnaires were used to gather valuable data from teachers and students regarding the practices and challenges of 1to5 cooperative group learning. There are close-ended and open-ended questionnaires administered for teachers, and students. Close -ended questions were presented by using table and analyzed using frequency and percentage. The qualitative data gathered from principals through interview was presented in descriptive way with relative quantitative data from questionnaire. Generally, this chapter contain to two parts. The first part is about the background respondents' and the second part deals with the presentation, and analysis of collected data.

4.1. Background of Respondents

4.1.1 Background of student Respondents

This part shows some basic information's about the background and nature of the respondents' in terms of sex, age, and grade level of students. In the same way, it indicates sex, age, educational background (qualification), work experience, and their field of study (stream) about teachers and principals who have participated in the study.

Table 4.1. Distribution of Student Respondents Sex, Age, and Grade

General characteristics		Sample Schools							
		Ethio-Japan Hidasie secondary school		Fitawrary Abayneh secondary school		Kality secondary school		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Sex	M	26	44.07	26	45.61	33	58.93	85	49.42
	F	33	55.93	31	54.39	23	41.07	87	50.58
	Total	59	100	57	100	56	100	172	100
Age	14-17	48	81.36	43	75.44	46	82.143	137	79.65
	18-20	6	10.17	11	19.30	6	10.714	23	13.37
	>20	5	8.47	3	5.26	4	7.143	12	6.98
	Total	59	100	57	100	56	100	172	100
Grade	9	29	49.15	29	50.88	29	51.79	87	50.58
	10	30	50.85	28	49.12	27	48.21	85	49.42
	Total	59	100	57	100	56	100	172	100

**Key - No= number of respondents, %= percentage calculated for No, M= Male respondents, F= Female respondents*

As indicated above in table 4.1, 172 student respondents have successfully returned the questionnaires distributed to answer the basic research questions. From these 172 (100%) respondents 85 (49.42%) students are males and 87 (50.58%) students are females. Table 2 also shows respondents age in three groups as from 14-17 years, from 18-20 years, and above 20 years old. As stated above from the 172 (100%) students 137 (79.65%) students have the age of 14-17 years old, 23 (13.37%) are 18-20 years old, and 12 (6.98%) are above 20 years old. As described in the same table the student respondents were selected from both grade 9, and grade 10. From the 172 (100%) students, 87 (50.58%), and 85 (49.42%) are grade 9 and grade 10 students respectively. Generally, the above table summarizes that there is no significant difference in sample size from school to school, and the distribution of student respondents in sex, age, and grade level.

Table 4.2. Distribution of Teacher Respondents

General characteristics		Sample Schools							
		Ethio-Japan Hidasie secondary school		Fitawrary Abayneh secondary school		Kality secondary school		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Sex	M	6	40	11	73.33	10	66.67	27	60
	F	9	60	4	26.67	5	33.33	18	40
	Total	15	100	15	100	15	100	45	100
Age	21-30	8	53.33	6	40	3	20	17	37.78
	31-40	4	26.67	7	46.67	8	53.33	19	42.22
	41-50	3	20	2	13.33	4	26.67	9	20
	>50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	15	100	15	100	15	100	45	100
Qualification	BSC/BED	15	100	15	100	15	100	45	100
	MSC/MA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Work experience	1-5	4	26.67	2	13.33	-	-	6	13.33
	6-10	5	33.33	3	20	4	26.67	12	26.67
	11-15	3	20	8	53.33	6	40	17	37.78
	>16	3	20	2	13.33	5	33.33	10	22.22
	Total	15	100	15	100	15	100	45	100
Field of study (Stream)	Language	4	26.67	5	33.33	4	26.67	13	28.89
	N.S.	7	46.66	7	46.67	8	53.33	22	48.89
	SS.	4	26.67	3	20	3	20	10	22.22
	Total	15	100	15	100	15	100	45	100

**Key - No= number of respondents, %= percentage calculated for No, M= Male respondents, F= Female respondents, N.S. = Natural science, SS. = Social science.*

As presented in table 4.2 above, from 45 (100%) teacher respondents 27 (60%) and 18 (40%) are males and females respectively. The age of respondents also presented in 4 groups ranging from 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, and above 50 years old. Based on this 17 (37.78%) are found within the age group of 21-30 years old, 19 (42.22%) teacher respondents have an age ranging 31-40, and 9 (20%) teacher respondents are aged between 41 & 50 years old. As we can see from the table, no teacher respondent is above 50 years old. Regarding their educational background or qualification, all teacher participants 45 (100%) are first-degree holders. The researcher has also presented work experience of teachers by classifying in 4 groups as 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and above 16 years of service. As indicated above from 45 (100%) teacher respondents 6

(13.33%) teachers have experience of 1-5 years, 12 (26.67%) have an experience of 6-10 years, 17 (37.78%) have an experience of 11-15 years, and 10 (22.22%) have above 16 years experience. Moreover, regarding the teacher participants field of study, from 45 (100%) teacher participants 13 (28.89%), 22 (48.89%), and 10 (22.22%) teachers are from language, natural science, and social science streams (departments) respectively.

Table 4.3. Distribution of Principals Respondents

General characteristics		Sample Schools							
		Ethio-Japan Hidasie secondary school		Fitawrary Abayneh secondary school		Kality secondary school		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Sex	M	1	100	1	100	1	100	3	100
	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	1	100	1	100	1	100	3	100
Age	21-30	-	-	-	-	1	100	1	33.33
	31-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	41-50	1	100	-	-			1	33.33
	>50	-	-	1	100	-	-	1	33.33
	Total	1	100	1	100	1	100	3	100
Qualification	BSC/BED	-	-	1	100	1	100	2	66.67
	MSC/MA	1	100	-	-	-	-	1	33.33
Work experience	1-5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6-10	-	-			1	100	1	33.33
	11-15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	>16	1	100	1	100	-	-	2	66.67
	Total	1	100	1	100	1	100	3	100
Field of study (Stream)	Subject area	-	-	1	100	1	100	2	66.67
	Leadership	1	100	-	-	-	-	1	33.33
	Total	1	100	1	100	1	100	3	100

**Key - No= number of respondents, %= percentage calculated for No, M= Male respondents, F= Female respondents, BSC/BED= Bachelor of Science/ Education, MSC/MA= Masters of Science/ Art*

As stated on table 4.3above, principals were taken from the selected sample schools to collect data through interview. Three of the principals selected as sample population of principals were males. From the 3 (100%) principals who has participated in this study, 1 (33.33%), 1 (33.33%), and 1 (33.33%) are found within the age groups ranging 21-30 years, 41-50 years, and above 50 years old respectively.

In addition to sex and age characteristics educational background (qualification), work experience, and field of study of the sample principals were presented. As indicated above 1 (33.33%), and 2 (66.67%) are first degree and MA graduates respectively. Among these 2 (66.67%) of them are subject area graduates (like Amharic, English, Geography …etc.). Whereas the remaining 1 (33.33%) is leadership graduate. Regarding their work experience 2 (33.33%), and 2 (66.67%) participants from principals and vice-principals have an experience of 6-10 years, and above 16 years respectively.

4.2. Presentation of Data

This section was about the presentation and analysis of results of both quantitative and qualitative data collected from teachers, students, and principals through questionnaires and interview. It was classified in to sub-sections based on the variables where the researcher was intended to investigate.

Regarding items employed to collect valuable data, 42 close-ended and 5 open items were distributed for teachers. Similarly, 42 of the close-ended items were also used to gather data from students. 3 principals were also successfully interviewed 5 items each. For teachers 45, and for students 180 copies of items were distributed. Among these, all of 45 copies from teachers were successfully returned with full information. While, from 180 copies distributed to students 172 (95.56%) copies were returned with full of necessary information, but 3 (1.66%) are not returned from the respondents and 5 (2.78%) copies were returned with incomplete information.

The respondents are required to indicate their view by using the choice that represents weights for their level of agreement. The weight of choices was presented as 5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= somewhat agree, 2=disagree, and 1= strongly disagree. Since the scale consists of 5 points value; the weight of the mean score value =2.5 was taken as average, mean score value ranging from 2.5 to 3.5 moderate, mean score value greater than 3.5 and less than 2.5 were regarded as high and low accordingly.

The information on the tables used to present the data of the study are described using the following abbreviations. No= number, F= Frequency, %= Percentage of Respondents from the Total, A.M= Average mean SA=5=strongly agree, A= 4=Agree, SW=3=somewhat agree, DA=2= Disagree, SDA= 1=strongly disagree

4.2.1. Perception of Teachers and Students about 1 to 5 CGL

Concerning to the perception of teachers and students about 1 to 5 CGL the researcher has distributed six items. The items were focus to assess the respondents' level of agreement or trust mainly on the purpose or necessity of 1 to 5 CGL. The respondents are required to indicate their level of agreement or trust from the choice represented with their weighted value as strongly agree=5, Agree= 4, somewhat agree=3, Disagree=2, strongly disagree= 1

Table 4.4. Perceptions of teachers and students about 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement							Total	Mean	A. M
		Respondents		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	Teachers and students trust on the value of 1to5 cooperative learning for academic achievement	Teachers	F	10	10	12	7	6	45	3.24	2.88
			%	22.22	22.22	26.67	15.56	13.33	20.74		
		Students	F	27	15	14	57	59	172	2.52	
			%	15.69	8.72	8.4	33.14	34.30	79.26		
2	1 to 5 cooperative learning groups are used for non-academic agendas.	Teachers	F	11	9	10	9	6	45	3.22	3.15
			%	24.44	20	22.22	20	13.33	20.74		
		Students	F	33	45	29	35	30	172	3.09	
			%	19.18	26.16	16.86	20.15	17.44	79.26		
3	1to5 cooperative group learning is believed as time-consuming task for students and teachers.	Teachers	F	10	15	8	4	8	45	3.33	3.49
			%	22.22	33.33	17.78	8.89	17.78	20.74		
		Students	F	42	73	23	24	10	172	3.66	
			%	24.42	42.44	13.37	13.95	5.81	79.26		
4	It provides an extra work load (burden of task) for teachers and students	Teachers	F	12	14	8	7	5	45	3.53	3.55
			%	26.67	31.11	17.78	15.56	11.11	20.74		
		Students	F	52	50	32	18	20	172	3.56	
			%	30.23	29.07	18.60	10.47	11.63	79.26		
5	It is implemented for report purpose.	Teachers	F	14	13	9	6	3	45	3.64	3.48
			%	31.11	28.89	20	13.33	6.67	20.74		
		Students	F	43	46	33	25	25	172		
			%	25	26.74	19.19	14.53	14.53	79.26	3.33	
6	1to5 cooperative group learning makes Students academically dependent.	Teachers	F	9	15	13	4	4	45	3.47	3.35
			%	20	33.33	28.89	8.89	8.89	20.74		
		Students	F	40	37	40	33	22	172	3.23	
			%	23.25	21.51	23.25	19.19	12.79	79.26		
			%	20	33.33	28.89	8.89	8.89	20.74		
		Students	F	40	37	40	33	22	172	3.23	
			%	23.25	21.51	23.25	19.19	12.79	79.26		

The researcher has used six items presented on table 4.4 to assess the perception of teachers and students for 1 to 5 CGL and average mean value of respondents indicate that teachers and students perception as positive. For this claim the researcher has discuss each item as follows.

Regarding item 4 both teacher and student respondents mean score 3.53 and 3.56 respectively and also the mean average of the two groups of respondents 3.55 indicate that they strongly agree as 1 to 5 CGL provides an extra work load (burden of task) for students and teachers.

On item 1 about teachers and students trust, the mean value of teacher and student respondents 3.24 and 2.52 respectively as well as the average mean of the two groups 2.88 indicates that both teachers and students moderately agree on the value of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning for academic achievement of students. Concerning item 2 about for what purpose (for academic or non-academic agendas) did 1 to5 CGL used for the mean score 3.22 and 3.06 of teachers and students agreement respectively and also the average mean 3.14 shows that they moderately agree that 1 to 5 CGL are used for non-academic agendas. Similarly, on item 3 the table presents that the average mean 3.49 of the two groups of respondents show as they moderately agree on the idea 1 to5 CGL is time-consuming for both teachers and students. On this item, however teacher respondents have moderate view with mean 3.33; and student respondents mean 3.66 shows that they strongly perceive 1 to5 CGL as time-consuming task for teachers and students.

On contrary to this, on item 5 which states that 1 to 5 CGL is conducted for the purpose of report, the teacher respondents' level of agreement mean score 3.64 which shows their strong agreement whereas student respondents mean 3.33 shows moderate agreement. On item 6 both teacher and student respondents level of agreement with mean value of 3.47 and 3.23 respectively and the mean average of the two respondent groups indicate that teachers and students moderately agree that 1to 5 CGL makes students academically dependent.

In addition to this, the teacher respondents on an open-ended question 'what do you think about teachers and students perception regarding 1 to 5 CGL program?' strengths the above analysis. Teacher respondents' reflection on this item shows both teachers and students consider 1 to 5 CGL program especially after class program as non-academic that is not included in curriculum policy and as intentionally add work intended to make teachers and students over loaded. Some

participants also stated as the program has its own non-academic hidden purpose. These all indicates that teachers and students have negative attitude for this study program.

Moreover, concerning the perception of teachers and students about 1 to 5 CGL the qualitative data from principals' interview confirms the teacher and student respondents view. In relation to this, the researcher has forwarded an interview item, 'How do you see the teachers and students perception about 1 to 5 cooperative group learning?' principals remarked their views as follows.

"Although it is difficult to say all teachers and students do not have good feeling for 1 to 5 program, teachers and students are not interested to practice. Partially there are teachers and students who trust on its importance use different ways to use 1 to 5 CGL during or after their regular class. However, most teachers consider and say this 1 to 5 program 'non academic program, created for political consumption to make teachers restless, makes students dependent.' In addition to these teachers, say that it does not add anything to ensure quality of education. It helps student to get marks inappropriately, it enforces group leader students to become overloaded by doing more group works."

The other principal on the same interview 'How do you see the teachers and students' perception about 1 to 5 CGL?' responded as follows.

"It is difficult to describe the perception of teachers, students, or other principals about this issue. Because always we observe different feelings and hear various expressions about 1 to 5 CGL Program from teachers and students and sometimes there are principals who blame it. School principals become strong to enforce both teachers and students to involve on the program. However, some students want to discuss on assignments and project works most of them says 'why we lost our time why do not go to our home?' and at the same time teachers also blame as 'why we … for their report'."

"1 to 5 CGL was very essential instructional method. We always try to convince both teachers and students to use it even in their regular class. Yet, some students say that 'why don't we learn appropriately most students are talking out the lesson and disturbing others.' Teachers also blame that students are not interested to work in 1 to 5 groups; why do not you make students to trust on its value. However, it is not new we are facing challenges from teachers and students."

Concerning people's perception and belief Richardson, (1996), stated as "Attitudes and beliefs are a subset of a group of constructs that name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person's actions." According to this saying ones belief and attitude determines the success or failure of a task. Active teaching earning pedagogy enhances learners to make maximum interaction with classmates (Derebsa, 2006). In relation to this the findings of a local study on practice and attitude of Bulbula school community towards implementation of active learning indicates the existence of misperception of teachers towards active learning (Betel. 2011). In the same way the qualitative and quantitative data analysis of this study indicates that teachers and students attitude towards 1 to 5 CGL is not as such well. Teachers and students believe it as non-professional task and their trust on its value is low. Therefore as stated earlier attitude and belief is direct reflection of success in practice.

4.2.2. The value of 1 to 5 Cooperative Group Learning

As described by Moreno, Cosio, (1954), scholars agree that cooperative learning is an effective tool to realize improvement of students' academic achievement as well as social relationships in various disciplines at all grade levels. However, its effectiveness is determined by its way of implementation including students' knowledge and experience as well as teachers' goals and management. In turn, this can also determined by the practitioners' acceptance and trust including its value. Practically it is important to assess the teachers and students acceptance and trust regarding the values or benefits for teachers, students, or society. Concerning to this the researcher has distributed ten items that are direct or indirect benefits of 1 to 5 CGL. The items were focus to assess the respondents' level of agreement or trust mainly on the value of 1 to 5 CGL. The respondents are required to indicate their level of agreement or trust from the choice represented with their weighted value as strongly agree=5, Agree= 4, somewhat agree=3, Disagree=2, strongly disagree= 1

Table 4.5 The value of 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement							Total	Mean	A.M
		Respondents		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	1 to 5 cooperative group learning enhance students for better achievement	Teachers	F	9	10	8	11	8	45	3.08	2.68
			%	20	22.22	17.78	24.44	17.78	20.74		
		Students	F	17	16	32	46	57	172	2.29	
			%	9.88	9.30	18.60	26.74	33.14	79.26		
2	It enables students to share various socio cultural aspects with their classmates.	Teachers	F	4	6	10	15	10	45	2.51	2.44
			%	8.89	13.33	22.22	33.33	22.22	20.74		
		Students	F	14	24	29	50	55	172	2.37	
			%	8.14	13.95	16.86	29.07	31.97	79.26		
3	1 to 5 cooperative group learning develops self-confidence, self-esteem, and critical thinking skill	Teachers	F	3	4	6	7	25	45	1.96	2.35
			%	6.67	8.89	13.33	15.56	55.56	20.74		
		Students	F	19	23	37	59	53	172	2.73	
			%	11.05	13.37	21.51	34.30	30.81	79.26		
4	It encourages students to develop face-to-face communication skills	Teachers	F	6	7	11	10	11	45	2.71	2.66
			%	13.33	15.56	24.44	22.22	24.44	20.74		
		Students	F	17	29	37	52	35	172	2.62	
			%	9.88	16.86	21.51	30.23	20.35	79.26		
5	It is used to promote diversity among students and society (e.g. ethnic, language and culture)	Teachers	F	4	8	11	14	7	45	2.67	2.58
			%	8.88	17.78	24.44	31.11	15.56	20.74		
		Students	F	20	22	29	56	41	172	2.49	
			%	11.62	12.79	16.86	32.56	23.84	79.26		
6	It enhances the progress of development in democratic culture.	Teachers	F	4	6	10	8	10	45	2.22	2.31
			%	8.89	13.33	22.22	17.78	22.22	20.74		
		Students	F	16	17	43	40	56	172	2.40	
			%	9.30	9.88	25	23.26	32.56	79.26		
7	It makes the activities, assignments, project works or worksheets more simple/easy to complete	Teachers	F	6	12	10	10	6	45	2.98	2.94
			%	13.33	26.67	22.22	22.22	13.33	20.74		
		Students	F	37	28	25	43	39	172	2.89	
			%	21.51	16.27	14.53	26	22.67	79.26		
8	1 to 5 cooperative group learning develops positive interaction between teachers and students	Teachers	F		11	13	14	7	45		2.56
			%	8.89	24.44	28.89	31.11	15.56	20.74	2.62	
		Students	F	23	19	30	51	49	172		
			%	13.37	11.05	17.44	29.65	28.49	79.26	2.51	
9	1 to 5 cooperative groups learning used to cover large (broad) contents effectively.	Teachers	F	5	10	12	8	10	45	2.82	2.69
			%	11.11	22.22	26.67	17.78	22.22	20.74		
		Students	F	24	28	22	42	56	172	2.57	
			%	13.95	16.28	12.79	24.42	32.56	79.26		
10	1 to 5 cooperative group learning reduces the teachers burden/work load/	Teachers	F		2	9	7	23	45	1.96	2.15
			%		4.44	20	15.56	51.11	20.74		
		Students	F	27	37	34	39	45	172	2.95	
			%	15.69	21.51	19.77	22.67	26.16	79.26		

However, the respondents view on items regarded as benefits of 1 to 5 CGL score a mean value ranging from 1.96 to 3.08 for teachers and from 2.22 to 2.89 for students. The mean average of the two respondent groups indicates that they moderately agree on five items (1, 4, 5, 7, & 8) and have low agreement on the remaining five items (2, 3, 6, 9, & 10). As table 6 above shows that on two items item 4= 2.71& 2.62 and item **7** =2.89 and 2.98, score a mean value of teacher and student respondent groups accordingly. This indicates both teachers and students moderately agree on the value of 1 to 5 CGL to encourage students to develop face- to- face communication skills as well as to make the activities, assignments, project works, and/or worksheets more simple or easy to complete. In addition to this item 8 shows that both teacher and student respondent groups independently have moderate agreement with mean= 2.62 and 2.51 respectively and also the mean average of the two groups 2.56 shows that they moderately agree on the value of 1 to 5 CGL to develop smooth interaction between teachers and students.

In contrary to this there are too extreme differences on the mean value score which show the agreement of teacher and student respondents on items 3 & 10. Although the mean average score 2.35 and 2.15 of the two respondent groups respectively show low agreement of respondents on these two items, student respondents score mean= 2.73 for item 3 and 2.95 for item 10 and teacher respondents level of agreement score a mean value 1.96 for each. This, indicates that students have moderately agree on the benefits of 1 to 5 CGL to develop self-confidence, self-esteem, and students critical thinking skill as well as to reduce the teachers burden of work load. However, teacher respondents mean value 1.96 shows that they have very low level of agreement on the benefits of 1 to 5 CGL to develop self-confidence, self-esteem, and students' critical thinking skill as well as to reduce the teachers' burden of workload. In the same way on item, 1 about the value of 1 to 5 CGL to enhance students for better achievement student respondents' level of agreement with mean 2.29 indicates their low agreement on this value. Whereas teacher respondents level of agreement 3.08 shows that teachers moderately agree on the importance of 1 to 5 CGL to enhance students for better achievement. Nevertheless, the mean average of the two respondent groups 2.68 reflects that the respondents commonly have moderately agreed on this value. Concerning items 5, and 9, the average mean of the two respondent groups 2.58, and 2.69, respectively show moderate agreement of teachers and students on the value of 1 to 5 cooperative groups learning to promote diversity (ethnic, language, culture…), to complete large (broad) contents easily and effectively. Moreover, the respondents have moderate agreement on

the value of 1 to 5 CGL to enable students to share various socio cultural aspects with their classmates as well as to enhance the progress of development in democratic culture.

In addition to this concerning items 2 and 6 the average mean value of the two respondent groups 2.44, and 2.31 respectively show low agreement of teachers and students on the value of 1 to 5 CGL for development in democracy.

The qualitative data from principals' interview also ensure most teachers and students blame the importance of 1 to 5 CGL program. Regarding the value of 1 to 5 CGL on an interview, how do you see 1 to 5 CGL in relation to its importance and implementation? The principals of the selected sample schools told as;

> "Honestly, I trust and recognize the importance of 1 to 5 CGL. Students get an opportunity to find out knowledge by themselves. It makes our students' critical thinker, creative, confident. However, our teachers and students are not interested/ ready to use it. In most cases, they do not accept its value; they blame and give inappropriate definition."

"Everyone can understand that 1 to 5 CGL has different advantages for students and teachers. It helps teachers to cover wide contents more easily, to give different project works to assess in groups etc. and for students to help to each other academically for better achievement, to share different cultural values with classmates, as well as to develop their communication skills. Yet, either students or teachers do not believe such benefits of the program. Sometimes parents also blame when students stay at school to attend the program. Due to these and other reasons, the level of implementation 1 to 5 CGL is at lower level."

One of a Principal of school also told, "Although there are teachers and students' having high expectation on the academic advantage of 1 to 5 CGL, their interest is dominated by others with negative view. School leaders have common understanding on the benefits and implementation strategies of the program. Partially there are also some teachers and students interested to use 1 to 5 CGL. However, most of teachers and students including group leaders consider it as valueless, time wasting program.' Such statements ensure that teachers and students have low agreement on the importance of 1 to 5 CGL.

Although different literatures as Arends, (1997), describes varieties of advantages as academic success, tolerance, and development of social skills in their diversified living environment that the learners can gain when cooperative group learning is implemented effectively, the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data from participants of the study indicates the acceptance of teachers and students is low.

4.2.3.Implementation of 1 to 5 Cooperative Group Learning

4.2.3.1.Implementation of School Focused Tasks or Activities

This part focuses on analysis of data regarding the respondents' view on the extent of practical implementation of school-focused tasks of 1 to 5 CGL. As institution, the school leaders are responsible bodies for success or failure of different programs. As 1 to 5 cooperative group formation and implementation guideline school principals should create conducive environment for effective implementation of 1 to 5 CGL program. Leading, facilitating, monitoring, and evaluation of 1 to 5 CGL program is one of the main task of school principals. Therefore, the role of the school for effectiveness of 1 to5 CGL should be assessed. For this reason, the researcher has distributed 5 items to assess whether the school is implementing the intended tasks for effectiveness 1 to 5 CGL or not.

Table 4.6. The implementation of school focused tasks or activities

No	Items	Degree of agreement							Total	Mean	A.M
		Respondents		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	The school has set a clear direction for implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.	Teachers	F	4	5	9	14	13	45	2.40	2.44
			%	8.89	11.11	20	28.89	26.67	20.74		
		Students	F	21	16	18	63	54	172	2.34	
			%	12.21	9.30	10.46	36.63	31.39	79.26		
2	The school communicates with parents on the implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.	Teachers	F	-	7	10	10	18	45	2.13	2.42
			%	-	15.56	22.22	22.22	40	20.74		
		Students	F	29	17	35	46	55	172	2.70	
			%	16.86	9.88	20.35	26.74	31.97	79.26		
3	The school principals involve and guide students during 1 to 5 cooperative group learning program.	Teachers	F	4	8	8	11	14	45	2.48	2.69
			%	8.89	17.78	17.78	24.44	31.11	20.74		
		Students	F	19	32	39	58	44	172	2.90	
			%	11.05	18.60	22.67	33.72	25.58	79.26		
4	School level trainings are given for students and teachers to implement 1 to 5 cooperative group learning effectively.	Teachers	F	-	4	11	20	10	45	2.20	2.17
			%	-	4.89	24.44	44.44	31.11	20.74		
		Students	F	5	21	35	42	69	172	2.31	
			%	2.91	12.21	20.53	24.42	40.11	79.26		
5	A school has common schedule to practice 1to5 cooperative learning before/after regular class.	Teachers	F	-	6	10	15	14	45	2.18	2.37
			%	-	13.33	22.22	33.33	31.11	20.74		
		Students	F	20	25	37	40	50	172	2.56	
			%	11.62	14.53	21.51	23.26	29.07	79.26		

As the analysis of data above on table, 4.6 shows that teacher and student respondents have different views about the degree of practice or implementation of school level activities of 1 to 5 CGL or study program for its effectiveness. Regarding all items designated as the school level tasks or activities, the mean score which indicates the teacher respondents view shows that their agreement as low. However, the student respondents moderately agree on three items 2, 3, and 5

with the mean score of 2.70, 2.90, and 2.56 respectively. Similarly, the mean average of the two respondent groups view shows that the agreement of teacher and student respondents is low on all items except item 3 about involvement of principals to guide students during 1 to 5 CGL program. On item 3 about involvement of principals to guide students during 1 to 5 CGL program the independent analysis of teacher and student respondents view score 2.48 and 2.90 respectively. The average mean of the two respondent groups 2.69 indicates their moderate agreement on the involvement of principals to guide students during 1 to 5 cooperative group learning program. But for the remaining items 1, 2, 4, and 5 the average mean score of teacher and student respondent groups level of agreement 2.44, 2.42, 2.17, and 2.37 respectively show their low agreement.

Moreover, the qualitative data from teachers through open-ended questionnaires and principals' interviewee of sample schools support the data on quantitative analysis.

'What tasks (activities) do you think of from school principals or tasks expected at school level in general for effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL? What tasks do you suggest to perform to improve its implementation and effectiveness?' In relation to this open-ended item; rewarded for teacher participants, the respondents confirm that the school principals always perform routine activities. They order homeroom teachers to organize CGL teams and post teachers program to facilitate or coordinate the daily program. They always run through all classrooms from the beginning to the end of 1 to 5 CGL program. Their monitoring and evaluation system is poor they simply collect attendances and worksheets from teachers who are assigned as facilitators. To improve the level of implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL teachers forwarded that, the school principals should give school level trainings for students and teachers, create and apply different monitoring, evaluation systems, and seat clear statement on the implementation of this program. It is also important to make detail discussion and reach on agreement or consensus with teachers. The school should engage more to change the perception of the school community towards 1 to 5 CGL and to enhance teachers and students for its practical involvement. In addition to these, the researcher has discussed interview data from principals as follows depending on each item.

‘As principal of the school what is expected from you and your school as institution to make implementation of 1 to 5 CGL effective? What things are done well?

“As principle we school leaders were expected to facilitate trainings, to communicate stakeholders about the program, to assign and post facilitator teachers for after class 1 to 5 CGL program for each section, and facilitate them to run the program. However, we are not doing as such; we are running with students and sometimes fight with teachers. Instead of facilitating, we in force teachers to get in to their class before the students leave it and in force students to stay until the teachers come up with worksheets. During the program we principals round through all corridors and sometimes each class not to facilitate rather to control both teachers and students. Although different trainings related to this program are essential, I do not believe that such trainings are new for teachers.”

“Most of the activities were expected to be conducted by teachers and students by themselves. We order homeroom teachers to organize students in to 1 to 5 groups and collect list of the groups. During implementation, we assign and post teachers as coordinators for after class 1 to 5 CGL program for each class (section). Make students not to go to home before the program is closed. In addition to this, we also round through classrooms to control students and teachers work; collect attendances and worksheets after the program is completed. We discuss strong sides and limitations on meetings.”

“However, we want to give trainings, communicate, and convince teachers and students about the importance and practical implementation of 1 to 5 CGL, teachers always refuses or oppose such like agendas. Students are also not interested to implement. Due to these and other reasons, we prefer to order and control students and teachers to involve in program. For this, we have set clear direction and schedule. Nevertheless, there are difficulties to run the program effectively as scheduled.”

The overall response of participants through questionnaire and interview (qualitative and quantitative) data analysis indicates that the implementation or practice of School focused tasks or activities of 1 to 5 CGL are at lower level.

4.2.3.2.Implementation of Teachers Activities

The effectiveness of cooperative learning approach depends on students' knowledge and experience as well as teachers' instructional goals and management (Moreno, Cosio, 1954). Cooperative group learning should be supported by continuous observation and feedback of teachers about how students are implementing and about tasks what they are working on for its effectiveness (Johnson et al.1984).Based on this the researcher has used the following items to assess to what extent the teachers activities are practiced or implemented in the selected sample schools.

Table 4.7.The implementation of teachers activities of 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement							Total	Mean	A.M
		Respondents		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	Teachers organize 1 to 5 cooperative learning groups scientifically.	Teachers	F	5	6	10	13	11	45	2.57	2.51
			%	11.11	13.33	22.22	28.88	24.44	20.74		
		Students	F	19	23	30	43	57	172	2.44	
			%	11.05	6.39	17.44	25	33.14	79.26		
2	Teachers explain the learning objectives of 1to 5 cooperative learning in advance.	Teachers	F	5	4	11	12	13	45	2.47	2.25
			%	11.11	4.44	24.44	26.67	28.89	20.74		
		Students	F	6	15	23	61	67	172	2.02	
			%	3.49	8.72	13.37	35.47	38.95	79.26		
3	All teachers prepare and give 1 to 5 cooperative group-learning work sheets.	Teachers	F	4	11	10	11	9	45	2.78	2.65
			%	8.89	24.44	22.22	24.44	20	20.74		
		Students	F	20	32	31	35	42	172	2.52	
			%	11.63	18.60	18.02	20.35	24.42	79.26		
4	Teachers motivate & reward students to work in 1to5 cooperative group learning.	Teachers	F	3	7	8	19	8	45	2.51	2.47
			%	6.67	15.56	17.78	42.22	17.78	20.74		
		Students	F	-	23	49	60	57	172	2.42	
			%	-	6.39	22.67	34.88	41.86	79.26		
5	1 to 5 cooperative group learning approach is commonly practiced in a regular class	Teachers	F	4	6	10	13	12	45	2.49	2.30
			%	8.89	13.33	22.22	28.89	26.67	20.74		
		Students	F	-	28	32	43	69	172	2.11	
			%	-	16.28	18.60	25	40.12	79.26		
6	Teachers give feedback for 1 to 5 cooperative group learning works	Teachers	F	5	5	9	16	10	45	2.89	2.43
			%	11.11	11.11	20	35.56	22.22	20.74		
		Students	F	-	19	24	51	88	172	1.97	
			%	-	11.04	13.95	29.65	51.16	79.26		
7	All teachers summarize the students' 1to5 cooperative learning discussion on the spot.	Teachers	F	6	5	7	16	13	45	2.58	2.33
			%	13.33	11.11	15.56	35.56	28.89	20.74		
		Students	F	7	12	31	59	63	172	2.07	
			%	4.07	6.98	18.02	34.30	36.63	79.26		

As presented in table 4.7 above concerning teacher focused tasks or activities of 1 to 5 CGL only one item or activity has moderately agreed by the two of respondent groups. Regarding this item (item 3) the teacher and student respondents mean value 2.78 and 2.52 respectively and also their average mean score 2.65 indicates that the two groups moderately agree on the idea that all teachers prepare and give 1 to 5 CGL work sheets for their students.

Although the teacher respondents level of agreement on items 1, 4, 6, and 7 shows that teachers moderately agree with respective mean value of 2.57, 2.71, 2.89, and 2.58; student respondents mean value 2.44, 2.42, 1.97, and 2.07 accordingly indicates that their agreement is low. However, the average mean value 2.51, 2.47, 2.43, and 2.33 respectively indicates low agreement except the first activity, which has a moderate agreement. The average mean value of item 2, and 5scored 2.25 and 2.30 accordingly indicates below moderate.

Generally, the analysis of the data from teacher and student respondents about the practical implementation of teacher focused tasks or activities indicate that it is poor. Because except one item (item 3) which scored an average mean of 2.65 the average mean value of the other items is below 2.50 which is low.

Teachers also connect their view about practical implementation of their 1 to 5 CGL activities with the open-ended item 'How do you describe the practical involvement of teachers and students in 1 to 5 CGL program?' In relation to this, the teachers view indicates that practically teachers can use 1 to 5 CGL in their regular class and make the after class 1-to 5 study programs more effective. However, their interest is very low. Without willingness, no one can do effective work. Teachers believe that there is a gap between the intended goal of 1 to 5 CGL and its practical implementation. Not only teachers but also school community including principals any one does not carry out his/her role.

In addition to quantitative data analysis here, there are also principal interviewees' views on the level of performance of teachers' activity of 1 to 5 CGL by relating the interview 'What are the roles of teachers in 1 to 5 CGL and to what extent they are practically implemented?' regarding these Principals of the sample schools side that;

"Actually, for effective implementation of 1 to 5 CGL program and success of students learning a lot of activities are expected from teachers starting from organizing 1 to 5 CGL to facilitating

the discussion as well as assessing and giving feedback. However, there are gaps on practice. This is due to their low motivation/interest."

"There are different tasks of teachers to run the program effectively. For example, Homeroom teachers form groups, all teachers are expected to prepare and give different group work tasks or worksheets, and coordinating and facilitating the discussion when they are assigned as coordinator is the role of every teacher. In addition to this, subject teachers have responsibility of elaborating and giving conclusion about the main points of the groups learning. Although teachers are not working as such sometimes, students come with complains on their teachers. Such complains include 'our group is large in number of members, our class is full of disturbance teacher don't support, some teachers do not elaborate our discussion they simple pass by saying you have discussed in 1 to 5 CGL.' When we observe during 1 to 5 CGL, some teachers move here and there out of class and others simply seat on table and play with their mobiles."

As described by Ashman and Gillies ,(1997), organizing students into groups carefully with high attention and providing trainings regarding how to interact and participate with each other as well as about the contributions and tasks expected from for success. Moreover, organizing students learning opportunities, dealing with students' heterogeneity, managing students learning and progression as well as working in team are some of good teacher competencies (MOE, 2011). However, the overall response of participants through questionnaire and interview (qualitative and quantitative) data analysis indicates the implementation of teacher related tasks or activities of 1 to 5 CGL are at lower level.

4.2.3.3. Implementation of Student Activities in 1 to 5 CGL

Students are the main practitioners and beneficiaries of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning program. Because as different sources indicate there are varieties of advantages as academic success, tolerance, and development of social skills in their diversified living environment that the learners can gain when cooperative group learning is implemented effectively (Arends, 1997). Since they are direct and primary beneficiaries' of this program, students should have to play active role on its implementation. Therefore, to assess the researchers has used the following items.

Table 4.8The implementation of students activities in 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement							Total	Mean	A.M
		Respondents		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	Students organize themselves in to 1 to 5 cooperative learning groups.	Teachers	F	3	6	8	15	13	45	2.36	2.41
			%	6.67	13.33	17.78	33.33	28.89	20.74		
		Students	F	18	25	30	44	55	172	2.46	
			%	10.47	14.53	17.44	25.58	31.98	79.26		
2	Students actively engage on discussions to complete 1 to 5 cooperative group learning worksheets or activities.	Teachers	F	-	9	13	12	11	45	2.44	2.51
			%	-	20	28.89	26.67	24.44	20.74		
		Students	F	17	28	39	42	46	172	2.58	
			%	9.88	16.28	22.67	24.42	26.74	79.26		
3	Students use their 1 o 5 cooperative learning teams to do their assignments & project works/ tasks effectively.	Teachers	F	5	6	15	10	9	45	2.73	2.73
			%	11.11	13.33	33.33	22.22	20	20.74		
		Students	F	22	34	31	45	40	172	2.72	
			%	12.79	19.77	18.02	26.16	23.25	79.26		
4	In 1to 5 cooperative group learning program, students work attentively to help to each other.	Teachers	F	4	7	9	12	13	45	2.49	2.45
			%	8.89	15.56	20	31.11	28.89	20.74		
		Students	F	14	27	24	58	49	172	2.40	
			%	8.14	15.69	13.95	33.72	28.48	79.26		
5	In cooperative group students debate and commonly agree on their point of discussion or activity.	Teachers	F	3	8	11	13	10	45	2.58	2.54
			%	6.67	17.78	13.33	28.89	22.22	20.74		
		Students	F	18	22	33	52	47	172	2.49	
			%	10.47	12.79	19.19	30.23	27.32	79.26		
6	Students present their 1 to 5 cooperative group works to the class	Teachers	F	-	5	15	15	10	45	2.33	2.21
			%	-	11.11	33.33	33.33	22.22	79.26		
		Students	F	-	16	41	56	59	172	2.08	
			%	-	9.30	23.84	27.32	34.30	79.26		

Concerning item 1 about cooperation of students in to 1 to 5 CGL groups majority of teacher respondents 33.33% and 28.89% disagree and strongly disagree respectively. Similarly about 25.58% and 31.98% of student respondents disagree and strongly disagree accordingly. The average mean values 2.41 of the two respondent groups also indicate low agreement of participants on the practical implementation of this activity.

Similarly, on item 4 about the attention of students to work to help to each other, 31.11% teacher and 37.72% student respondents disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In addition to this 28.89% and 28.48%, student respondents disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In the same way, the average mean value of the two respondent groups 2.45 indicates that students

have low attention to help to each other when they are working in 1 to 5 CLG. Based on this it is possible to say that they are simply seating or working to attend the program.

Regarding item 6 about students' reflection of their 1 to 5 cooperative group work, majority of student respondents 27.32% and 34.30% disagree and strongly disagree accordingly. From the total of 45 (100%) teacher respondents 10% strongly disagree, 15% disagree, and 15% somewhat agree. The average mean value 2.21 of teacher and student respondents view indicates that students do not reflect their 1 to 5 cooperative group work.

Concerning items 2, 3, & 5 the highest percentage of respondents view revolves on somewhat agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Although the independent analysis of each respondent group (students and/or teachers alone) shows different level of agreement on each item, the mean average value of 2.51, 2.73, and 2.54 respectively indicates that they have moderate agreement.

As described before teachers also connect their view about practical implementation of students 1 to 5 CGL activities with the open-ended item 'How do you describe the practical involvement of teachers and students in 1 to 5 CGL program?' In relation to this, the teachers view indicates that practically students can use 1 to 5 CGL in their regular class and make the after class 1-to 5 study programs more effective if teachers carry out their to coordinate and facilitate them.. However, the students and teachers interest is very low. Without willingness, no one can do effective work. Teachers believe that there is a gap between the intended goal of 1 to 5 CGL and its practical implementation. Not only teachers and students but also school community including principals any one does not carry out his/her role as guideline.

Cooperative group learning is a way in which students are organized in to small teams to work together to promote their own and group members learning. It is an opportunity for students to debate and assess their knowledge to fill their understanding gaps (Gillies and Ashman, 1997). Working in team with the spirit of self-help and learning is one of the competencies expected from students (MOE, 2011). Moreover, the ministry of education promotes the implementation of cooperative learning as one of active methods of teaching. Because students gain social and academic benefits and it helps to develop the students' problem solving-capacity & competencies (MoE, 2002). In addition to this, as Walmsley and Muniz, (2003), cooperative learning is a pedagogical approach in which students allowed to work with group members having

heterogeneous abilities on subject matter or content to help to each other. However, the data analysis of this study indicates that the students' level of performance (involvement) in practical implementation of 1 to 5 CGL is at low level.

4.2.4. Factors Hindering the Implementation of 1 to 5 Cooperative Group Learning

As described by Muhamed, (2012), the implementation of cooperative learning encounters various challenges. As a study on cooperative learning practice in Haramaya University, Ethiopia in college of education and behavioral sciences, there are serious problems as the motivation of students to work in groups, time shortage, as well as failure of instructors to give relevant feedback on time (Muhamed, 2012). In relation to this, the researcher has adopted the following items to assess the factors that may hinder implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL in selected study area. The respondents are required to indicate their level of agreement or trust that those factors are limiting and the practitioners' (teachers and students) are facing challenges to implement effectively.

Table 4.9 Factors that hinder effectiveness in implementation of 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement							Total	Mean	A.M
		Respondents		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA			
				5	4	3	2	1			
1	Low understanding of teachers and students about 1 to 5 cooperative group learning	Teachers	F	9	14	12	5	5	45	3.37	3.44
			%	20	31.11	26.67	11.11	11.11	20.74		
		Students	F	45	59	28	19	21	172	3.51	
			%	26.16	34.30	16.28	11.05	12.21	79.26		
2	Unwillingness of students to work in 1to5 cooperative learning group	Teachers	F	16	12	5	8	-	45	3.52	3.74
			%	35.56	26.67	11.11	17.78	-	20.74		
		Students	F	72	58	18	13	11	172	3.96	
			%	41.86	33.72	10.47	7.56	6.39	79.26		
3	Unwillingness of teachers to implement 1 to 5 cooperative group learning	Teachers	F	11	14	9	7	4	45	3.45	3.6
			%	24.44	31.11	20	15.56	8.88	20.74		
		Students	F	61	54	29	11	17	172	3.75	
			%	35.47	31.39	16.86	6.39	9.88	79.26		
4	Poor coordination of students in group	Teachers	F	10	15	10	6	4	45	3.44	3.62
			%	22.22	33.33	22.22	13.33	8.88	20.74		
		Students	F	52	69	23	20	8	172	3.79	
			%	30.23	40.11	13.37	11.63	4.65	79.26		
5	Very large group size and Uncomfortable seating arrangement of students	Teachers	F	19	9	7	5	5	45	3.70	3.72
			%	42.22	20	15.56	11.11	11.11	20.74		
		Students	F	56	60	27	15	14	172	3.73	
			%	32.56	34.88	15.69	8.72	8.14	79.26		
6	Reluctance of teachers to give periodic feedback for students work on time	Teachers	F	8	14	10	6	7	45	3.30	3.43
			%	17.78	31.11	22.22	13.33	15.56	20.74		
		Students	F	57	43	30	25	17	172	3.55	
			%	33.14	25	17.44	14.53	9.88	79.26		
7	Lack of principals attention and support to facilitate its implementation	Teachers	F	11	10	15	6	3	45	3.45	3.37
			%	24.44	22.22	33.33	13.33	6.67	20.74		
		Students	F	39	45	39	23	26	172	3.28	
			%	22.67	26.16	22.67	13.37	15.11	79.26		
8	Poor training of teachers and principals to implement and coordinate 1to5	Teachers	F	10	14	13	3	5	45	3.45	3.36
			%	22.22	31.11	28.89	6.67	11.11	20.74		
		Students	F	42	37	41	29	23	172	3.27	
			%	24.42	21.51	23.84	16.86	13.37	79.26		

As analysis shows that item 1 about low understanding of teachers and students as a factor for implementation of 1 to 5 CGL teacher respondents mean = 3.37 show that they have moderate agreement whereas students have high agreement with mean = 3.51. The average mean of the two respondent groups show that understanding of teachers and students as a moderate factor that hinder the implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

Item 2 about unwillingness of students to work in 1 to 5 CGL both teacher and student respondents strongly agree as it is a factor which hider the implementation of 1 to 5 CGL. On this item the independent mean score =3.52 and =3.96 of teachers and students respectively and the average mean of the two respondent groups level of agreement= 3.74 show that unwillingness of students to work in1 to 5 CGL is a powerful factor which limit its effectiveness and implementation. Similarly on item 3 about unwillingness of teachers to implement 1 to 5 CGL the teacher and student respondent groups mean =3.45 and= 3.75 respectively indicate that it has high impact on implementation and effectiveness of 1 to5 CGL with average mean =3.6.

Concerning item 4 about poor coordination of students in 1 to 5 CGL the mean score of teachers and students= 3.44 and= 3.79 respectively. This shows that, it is a moderate and strongly influential factor of its effective implementation accordingly. The average mean= 3.62 presents that poor coordination of students in 1 to5 CGL is a strong factor for its implementation. Regarding item 5 about very large group size and seating arrangement the independent mean value of teacher and student respondents= 3.70 and= 3.73 accordingly and average mean= 3.72 shows that very large group size and uncomfortable seating arrangement of students have high impact on implementation of 1 to 5 CGL.

On item 6 about reluctance of teachers to give periodic feedback for students work the analysis shows that teachers and students level of agreement score mean value= 3.30 and 3.55 respectively. This indicates that teachers moderately agree and students strongly agree on reluctance of teachers to give periodic and immediate feedback as a factor that retards the implementation of 1 to 5 CGL. The average mean 3.43 of the two respondent groups conclude that it is a moderate factor. Similarly, on item 7and on item 8concerning lack of principals' attention and support to facilitate the implementation of 1 to 5 CGL and poor training of students, teachers, and principals about 1 to 5 CGL as a factors that hinder the implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL respectively. Regarding these items teacher and student

participants level of agreement score mean= 3.45 and 3.28 respectively for item 7 and 3.45 and 3.27 for item 8-teacher and student participants respectively. The average mean of the two respondent groups score= 3.37 and 3.36 respectively for each item. From this, it is possible to conclude that lack of principals' attention to support and facilitate 1 ton 5 CGL program as well as lack (poor) training of students, teachers, and principals about 1 to 5 CGL are moderate factors which hinder the implementation of 1 to 5 CGL.

Regarding the factors hindering the implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL the researcher also, collected qualitative data from teachers through an open-ended item and principals of those selected sample schools strengths the teacher and student participants quantitative data analysis.

In relation to this, the researcher has forwarded an open-ended questionnaire 'what factors that limit implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL do you see in your school?' Concerning this item teacher respondents response confirm that low interest of students and lack of teachers' readiness to practice as well as the existence of large number of members in the group are the main factors for its low level of implementation and effectiveness. Moreover, the teachers and students trust and acceptance, group arrangement as well as the low monitoring and evaluation system of principals were described as the factors hindering the effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL program.

In response to the interview item, 'What do you think of about factors hindering implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL? What possible solutions do you think of to improve its implementation and effectiveness?'

Concerning to this Principals of schools in the sample schools side that; "Although it was very important to use 1 to 5 CGL as one of active pedagogical approaches to ensure quality of education we are facing a lot of challenges. Among those factors, the attitude related problems and lack of interest of teachers and students to accept or trust its implementation the most challenging. Our class size is also challenging to form groups. However, as principle the number of group members recommended are 5-7 but practically one group may have up to nine members depending on the class size. As solution, I expect that it is important to have detail discussion with teachers and students to have common agreement especially on its value and

implementation strategies. It is also important to have reward those who involve on the program more effectively and motivating others."

One of a Principal in the other sample school also described the factors as, "Reluctance and/ or unwillingness of teachers to facilitate students, to support the students' discussion through worksheets or by giving organized tasks. In addition to this, the presence of large number of students in a class is the other problem. Lack of understanding about its implementation strategies may hinder its effectiveness. However, it is not new for teachers' further trainings well enhance both teachers and students. Nevertheless, what I understand about the factors is not related to understanding problem/lack of knowledge rather I feel that it is more related to attitude problem or lack of trust and unwillingness of both teachers and students. Therefore, as a solution to improve its implementation and effectiveness, I think it is important to make more discussions to convince teachers and students and have common agreement as well as having good reward culture specifically based on the performance of tasks directly related to 1 to 5 CGL."

"Although the program is very important it is difficult to ensure its effectiveness without the acceptance of practitioners'. It as we know this activity is more close to teachers and students. Partially some students and teachers are interested to use in their regular class. However, most of the teachers and students are not interested to use it especially after class. 1 to 5 CGL are not suitable for effective discussion because when groups are formed one group may contain students with the same level of ability and have large number of members. There can be teachers' lack of knowledge about its value and implementation strategies. Even so, I do not expect that lack of understanding or knowledge is the main problem. Because we have counted long years talking about 1 to 5. Moreover, it is simply the other name of active teaching. The main problem was related to willingness and trust."

The qualitative and quantitative data analysis on this study confirms that the factor described on table 4.9 highly influences the effectiveness in implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Even though, all items described above on table 4.9 as factors hindering the implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL score average mean > 2.50 which is moderate, the average mean value of 3 items concerning unwillingness of teachers and students as well as the existence of large group size is >3.50 which indicates high agreement of the participants.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary

The main objective of this study was to assess 1 to 5 CGL in government secondary schools in AKSc focusing on its practices and challenges. The investigation was conducted in three secondary schools. About 220 participants from students, teachers, and principals were involved in the study. Questionnaires and interviews were employed to collect valuable data for the study.

Based on the both quantitative and qualitative analysis of data the researcher has set the following findings.

A. Regarding the perception of teachers and students about 1 to 5 CGL the study indicates that teachers and students acceptance or trust is low. Both teachers and students view it as time-consuming and extra or additional task for teachers and students implemented simply for report purpose. Groups formed to practice 1 to 5 CGL are used to run non-academic issues; it is created for political purpose and it does not serve for academic issue. There are teachers and students having perceiving that it makes students academically dependent.
B. Concerning the value of 1 to 5 CGL the quantitative and qualitative data analysis indicates two extreme ideas. As quantitative data indicates, there are teachers and students moderately agree that 1 to 5 CGL has academic, social, and other related benefits, some of participants agree that its benefit is not as such. However, the qualitative data confirms that multi-dimensional benefits. It passes from classroom (academic) to personality development.
C. The implementation of tasks (activities) expected from school leaders for effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL program are at low level. Instead of seating directions, communicating with stakeholders, as well as training teachers and students they are running alone. They does not mobilize the school community especially teachers and students.

D. As the average mean value of the two respondent groups as well as the qualitative analysis of data the tasks or activities expected from teachers for effectiveness of students 1 to 5 CGL is poor. Teachers are not interested to carry out their role effectively.

E. Students were expected to carry out a wide range of activities to practice 1 to 5 cooperative groups learning effectively. Nevertheless, this study shows that the level of implementation of 1 to 5 activities by students' is at 50% moderate 50% low.

F. Concerning the overall factors of 1 to 5 CGL, unwillingness of teachers and students, poor group coordination, as well as large group size and uncomfortable seating arrangement of students highly influence the effectiveness of implementation in 1 to 5 CGL. Gaps in training and reluctance of teachers to give feedback on the spot also have impact on the effective implementation of 1 to 5 CGL and students interest to involve. Similarly, attention of school principals to use different strategies to facilitate the involvement of teachers and students and its implementation is the other factor. Moreover, the group arrangement and monitoring and evaluation gaps are factors of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

5.2. Conclusions

The study has presented various aspects of 1 to 5 CGL focusing on its practice and challenges hindering effectiveness in its implementation. Based on the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data the researcher has drawn the following conclusions.

A. Regarding the perception of teachers and students, about 1 to 5 CGL the respondents moderately view that 1 to 5 CGL is tiresome, time consuming, and serve for non-academic purpose. Moreover, they view 1 to 5 CGL program as it is implemented simply for report purpose and make students academically dependent.

B. Regarding its value, 1 to 5 cooperative group learning is moderately important. It has academic and other societal benefits; but there are students and teachers who blame on it.

C. Concerning the practice (implementation) of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning is at low level. Nearly 30% of activities directly related with 1 to 5 CGL are practiced moderately while the implementation of the remaining 70% of teachers, students, and principals' tasks are at low level.

D. Unwillingness of students and teachers as well as poor coordination and large group size and uncomfortable settings are the most influential factors that hinder the practice of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn from the data analysis and findings of the study the researcher has recommended the following as possible solutions to enhance the practice of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning

- Awareness trainings should be provided for student on the role of one-to-five cooperative group learning. Different workshops and experience-sharing programs should be arranged for teachers.
- There should also be a strong monitoring and evaluation systems on not only groups but also individual teachers and students' performance.
- Teachers should have strong and continuous monitoring of the students performance not only as the group but also as the individual members. In addition to this, teachers should assess the students work as a group and individual and give feedback on the spot.
- Reward and re-enforcement procedures should be cultured based on their performance at school level.
- One to five cooperative learning group formations should focus on the existing performance of students rather than using the last grades' average score. Moreover, CGL groups should not be fixed throughout the semester (year).
- Teachers should culture the practice one-to-five cooperative group work throughout their teaching learning process. It should be practiced starting from the lower grades.
- Principals should try their own best to consider the student-classroom ratio as well as seating arrangement of students. Classrooms should have space for teachers to move freely to facilitate the students' discussion.
- Principals should delegate and share responsibility for others to coordinate especially for after class 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.
- Teachers should recognize their role and work with school principals to enhance the students' involvement on 1 to 5 CGL.

- School principals and supervisors (experts) should take practical actions to change the implementation gaps and to seat solutions for existing challenges of 1 to 5 CGL in secondary schools.
- Finally, the researcher recommends that further investigations on monitoring and evaluation system of supervisors and principals, access of materials needed to practice 1 to 5 CGL in regular class, and the rewarding and re-enforcement procedures and its role for effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL.

Reference

Addis Ababa City Government Education Bureau. (2006).1 to 5 Cooperative Work Group Formation and practice guideline.

Agashe L (2004). Sustainable Development and Cooperative Learning in the Formal Education System in India. Progress of Education. Pune: Pune Vidyarthi Griha Prakashan.

Ali, H. (2011). A comparison of cooperative learning and traditional lecture methods in the project management department of a tertiary level institution in Trinidad and Tobago. *The Caribbean Teaching Scholar*, 1(1),39-60. http://libraries.sta.uwi.edu/journals/ojs/index.php/cts/article/view/5

Antony R. Adams (2003). Cooperative Learning Effects on the Classroom .MA Thesis at Northern Michigan University (November 26, 2013).

Arends, I. (1997), Classroom Instruction and Management. Central Connecticut State University.

Aschettino, E. (1993). *Cooperative Learning Structures to foster student involvement in Cooperative learning and college teaching*, Vol. 4, No. 1

Berhanu Gebremichael. (2000). a study of the practices of cooperative learning in grade eleven: Group work organization in focus. (MA. Thesis). Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

BerhanuYayo. (2013). Teachers Knowledge, Attitude and Practice of Cooperative learning; (MA. Thesis).Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

Best and kohn (19890) Descriptive s survey method.

Betel Bekele, (2011). Practice and Perception of Bulbula school community towards the implementation of Active Learning in teaching English: Bulbula Secondary School MA Thesis: Addis Ababa University.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. 2000. Research Methods in Education. communication apprehension. *Emerging Leadership Journeys, 2*(1), 3-16.

Combs, A W, Avial, D Land Purkey,WW (1971) Helping relationships, Boston, Mass: Allyan& Bacon.

Cosio, M. (1998). Implementation of Cooperative Learning in Mexican high schools. doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Cowei, H., Smith, P. Boulton, M., & Laver, R. (1994). Cooperation in the Multiethnic Classroom: *The impact of cooperative group work on social relationships in middle school. London:* David Fulton Publishers

Creswell, J. (2003). Research Design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3rd ed.).

Daniel Ngaru Muraya and Githui Kimamo .(2011). Effects of Cooperative Learning Approach on biology mean achievement scores of secondary school students': *Machakos District, Kenya Educational Research and Reviews Vol. 6(12), pp. 726-745.*

Derebssa Dufera Serbessa, (2006), Tension between Traditional and Modern Teaching-Learning Approaches in Ethiopian Primary Schools Addis Ababa University CICE Hiroshima University, *Journal of International Cooperation in Education, Vol.9, No.1, (2006) pp.123- 140*

Dionigi, R.A. (2013). Implementing Cooperative Learning in Australia Primary Schools: Generalist Teachers' Perspective**.** *Issues in Educational Research,23(1), pp.52-68.*

Educational Research. 98 (6).1-15.

Effandi, Z., Zanaton, I (2007). Promoting Cooperative Learning in Science and Mathematics Education: *A Malaysian Perspective. Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ., 3(1): 35-39.*

Fahad, N.(2009). Students Attitude and Perception towards the Effectiveness of Mobile Learning in King Saud University, Saudi Arabia. *The Turkish Online Journal of Education Technology.*

Felder, M. and Brent. (2007).Cooperative Learning. Active Learning: Models from the Analytical Sciences, ACS Symposium Series 970, Chapter 4,pp. 34–53.Washington, DC: *American Chemical Society, 2007.State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-7905*

Geremew Sime, (2005). Engaging Students in Group- Based Cooperative Learning: Hawassa College of Teachers Education (Training manual for study group coordinators)

Gillies, Peter Renshaw & Thanh et al, (2008). Cooperative Learning (CL) and Academic Achievement of Asian Students: *A True Story. International Education Studies* (vol.1, no.3) www.ccsenet.org / Journal.htm/

Gillies, R. M., & Ashman, A. F. (2000).The effects of cooperative learning on students with learning difficulties in the lower elementary school Journal of Special Education, 34(1),19-27.

Hagos Haftu. (2012). The Major Challenges of Implementing Active Learning in EFL Classes of Wolita Sodo University. (MA Thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1989). Cooperation and competition: *Theory and Research. Edina, MN:* Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1990). Social skills for successful group work, Educational Leadership, 47 (4), 29-33.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1994). Learning together and alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and individualistic learning (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon. http://www.nactateachers.org

Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. (1999). Learning together and alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and individualistic learning (5th ed).

Johnson, D., Johnson, R., Stanne, M., & Garibaldi, A. (1990). Impact of group processing on achievement in cooperative groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 130, 507-516.

Li,M.P and Lam, B.H.(2013). The Active Classroom, Hong Kong Institute of education.

Liang X. (2002). Implementing Cooperative Learning In Efl Teaching: Process and Effects. (PhD Dissertation) National Taiwan Normal University

Ling X. (2015). *Application of cooperative learning approach:* teachers and students' perceptions towards cooperative learning. MA Thesis. State University of New York at Fredonia, New York .

Mary Koutselini (2009). Teachers Misconceptions and Understanding of Cooperative Learning: An Intervention Study 43 (2), 34-44

MoE, (1994). Ethiopian Education and Training Policy, Addis Ababa.

MoE, (2002). The Education and Training policy and its implementation. Addis Ababa

MoE, (2003). A National curriculum guideline for pre-service teacher education programs. Addis Ababa

MoE, (2013). School Improvement Planning Module Addis Ababa (November 2013)

Moreno, Cosio Macario, (1954).Implementation of cooperative learning in Mexican high schools. University of Arizona. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/282627

Muhammed Kedir Hiko, (2012). Cooperative Learning Practice in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya university, Ethiopia

Neuman, W.L. (2000). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches. 4th edition.

Neuman, W.L. (2003). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches.5th edition.

Nunan, D. (1992).*Collaborative language learning & teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panitz, T. (1996). *A Definition of Collaborative Learning Vs Cooperative Learning*. London Metropolitan University. July 25, 2005.

Pate, GS. (1988). Research on Reducing Prejudice. Social Education, vol 52, no 4,pp 287-289.

Richardson, V. (1996). *The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach*. In J. Sikula (Ed), Handbook of Research on Teachers Education. New York: Macmilla

Seid Mohammed.(2012). *Effects of Cooperative Learning on Reading Comprehension Achievement in EFL and Social Skills*. (PhD Dissertation). Addis Ababa University.

Sharan, S. (1980). Cooperative learning in small groups: recent methods and effects on achievement, attitudes, and ethnic relations. Review of Educational Research.

Sharan, S. (1984). Cooperative Learning in teams: Recent Methods and Effects on Achievement Attitudes and ethnic relations Review of Educational Research 50 (2), 241-271.

Sharan, S. (1994). Cooperation in the Multi Ethnic Classroom. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Siegel, C. (2005). Implementing a research based model of cooperative learning. *The Journal of*

Simsek, U.(2013) Effects of cooperative learning methods on social studies undergraduate students' achievement in political science. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies. 5 (1), 619-632*.

Slavin, R. (1987). Cooperative Learning: Where behavioral and humanistic approaches to classroom motivation meet.

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

Slavin, R. (1995). Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice (2nd Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. (1995). Instruction Based on Cooperative learning. Johns Hopkins University & University of York.

Slavin, R. E. (1987). Cooperative Learning and the Cooperative School. Educational Leadership, 45 (3).

Slavin, R. E. (1996). Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: What we know, what we need to know. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21, 43–69.

Slavin, R.E. (1991). Synthesis of research on cooperative Learning. *Educational Leadership,* 48 (5).71-82.

Thanh,P. (2008). The Role of Teachers in Implementing Educational Innovation. The Case of Implementing Cooperative Learning in Vietnam. *Canada Center of Science & Education.*

Thomas R. Lord (1994). Using Cooperative Learning in the Teaching of High School Biology. University of California 56 (5). pp 280-284.

Tippawan, N. (2008). *Two Thai Teachers Perception of Cooperative Learning.* Queens land University Press.

Tsai, S. (1998). The effects of cooperative learning on teaching English as a foreign language to senior high school students. Unpublished master's thesis, Kaohsiung University, Taiwan

Tsailing Liang, (1998). Implementing Cooperative Learning in EFL teaching: Process and Effects , National Taiwan Normal University

Vygotsky, L.(1978). Interaction between learning and development in Gauvain and cole (Eds.) Readings on the development of children. New York: Scientific American Books. pp 34-40

Walmsley, A. L. E., & Muniz, J. (2003). Cooperative learning and its effects in a high school geometry classroom. *The Mathematics Teacher, 96*(2), 112-116.

Wei, C. (1997). Union is strength: Applications of Cooperative Learning in EFL class in Taiwan. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.

Wossen Mekonenn. (2011). Assessing Students' and Teachers' Perception and Classroom Practice of Cooperative Learning in EFL Classes.*(*MA Thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.

Yu, G. (1995). Implementing Cooperative Learning Approach in an EFL Classroom in Taiwan, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

Appendix I

Addis Ababa University School of Graduate studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

This is a Questionnaire to be field by respondents

Dear Respondents: - This questionnaire is prepared to collect necessary data to assess 1 to 5 cooperative group learning in government secondary schools of Akaki Kality sub-city. The items focus on the attitude of teachers and students towards 1 to 5 cooperative group learning, and its implementation as well as factors affecting the implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Since the success of this study is the result of the data gathered from the respondents, you are required to fill all items carefully and honestly. Please; indicate your degree of agreement by putting "tick mark" (✓) in one of the boxes.

Strongly agree= SA, Agree =A, Somewhat agree =SWA, Disagree =DA, Strongly disagree= SDA

Part I: Background Information

1. Sex:- Male ☐ Female ☐
2. Age:- A. 21-30 ☐ B.31-40 ☐ C.41-50 ☐ D. >50 ☐
3. Educational background A. BSC/BED ☐ B. MSC/MA ☐
4. Experience A. 1-5 ☐ B. 6-10 ☐ C.11-15 ☐ D. >16 ☐
5. School name _____
6. Field of study (stream) or Subject you are teaching_____

Thank you for your volunteer cooperation!

Gashaw Alganeh

II. Respondents view on perception of teachers and students about 1 to 5 CGL.

The following are statements supposed to describe the attitude of teachers and students regarding 1to5 cooperative group learning. Please; indicate your degree of agreement by putting "tick mark" (✓) in one of the boxes.

Strongly agree= SA, Agree =A, Somewhat agree =SWA, Disagree =DA, Strongly disagree= SDA

No	Items	Degree of agreement				
		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Teachers and students trust on the value of 1to5 cooperative learning for academic achievement					
2	1 to 5 cooperative learning groups are used for non-academic agendas.					
3	1to5 cooperative group learning is time-consuming task for students and teachers.					
4	It is an extra work load (burden of task) for teachers and students					
5	It is implemented for report purpose.					
6	1to5 cooperative group learning makes Students academically dependent.					

III. The respondents view on the value of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.

The following statements are the benefits of 1to5 cooperative group learning. Please; indicate your trust or degree of agreement by putting "tick mark" (✓) in one of the boxes.

Strongly agree= SA, Agree =A, Somewhat agree =SWA, Disagree =DA, Strongly disagree= SDA

No	Items	Degree of agreement				
		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA
		5	4	3	2	1
1	1 to 5 cooperative group learning enhance students for better achievement					
2	It enables students to share various socio cultural aspects with their classmates.					
3	1 to 5 cooperative group learning develops self-confidence, self-esteem, and critical thinking skill					
4	It encourages students to develop face-to-face communication skills					
5	It is used to promote diversity among students and society (e.g. ethnic, language and culture)					
6	It enhances the progress of development in democratic culture.					
7	It makes the activities, assignments, project works or worksheets more simple /easy to complete					
8	1 to 5 cooperative group learning develops positive interaction between teachers and students					
9	1 to 5 cooperative groups learning used to cover large (broad) contents effectively.					
10	1 to 5 cooperative group learning reduces the teachers burden(work load)					

VI. The implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning

The following items are related to implementation of 1to5 CGL. These activities are thought to be practiced by students, teachers, and the school leaders (school as institution). Please, indicate your degree of agreement on its practical implementation by putting "tick mark" (✓) in one of the boxes

Strongly agree= SA, Agree =A, Somewhat agree =SWA, Disagree =DA, Strongly disagree = SD

1. The respondents view on implementation of school focused tasks or activities

No	Items	Degree of agreement				
		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The school has set a clear direction for implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.					
2	The school communicates with parents on the implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning.					
3	The school principals involve and guide students during 1 to 5 cooperative group learning program.					
4	School level trainings are given for students and teachers to implement 1 to 5 cooperative group learning effectively.					
5	A school has common schedule to practice 1to5 cooperative learning before (after) regular class.					

2.The respondents' view on implementation of teachers' activities of 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement				
		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Teachers organize 1 to 5 cooperative learning groups scientifically.					
2	Teachers explain the learning objectives of 1to 5 cooperative learning in advance.					
3	All teachers prepare and give 1 to 5 cooperative group-learning work sheets.					
4	Teachers motivate & reward students to work in 1to5 cooperative group learning.					
5	1 to 5 cooperative group learning approach is commonly practiced in a regular class					
6	Teachers give feedback for 1 to 5 cooperative group learning works					
7	All teachers summarize the students' 1to5 cooperative learning discussion on the spot.					

3. The respondents view on implementation of students' activities in 1 to 5 CGL

No	Items	Degree of agreement				
		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Students organize themselves in to 1 to 5 cooperative learning groups.					
2	Students actively engage on discussions to complete 1 to 5 cooperative group learning worksheets or activities.					
3	Students use their 1 o 5 cooperative learning teams to do their assignments & project works/ tasks effectively.					
4	In 1to 5 cooperative group learning program, students work attentively to help to each other.					
5	In cooperative group students debate and commonly agree on their point of discussion or activity.					
6	Students present their 1 to 5 cooperative group works to the class					

V. Respondents view on factors that hinder effectiveness in implementation of 1 to 5 CGL

The following items are supposed to be the factors that hinder the implementation of 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. Please, indicate your degree of agreement regarding the extent to which did each practically exist by putting "tick mark" (✓) in one of the boxes.

Strongly agree= SA, Agree =A, Somewhat agree =SWA, Disagree =DA, Strongly disagree = SDA

No	Items	Degree of agreement				
		SA	A	SWA	DA	SDA
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Low understanding of teachers and students about 1 to 5 cooperative group learning					
2	Unwillingness of students to work in 1to5 cooperative learning group					
3	Unwillingness of teachers to implement 1 to 5 cooperative group learning					
4	Poor coordination of students in group					
5	Very large group size and Uncomfortable seating arrangement of students					
6	Reluctance of teachers to give periodic feedback for students work on time					
7	Lack of principals attention and support to facilitate its implementation					
8	Poor training of teachers and principals to implement and coordinate 1 to 5					

VI. Open ended questions

Dear respondents:-The following are open-ended items to assess 1 to 5 cooperative group learning. The questions focus on the opinion of teachers and students about 1 to 5 CGL & its implementation as well as related factors hindering its implementation. Please state your view for each item.

1. what do you think about teachers and students view (opinion) regarding 1 to 5 CGL program?_____
   _____
   _____
2. What tasks activities do you think of from school principals and/ or at school level in general for effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL? What tasks do you suggest to perform to improve its implementation and effectiveness?
   _____
   _____
3. How do you describe the practical involvement of teachers and students in 1 to 5 CGL program?_____
   _____
   _____
4. How do you describe the practical involvement of teachers and students in 1 to 5 CGL program?_____
   _____
   _____
5. what factors that limit implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL do you see in your school?_____
   _____
   _____

Thank you again for your volunteer cooperation!

Appendix II

Addis Ababa University College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview questions for school principals

Part I: Background Information

1. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐
2. Age:- A. 21-30 ☐ B.31-40 ☐ C.41-50 ☐ D. >50 ☐
3. Educational background A. BSC/BED ☐ B. MSC/MA ☐
4. Work experience A. 1-5 ☐ B. 6-10 ☐ C.11-15 ☐ D. >16 ☐
5. School_____
6. Current position in this school_____

Part II. Interview questions for school principals and vice - principals

1. How do you see the teachers and students attitude about 1 to 5 cooperative group learning?

   _____

   _____

2. How do you see 1 to 5 CGL in relation to its importance and implementation?

   _____

   _____

3. As principal of the school what is expected from you and your school as institution to make implementation of 1 to 5 CGL effective? What things are done well?

   _____

   _____

4. What are the roles of teachers in 1 to 5 CGL and to what extent they are practically implemented?_____

   _____

   _____

5. 'What do you think of about factors hindering implementation and effectiveness of 1 to 5 CGL? What possible solutions do you think of to improve its implementation and effectiveness?'_____

   _____

Thank you for your volunteer cooperation!