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Abstract

The new high school system in Saudi Arabia comes with a lot of potential changes to the traditional way of teaching. One of them is using cooperative learning as the basic learning strategy in the classroom. The study aimed to find if cooperative language learning in the new developed high school system would enhance students' English proficiency as measured by their abilities in grammar, reading comprehension, vocabulary and listening comprehension. The study also sought to measure students’ attitude towards cooperative learning and motivation to learn English in the new high school system.

For the purpose of the study, a comparative research design in the form of non-equivalent control group design was carried out. The experiment lasted for twelve weeks in which two intact groups from two female high schools in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia were chosen as the study groups, one from a school that is following the new high school system and the other group from a traditional teaching based school. Both groups are high school first year students. During the study, subjects of the cooperative learning group (44 students) attended classes based on cooperative learning. The control group (53 students), on the other hand, did not carry out any additional activities.

In order to test the effectiveness of this method, two quantitative tools for data collection were used to compile the findings of the study. For starters, a pre- and a post-test were administered to measure English proficiency before and after the treatment. Afterward, a questionnaire was set to measure students’ attitude towards cooperative learning and motivation to study English in new high school system. The study found that cooperative learning in the new system positively affect some aspects in the participants’ English proficiency and they had a positive attitude towards cooperative learning in the new system and a higher motivation to learn English.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1. 1 Introduction

The Education system plays an important role in society. The Saudi Arabian government has decided to focus its education efforts on preparing students to enter the modern life of the twenty-first century. Therefore, the ninth development plan focused on improving the educational environment to meet the quantitative and qualitative needs of the next stage, developing advanced curricula to ensure comprehensive. Also, the development of students to enable them to contribute to building the community and enhancing the qualitative efficiency of educational staff to enable them to comprehend the objectives of modern educational curricula. (Report of the Ninth Developmental Plan, 2010).

According to a number of studies (e.g., Alhamed, 1999; Basamh, 2002; Merebah, 1987), the traditional state of the nature of classroom instruction in Saudi Arabia depends heavily on lecturing and memorization. Most of Saudi Arabia’s teachers adopted the traditional didactic methods. The teacher delivers a lecture and students receive it. Students usually do not participate in exploring information; rather, they get information in a passive way and they seldom express themselves. Students’ participation is limited by teachers and textbook questions which usually are at the lower levels of Bloom’s taxonomy (Ministry of Education, 2003).

Instruction in Saudi schools is based on teacher presentation regardless of the subject matter. The teacher starts the lesson by presenting information, while the students listen. The teacher also asks some questions to clarify unclear points. Often these questions are directed to volunteer students. The last part of class time is given to independent work, and students engage in individual work and compete to get teacher rewards (verbal or points). During
independent work, some teachers circulate to help students with their individual work. Because of the limit of class time and the large number of students the teacher does see not all students. Also, teachers do not come back to students who still do not understand the materials. Teachers do not allow students to cooperate to help each other because most Saudi teachers believe that demonstrating and teaching is the teacher’s job.

The Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia has worked hard to shift teaching methods to the use of new teaching strategies, including discussion, discovery, cooperative learning, and so on. In moving towards what Lemke (1996) terms “the interactive learning paradigm”, the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia came out with a new project for teaching students in high schools, the developed high school project, depending on some interesting strategies. One of them is cooperative learning.

Cooperative learning is a generic term for various small group interactive instructional procedures. Students work together on academic tasks in small groups to help themselves and their teammates learn together. It can be an effective method to motivate students, encourage active learning, and develop key critical-thinking, communication, and decision-making skills. David Jaques (2000) suggests that “Learning in groups, rather than in formal lectures or training sessions, allows students to have greater scope to negotiate meaning and express themselves within the language of the subject. It can also play a central part in developing key professional skills, such as listening, presenting ideas, persuasion, self-direction, self-monitoring and team working” (Jaques, 2000 p.4).

Abrami (et al.) (1995), Jacobs & Hall (2002) and Jacobs & Small (2003) indicate that using cooperative learning improves cognitive processes in students because they elaborate and organize information in their minds, as they work together to comprehend a passage. Cooperative group members can use their own as well as their teammates’ background
knowledge to comprehend the task by relating an event or events in the passage to their own experience.

Cooperative learning is not a new strategy; it has existed for many years, and there is a huge body of research to support cooperative learning in the classroom. It operates with three principles: group goal, individual accountability, and equal opportunity for success. The teacher’s role in implementing cooperative learning includes instruction and monitoring students, and active involvement in helping students to get the advantages of collaborative learning. As a result, through cooperative learning, we may be able to improve student achievement in Saudi English classes.

The new high school project (developed high school) is a modern method in teaching and presenting materials to high school students. It has new subjects, curricula and systems that facilitate learning and prepare students for the coming phase of their educational journey, which is the university. In this system, new subjects are introduced like business management, vocational education, life skills and statistical mathematics. The project applies the hour's system for attendance. Students in the first year should attend 5 hours a day for 15 weeks. As they develop and go to another year these hours decrease. After 7 hours of absence for one subject, the student loses the chance of entering the final exam – she will be banned. In Riyadh, the project was applied in five female high schools, three public schools and two private schools. The 4th secondary public high school for girls in Riyadh was chosen in 2004 to practice and implement the new way of teaching which mainly depends on communicative classrooms, based on cooperative learning and group work.
1.2. Significance of the Study

The significance of the study stems from the following points:

1- This study, to the best of my knowledge, is the first that attempts to investigate the effectiveness of cooperative learning in the new high school project in teaching English in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. This new project is still in its trial phase, and there are no extensive studies on its effectiveness in teaching English to our high school students.

2- The findings of this research will hopefully encourage other researchers to study the different methods of teaching English as a second language in high schools in Saudi Arabia and the ways to develop these methods.

3- The results of this research will shed some light on the effectiveness of this new project and the possibility of applying it in all female high schools in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia instead of using it on selected schools.

4- It will demonstrate to educators how various teaching trends can be used in our classrooms to help students gain and practice language.

5- It is also expected that this study will help English supervisors in the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia, teachers and researchers in the field of applied linguistics and more specifically educational linguistics by providing data concerning the effectiveness of using cooperative learning on improving students' proficiency. Also, it will provide some data for King Abdullah's Project for Developing General Education here in Saudi Arabia.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Using cooperative learning is an interesting method of teaching. However, we do not know the effectiveness and suitability of such new project for the Saudi educational system
and social environment. The project comes with new curriculum and a new method of teaching. It has been applied on ten female high schools only for seven years. It will be interesting to see the effect of using this approach in the English classroom on our teaching system in females' high schools in Riyadh.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the study are to investigate students’ use of linguistic features in their discourse while being involved in cooperative structures, to examine the improvement in students’ grammar and competence, to investigate the quality of language input, output, and context in cooperative learning, and to study to what extent the students have positive and negative attitudes towards the cooperative learning method.

1.5. Research Questions

In this research, the researcher will investigate the effectiveness of using cooperative learning in our high school English classrooms in this new project. To achieve the purpose of the research, the researcher will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effectiveness of cooperative learning when it comes to learning English as a foreign language for high school students in Saudi Arabia?
2. Do students use linguistic features in their discourse while being involved in cooperative structures?
3. Does it motivate students and encourage them to develop their language skills?
4. What are the students attitudes toward this project and the using of cooperative learning in English classes?
1.6. Delimitations of the Study

The study is limited to:

1. Saudi female high school students of two schools in Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

2. The study only investigates the effectiveness of using cooperative work in the new developed high school project implemented by the Ministry of Education in teaching English.

3. The study used only two quantitative tools to measure the results.

1.8. Definition of Terms

**Cooperative Learning**

- “A group learning activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in a group and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, P. 192).

**A Cooperative Group**

“…three to four students who are tied together by common purpose to complete the task and to include every group member” (Homan & Poel, 1999, P. 128).

**Collaborative Learning**

An instruction method in which students at various performance levels work together in small groups toward a common goal. The students are responsible for one another's learning as well as their own. Thus, the success of one student helps other students to be successful. (Gokhale, 1995)
Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978, p86).

The New High School Project

The new high school cubiculum has a joint program for secondary education students. It is bifurcated into two divisions, one for the science section and the other literary section. The course design of this system will hopefully make a quantum leap in secondary education due to its goals, structures, methods and contents. It seeks to achieve the following:

1- Achieving the primary aims of the Kingdom’s educational policy which are:
   • Strengthening the faith of the students in totality.
   • Promoting social and national values in the students.
   • Imparting knowledge and skill based on the learners intellectual capability.
   • Imparting practical knowledge and aid their all round development

2 - Reducing waste of time and money, by reducing the number of failures.

3 – Decreasing the number of courses taken by the student per semester.

4 – Helping develop the students' progressive thinking in terms of the right courses; thereby, building their self confidence for the future.

5 – Inculcating the qualities of perseverance and dedication through good moral conduct

6 – To accomplish the principle goal of education through new strategies that motivates students to think creatively.
The system depends on many new basics:

A – Integrated courses

The system’s plan of study is distributed in the form of courses that each section requires. It is designed in a five hours plan, so that the student takes each semester seven courses in maximum, including a number of elective courses that enrich his\her education.

B - Flexibility and choice

Besides being allowed to add and drop, students are given the opportunity to choose number of hours they wish to study, and they can also opt to complete their courses in the summer.

C - Academic Advising

Guidance and academic counseling right that helps them to choose a specialization that suits them.

D - GPA

The system calculates the cumulative average of all grades quarterly.

E- Cooperative Learning

The system highly encourage the use of cooperative learning in the classrooms. (Secondary Education developmental Project 2010)
Chapter 2
Theoretical Background and Review of Related Literature

2.1. Introduction

The following review of literature aims to review a number of studies carried out to examine the effectiveness of cooperative learning as a teaching technique in general and as a method to teach the English language in specific. Also, it shed light on the previous studies on the high school developed program. The review will be presented under the following headings:

1. Brief history of Cooperative learning

2. Supporting Theories for CL:
   2.1 Group Dynamics Theory
   2.2 Developmental Theory
   2.3 Constructivist Learning Theory
   2.4 The SLA Theory

3. Studies on cooperative learning:
   3.1 Cooperative Language Learning
   3.2 Arabic Studies

4. High School New Project

5. Conclusion
2.2 Brief History of Cooperative Learning

The idea of cooperative learning goes far back in history. According to Johnson, Johnson, and Smith’s work (1991), the concept of peer learning was described as early as the first century by Marcus Fabius Quintilian, who advocated that peer learning could benefit the students. Quintilian was Rome’s leading teacher from about 68 AD to 88 AD (Pappas, 2003). The idea of peer learning was also described in the Talmud, which explicitly stated the importance of having a learning partner to facilitate learning (Chiu, 2000). One should highlight that the idea of cooperative learning was also mentioned in the Bible and the Holy Quran. The value of peer learning was once again stressed between 400 AD and 600 AD. In the 17th century, Czech educational reformer and religious leader John Amos Comenius (1592-1670) emphasized in his writings political unity, religious reconciliation and educational cooperation (Diggins, 1997; Pappas, 2003). Comenius argued that students would learn by teaching and being taught by other students (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991). In the late 18th century, Joseph Lancaster and Andrew Bell opened schools in England that used peer learning groups extensively (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991). The development of these schools appeared to have marked a milestone for peer learning because, not long afterwards, the idea of peer learning was brought across the Atlantic Ocean when a Lancastrian school was established in New York City in 1806. Peer learning was emphasized in the early 19th century in the United States during the Common School Movement. In the last three decades of the 19th century, Colonel Francis Parker, the superintendent of the public schools in Quincy, Massachusetts (1875-1880), strongly advocated the use of peer learning groups in class. Being both enthusiastic and powerful, he was able to attract an average of more than 3,000 visitors yearly to observe his implementation of peer learning (Campbell, 1965, cited in Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991). Subsequent to Parker’s efforts, John Dewey (1963) advocated the employment of peer learning in his renowned project
method. The methods of peer learning ruled the American education through the turn of the century (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991).

Approximately the same time Parker was promoting with enthusiasm the use of peer learning, Turner in England and Triplett (1897) in the United States began to compare the effects of competitive, individualistic, and peer learning. Their efforts were followed by investigations in the early 20th century by Mayer in Germany and Ringelmann in France (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998). Two major studies on peer learning and competitive learning were published in the 1920s and 1930s. Maller’s research (1929) was probably one of the earliest laboratory studies on cooperation/collaboration; May and Doob (cited in Deutsch, 1949) reviewed literature on peer learning and competition up until 1937. Peer learning has had its ups and downs in the American education. After it enjoyed success in the late 19th century and the early 20th century, interpersonal competition gained ground in American public schools and colleges in the late 1930s (Pepitone, 1980), and interest in peer learning died out. However, A few decades later when public schools were forced to integrate in the 1960s, the interest in peer learning was rekindled. Peer learning was invited back to the classrooms because educators were seeking ways to construct social integration between minority and majority students and to help improve minority students’ academic performance (Olsen & Kagan, 1992).

In the 1970s, several research groups in the United States began independently to develop and examine cooperative learning methods in classroom settings (Slavin, 1991b). These groups included Elliot Aronson and his associates (University of Texas at Austin) who developed the Jigsaw method, David Johnson and Roger Johnson (Cooperative Learning Center at the University of Minnesota) who developed Learning Together, as well as David DeVries, Keith Edwards and Robert Slavin (Center for Social Organization of School at the
Johns Hopkins University) who developed Teams-Games-Tournament and Student Teams Achievement Divisions.

It is worth noting that, before 1970, almost all the reported studies on cooperative learning had been college-based. Beginning in the earlier 1970s, nonetheless, the positive effects of cooperative learning attracted K-12 educators’ attention. The tide turned. Studies at elementary and secondary levels became robust while those at college level became limited. It was not until after the 1990s cooperative learning at college level began to regain attention from researchers and educators (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998).

2.3 Supporting Theories for CL

One reason why the CL is so popular in educational circles is that it has sound scientific bases. But theories of the CL on different subjects are somehow different. So different kinds of the CL lay stress on different theoretical bases. According to the nature of English teaching and the actual setting of English teaching in general, this section intends to seek the theoretical support for CL from the perspectives of social psychology, cognitive psychology and language acquisition.

2.3.1 Group Dynamics Theory

A group is a dynamic whole in the sense that the interdependence between the members can change. As has been said, first, the nature of a cooperative group is the interdependence of the members that leads to the group becoming “a dynamic whole”, in which any member’s change will lead to the other members’ change; second, the nervous inner condition of the members can encourage the group to reach expected purpose (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 1993, p.15). Levin also did experimental research on group aims and individual aims. The result shows that in cooperative groups individuals have strong motives. They can encourage each other and make allowance for each other. The information communication between the
individuals can go on fluently. The work efficiency of cooperative groups is obviously higher than that of noncooperative groups (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 1992, p.39).

In America Johnson D.W and Johnson R.T developed the theory into social interdependence theory. They did research on three kinds of aim structure cooperation, competition and individual. And they drew the conclusion that group cooperative structure should become the main organizing form in class; only this structure can work towards the efficiency that promote students’ interaction and improve the teaching efficiency of the whole class (1989a, p. 24). From the viewpoint of group interaction, the core theory of the CL can be expressed simply in the following way. When all the people get together to work for the same purpose, they must depend on each other. The interdependence on each other provides interaction for individuals and make them, (1) encourage each other, willing to do whatever promotes the group success; (2) help each other, trying to make the group successful; (3) love each other, because all people like others to help themselves to fulfill the purpose. Hence cooperation has increased the connections of the group members to its at most extent (Wang, 2001).

2.3.2 Developmental Theory

The basic supposition of the developmental theory is that the interaction for the proper task can promote their mastery of important concepts. Children’s cognitive and social development has grown through companions’ interaction and association. Vygotsky, a famous Russian psychologist , presented “Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)” (1978, P.26), in which he stressed the difference between the actual developmental level that enables children to solve the problem alone and the latent developmental level with the guidance of adults or cooperation of a better companion. Making ZPD in teaching, he said, is not only necessary in the teacher’s teaching, but also necessary in the cooperation with better
companions. Vygotsky believed that “what the learner is able to do in collaboration today, he will be able to do independently tomorrow” (1978, p.47).

Enlightened by Vygotsky’s ZPD, later scholars discussed the cognitive function of the companions’ association from two aspects. One is that the companions teach each other. That is, students with better abilities work as teachers. The other is that the companions cooperate with each other. That is, the students communicate with each other equally and cooperate with each other (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005).

Similarly, Piaget, a Swiss developmental psychologist, thought that social experience and knowledge, language, value, rules, morality and sign system can be acquired through the interaction with others (Piaget, 1964). Many supporters of Piaget appeal to schools to use more cooperative activities. They think that students’ interaction for the learning task can improve their achievements. And they can learn from each other through interactions. For the discussions in the interaction, there must be cognitive struggles. And because of the cognitive struggles, the insufficient deduction must come into being. At last through cooperation a better understanding will be reached. (Piaget, 1950)

Bruner, one of the supporters of Piaget, created Discovery Learning and one of its pedagogical aims was to help students to learn how to learn (Bruner, 1960). He stated that teachers should make the best conditions for learning, which is one of the aims of CL. The CL can provide the students with more opportunities for interactions. It can also improve the students’ understanding and facilitate their development (Bruner, 1990).
2.3.3 Constructivist Learning Theory

Constructivist learning is an active constructive process. Learners are not passive to accept the external information, but active to choose the external information according to the former cognitive structure in order to construct the meaning of the present situation. The process of the construction is two ways. On one hand, learners construct the meaning of present things to trace the given information; on the other hand, the original knowledge is not taken out unchangeable, but it will be constructed according to the variation of the concrete situation. Learners’ constructions are pluralistic; that is, each learner’s constructions are different from one another (Ellis, 1993a).

It is not only a revolution in learning psychology, but also a leap of epistemology from behaviorism to constructivism. Behaviorists think that human understanding is determined totally by the property of stimulus. The subject of understanding is passive, just as a mirror reflects an object, while constructivists think that man, as the subject of understanding, does not simply reflect reality. In the process of understanding the individuals make choice and choose methods, and they also give reality special meaning. So understanding does not come from reality itself, but comes from the interaction between subjects and objects (Ellis, 1993a).

Constructivism stresses the subject’s conscious activity, and does not take learners as passive recipients. It considers teaching a process in which students construct their knowledge actively. And the construction takes place through interaction with others. In teaching, the teacher, who is no longer the original authority, has become a cooperator who constructs knowledge with the students, and the companions have become constructive cooperators from the original competitors. Based on the constructivist theory, English CL takes students as the main body of teaching and the active constructors of knowledge.
Students are no longer the passive receivers of outside stimulus or the objects of knowledge inculcation.

2.3.4 The SLA Theory

According to Krashen’s SLA (second language acquisition) theory (1988), comprehensible input is the key to language acquisition. Krashen presented the case for comprehensible input in the form of the input hypothesis. He argued that for SLA to take place, the learner needs input that contains exemplars of language forms which according to the natural order are due to be acquired next. (Krashen 1988)

Long considered interaction adjustments to be the important ones for SLA and pointed out that these occur even when there are no formal modifications. A “here-and-now” orientation, together with interaction, and adjustments, is the main source of comprehensible input (Ellis, 1993b).

(Swain 2000) suggested that output is important in several ways: (a) the learner may be “pushed” to use alternative means where there is communication breakdown, in order to express a message precisely, coherently, and appropriately; (b) using the language may force the learner to move from semantic processing which is characteristic of the early stages of SLA to syntactic processing and (c) the learner has a chance to test out hypotheses about L2.

From the second language acquisition theories, we learn that for both input and output, interactions are necessary conditions for EFL, not only in natural linguistic situation, but also in classroom teaching. Input is always made in the artificial environment and is the major way in which the learner is exposed to the target language.

CL has sound theoretical bases from the perspectives of social psychology, cognitive psychology and language acquisition. Among them, the constructivist learning theory is the most important for CL, which advocates that learners, during the process of learning, are
active to choose the external information according to the former cognitive structure in order to construct the meaning of the present situation. Besides, group dynamics theory held that in cooperative groups, when individuals get together for the common goal, they unite as one, respect and encourage each other to guarantee the success of their group. Also, the developmental theory indicated that the learners interacting for the proper task can promote their mastery of concepts. Vygotsky, a famous psychologist of former Russia, presented “Zone of Proximal Development” (ZPD), in which he stressed the difference between the actual developmental level that enables learners to solve the problem alone and the latent developmental level with the guidance of adults or cooperation of a better companion. Whether the teaching will facilitate students’ development or not greatly depends on whether the teacher will constantly create ZPD for students and transform it to the present situation.

2.4. Studies on Cooperative Learning

Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is an approach of teaching which has been utilized for many years. Slavin (1995) pointed out that the history of cooperative learning can be traced back to the seventeenth century. He cited such educational theorists as Comenius in the seventeenth century, Rousseau in the eighteenth century, Pestalozzi in the nineteenth century. Though it must be said that CLL is associated with the educator John Dewey, in the early twentieth century, who encouraged the notion of group work and cooperation in learning in the traditional classrooms (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Moreover, there have been several studies conducted on cooperative learning and students’ achievements over the past years. Johnson, Johnson & Holubec (1994b) stated that nearly 600 experimental and over 100 correlational studies have been conducted on cooperative, competitive, and individualistic efforts to learn since 1898. This part of literature is devised to display the various studies conducted on CLL and their major findings.
2.4.1. Cooperative Language Learning (CLL)

Many studies shed some light on using cooperative learning in EFL classrooms. Johnson and Johnson (1989) believe that students will not work mutually without a common goal. They argue that “in cooperative learning situations there is a positive interdependence among students’ goal attainment, students perceive that they can reach their learning if and only if other students in the learning group also reach their goal” (Johnson and Johnson, 1989, p.4). Slavin (1995) has the same idea saying that cooperative learning “is not enough to simply tell students to work together; they must have a reason to take one another’s achievement seriously” (Slavin, 1995, p.5). Therefore, a group’s success depends on successful learning by everyone and produces positive interdependence. Thus, group members are motivated to teach each other, to engage in behaviors that increase achievement, and to avoid behaviors that decrease achievement, such as giving or receiving answers without an explanation.

Slavin (1983) reported the effects of CLL carried out in grades from two to twelve and in various subjects, such as math, language arts, reading…etc. The accumulation of laboratory research findings were used to validate the usefulness of CLL as a method of teaching in the classroom. Slavin concluded that findings indeed supported CLL as a means to increase productivity in the classroom. All in all, Slavin stated that cooperation resulted in improvements of learning achievement, inter-group relations, self-esteem and encouragement of group members to help one another in any way to achieve group success. However, Slavin appeared concerned about the sort of help provided by the group members and the effect of this help on the learner’s performance. Because of that, he developed a model that focuses on external motivators, such as rewards and individual accountability established by the teacher. He found that group tasks with individual accountability produce stronger learning outcomes. Locke and Latham’s (1990) goal setting theory argues that human behaviors are regulated by
goals and that the setting of personal goals are in turn influenced by factors such as group goals, role modeling, encouragement, and feedback. These factors are compatible with Slavin’s (1995) model of cooperative learning (see Figure 1). For example, the goal setting theory argues that having group goals on top of personal goals brings about higher goal commitment to the personal goals than having personal goals alone. Correspondingly, the model of cooperative learning argues that the setting of group goals will trigger motivation to learn, motivation to encourage group members to learn, and motivation to help group members to learn.

![Figure 1: Slavin's model of cooperative learning](image)

While some critics of cooperative learning (e.g., Kohn, 1991a, 1991b) argued that extrinsic motivation triggered by cooperative learning can negatively affect intrinsic motivation, proponents of cooperative learning believed otherwise. Deci and his colleagues’ (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991) self-determination theory was apparently very much in line with the perception of cooperative learning advocates in this regard. The self determination theory presented four forms of behavior on a continuum based
on the degree of motivation internalization; it clearly argued that extrinsic motivation can facilitate intrinsic motivation and transfer a learner from the right (controlled and extrinsic) toward the left (self-determined and intrinsic) of the continuum.

Based on Slavin’s model (1995), cooperative learning facilitates learning not only because it motivates learners with shared goals but also because it further situates learners in a social context, which provides a stage for cognitive development through elaborated explanations, peer tutoring, peer modeling, cognitive elaboration, peer practice, peer assessment and correction (see Figure 1). As Merriam, Caffarella and Hansman put it, “learning does not occur in a vacuum” (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 22); rather, learning is shaped by “the nature of the interactions among learners, the tools they use within these interactions, the activity itself, and the social context in which the activity takes place” (Hansman, 2001, p. 45). It takes the context, culture, and tools in the learning situation for learning to happen. In a similar vein, Perry (1970) pointed out in his scheme of cognitive development that peer interactions help a learner advance from a lower level of cognitive development into a higher level.

Piaget (1964) argued that all developments consist of “momentary conflicts and incompatibilities which must be overcome to reach a higher level of equilibrium” (p. 19). Duckworth, a student of Piaget’s at the Institute of Genetic Epistemology in Geneva, Switzerland, elaborated on what Piaget means by “equilibration.” Piaget sees the process of equilibration as a process of balance between assimilation and accommodation in a biological sense. An individual assimilates the world which comes down to saying he sees it in his own way. But sometimes something presents itself in such a way that he cannot assimilate it into his view of things, so he must change his view he must accommodate if he wants to incorporate this new item. (Duckworth, 1964, p. 4) Equilibration involves two complementary activities: assimilation, in which learners use their current schemes to make
sense of the external world; and accommodation, in which they modify existing schemes or build new ones after they notice that the existing thinking does not fully capture the reality of the outside world. Equilibration is a process of restoring balance, and this process provides an opportunity for learners to grow and develop (Piaget, 1950). To Piaget (1932), individual activities and group activities both play important roles in the process. “Social life is . . . a complement of individual ‘activity’,” he argued.

In addition to his equilibration theory, Piaget’s social transmission theory (1964) provides a rationale for cooperative learning, and it is quite consistent with zone of proximal development. Piaget argued that learners are receptive to new information only when they are in a state where they are able to comprehend the substance, that is, when they have a structure which enables them to assimilate it. When learners have a structure that enables them to assimilate the information, they are in the zone of proximal development, and working in peer groups often enables learners to help each other move to the next level of development.

Dewey (1916, 1963) also deemed participation in social environment as critical to learning. In a similar way that Piaget criticized traditional whole class instruction, Dewey charged traditional instruction for failing to “secure the active cooperation of the pupil in construction of the purposes involved in his studying” (1963, p. 67). He emphasized that in a cooperative setting, “the individual appropriates the purpose which actuates it, becomes familiar with its methods and subject matters, acquires needed skills, and is saturated with its emotional spirit” (1916, p. 26). For Dewey, simply waiting passively for the instructor to hand-feed knowledge does not warrant learning; learners need to gain experience through activities in which they actively participate and cooperate with others.

Although Dewey rejected teachers as authoritarian figures, he appeared to be in disagreement with the more extreme advocates of learner-centered progressivism. While Dewey’s view of experiential education calls for active (rather than passive) participation of
learners, it is worth noticing that Dewey (1964) also stressed the significance of a teacher’s active role in the process. According to Dewey, experiential education does not mean that learners get unconstrained freedom in the classroom. The teacher needs to “observe” but not “humor” the interests of students. “To humor the interests is to substitute the transient for the permanent” (p. 179). Instead, the purpose of paying attention to learners’ interests is to link them with educative experiences and intellectual development so that essential relations between social experience and human knowledge can be taught and learned effectively.

Dewey (1964) emphasized that it is important for a teacher to keep “constant and careful observation of [learners’] interests” because those interests show “the state of development which the [learner] has reached” (p. 178). Therefore, in experiential education a teacher does not “stand off and look on; the alternative to furnishing ready-made subject matter and listening to the accuracy with which it is reproduced is not quiescence, but participation, sharing, in an activity” (1924, p. 188). According to Dewey (1964), students’ interests are always indicative of some power below. A teacher needs to keep “continual and sympathetic” (p. 178) observation of their interests in the process of activities so that he or she can detect what they are geared up for, and what teaching materials could work most efficiently and productively. In terms of the teacher’s role in participating and monitoring the group process, Dewey’s view seems to be more aligned with cooperative learning than with collaborative learning.

According to Olsen and Kagan (1992), CL provides second language (L2) students more opportunity for language development than traditional language classes do. They argued that, quantitatively, cooperative learning amplifies active use of language when L2 students try to comprehend or produce the language within their cooperative groups; qualitatively, cooperative learning increases linguistic complexity as L2 learners try to reiterate, explain, expand, and elaborate their thoughts to request clarification or to elucidate their points.
CLL fosters student interaction at all levels (Webb 1982). Research has shown that when students of high ability work with students of lower ability, the former benefit by explaining or demonstrating and the latter benefit by seeing an approach to problem solving modeled by a peer (Johnson & Johnson 1985; Swing & Peterson 1982, Hooper & Hannafin, 1988). Warm-up and group building activities help students to understand their differences and to learn how to capitalize on them rather than use them as a basis for antagonism.

Faust & Paulson (1998) suggested in their article to use cooperative learning groups to create active learning environment. According to both authors, allowing students to work together in groups would help them learn from one another. Thus, CLL would be a valuable technique which supports group discussion and allows more timid “students who have not yet mastered all of the skills required” to work harder and accomplish more.

Shachar & Sharan (1988) conducted one of the very early experiments on CLL. Their study sought to examine the following:

1. Whether students in group learning achieved more in the academic sense
2. Whether CLL had positive effects on the achievement of a particular ethnic group
3. Whether group learning increased interaction among group members
4. And whether the resulting high interaction among group members led to high academic results

The results as indicated by the authors showed “superior level of academic achievement by pupils who studied [cooperatively] compared to the Whole-Class method” (P. 156). By and large, the researchers came to the conclusion that CLL positively affected learners’ academic outcomes, enhanced social relations, and promoted interaction.

Furthermore, Farmer (1991) wrote a book about cooperative learning activities in which she listed the vast value of CLL. She stated that through cooperation and group
participation the level of tension and competitiveness would fall down allowing students to
learn in a more pleasant surroundings, thus, acquiring more beneficial learning experience.
The author then added that group learning is good for learners, for “it stimulates interest,
emphasizes participation, helps clarify ideas, promotes socialization, teaches cooperation…,
and boosts self-esteem” (P. 5). In her later edition, Farmer (1999) reemphasized the positive
influence of CLL in the learning process. She stated that “with [CLL], students have been
shown to improve their self-esteem, their attitude toward school, and their ability to work
with others” (P. 1).

Hall & Jacobs (1994) wrote that CLL is a tool to levitate “mutual helpfulness and …
participation of all group members” (P. 1). They further supported the value of CLL by
means of the findings of other researches which associated the benefits of CLL in areas such
as “learning self-esteem, liking for school, and interethnic relations”. In relation to ESL/EFL
settings, Hall and Jacobs indicated the following:

In second/foreign language learning, theorists propose several advantages for
cooperative learning: increased student talk, more varied talk,
more relaxed atmosphere, greater motivation, more negotiation of meaning, and
increased amounts of comprehensible input. (Hall & Jacobs, 1994, P. 2)

A year later, in 1995, Liang conducted a study by the teacher himself in his
classroom at a university in Taiwan for one school year. Liang states that:" the students in
this class demonstrated much more willingness and less anxiety about using English in the
groups than in the whole class." Generally the students were favorably disposed toward
group work. Students seldom volunteered to answer the teacher's general questions or
initiated talk in whole-class settings. "Thus group work appeared to be an appropriate
instructional strategy to promote practice in English." (Liang, 1995)
Dennis & Hamm (1996) criticized how traditional learning built around “individualistic and competitive manner” lead to passive learning; that is, learners became indifferent to what is being taught. Therefore, they recommended the application of CLL in the learning process. Dennis & Hamm stated that CLL would promote students’ learning, activate their thinking, and generate new knowledge via interaction with one another.

On the same year, Millis (1996) presented a paper at The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga in which she listed the following reasons as to why CLL is beneficial to the learning outcome:

1. Provides a share cognitive set of information between students.
2. Motivates students to learn the material.
3. Ensures that students construct their own knowledge
4. Provides formative feedback.
5. Developing social and group skills necessary for success outside the classroom.
6. Promotes positive interaction between members of different cultural and socio-economic groups (P. 2)

Homan & Poel (1999) incorporated CLL in order to develop interactive skills among learners in their English speaking lessons. The results, as stated in the paper, indicated that students seemed to acknowledge the benefits of CLL in teaching; in addition, they believed that CLL helped them in their real life. Based on these findings, the authors concluded that CL is “not only useful [in] teaching the language skills necessary for improving English, but also [effective in] improving students’ abilities to function in the society” (P. 133).

From a pedagogical point of view, Akcan (2000) wrote, “CLL might be useful for language teachers who are teaching English in large classrooms” (P. 22) in order to create opportunities in which learners could use the language more and interact with one another.
Lee (1999) reported the findings of studies carried out by Bejarano (1987) and Slavin (1983). After comparing the effects of the CLL approach to the whole-class method on academic achievement, the researcher stated that the students involved in CLL displayed major improvement in their learning process (Lee, 1999). Lee added to the benefits of CLL as follows:

Although the positive effects of CLL on achievement appear to be basically motivational, the key is not motivation to win competitions against other teams, but motivation to assist one’s teammates to meet their individual goals and thus insure that the team as a whole will do well. (P. 6)

Another study on CLL was conducted by Servetter (1999). He launched CLL and learner-centered projects for lower-level university students the outcomes of which came in favor of CLL. One of the objectives of the CLL project, as Servetter stated, was to encourage learners “to work enthusiastically [in groups] toward activating target language learning acquired in the past.” Based on Servetter’s results, students learning cooperatively displayed “increased motivation, increased perceived achievement, and increased desire to support their peers.” Overall, the researcher mentioned that the effects of CLL were positive.

Jacobs & Ward (2000) mentioned that CLL provided educators with techniques to assist students to work with one another “successfully”. The researchers in their study focused on analyzing students’ interaction from cooperative learning and systematic functional perspectives. In their findings, they reported that CLL fostered learning motivation, interaction among group members, and it also stressed positive interdependence.

In (2001) Greenfield conducted a qualitative case study that examined feelings, attitude and opinions of secondary school ESL students toward collaborative e-mail exchange
for the purpose of learning English. Findings of the study indicated that learners engaged in cooperative learning displayed higher abilities to retain information and to apply various learning strategies than those who worked competitively or individually. In addition, Greenfield indicated that some of Stahl's findings (Stahl, 1994, as cited in Greenfield, 2001) revealed that learners' outcomes during "cooperatively taught lessons" were quite impressive. Improvement of participants’ results as Stahl mentioned includes (a) great scores in academic tests, (b) significant development of motivation to learn, (c) positive attitude towards both learning and working with others, and (d) high level of enthusiasm to share and interact with the group members (P. 14).

Another interesting study was conducted by Meteetum (2001). He conducted a case study research on cooperative learning by using the jigsaw technique with nine second-year English majors at Naresuan University. The purposes of the study were to investigate students’ use of linguistic features in their discourse while being involved in cooperative structures, to examine the improvement in students’ grammar and competence, to investigate the quality of language input, output, and context in cooperative learning, and to study to what extent the students have positive and negative attitudes towards the cooperative learning method. The design of the study was based on a qualitative approach. Research data came from four instruments, including a grammar test, a structured field observation, a semi-structured interview and a reflective journal. The results showed that there were 39 language functions and three social language functions used in learning sessions. All subjects had higher academic and oral achievement test scores after engaging in this learning. Moreover, the cooperative language learning also generated functional and communicative, frequent, and redundant input. The last finding revealed that nearly all subjects had positive attitudes
towards cooperative learning in terms of oral competence, academic achievement, social
skills, personal development, collaborative skills, thinking skills, and learning atmosphere.

In the same year, Porto (2001) engaged her students in cooperative writing response
groups, in which groups of three or four students took turns in reading the writings of their
group members and gave feedback on what they read. Based on the members’ remarks,
students revised and edited their works. The purpose of implementing cooperative writing
was to help students develop their writing skills. Porto then reported the benefits of the
approach. She stated:

1. Cooperative writing led to consciousness-raising about the writing process.
2. Cooperative writing helped learners decide what to textualize on the basis
   of the purpose of their writing and their intended audience.
3. Cooperative writing response groups fostered the production of modified
   output.
4. Cooperative writing response groups encouraged group members to focus
   on the writers’ strengths, as opposed to the location and correction of
   errors. (p. 43-44)

A year later, Porto (2002) carried out the same approach with a different group of
learners. The results of the implementation supported the benefits stated in her prior study
(Porto, 2001). Porto (2002) remarked that cooperative writing was worthy to consider for it
empowered learners “to explore ideas of writing and examine their validity” (690). This
would eventually lead to developing inquisitive and critical thinking.

to develop learners’ awareness of how written discourse is created in using language to
communicate in the foreign language. In addition to the benefits listed in Porto (2001, 2002),
the author reported that cooperative writing response groups resulted in amazingly interesting feedback about the development of cohesion and coherence in writings.

Atsuta (2003) carried out a study to improve unsuccessful learners’ motivation where he incorporated cooperative learning as one of the many motivational strategies employed to achieve the intended goal. The findings of Atsuta showed the many advantages of CLL. These might include making students more responsible of their learning, achieving high level of motivation, and allowing students in a mix-ability environment to help one another and thus promoting the learning process.

O’Byrne (2003) acknowledged the value of CLL very briefly in her paper. She stated that CL encouraged “students working in groups to master fundamental knowledge” (P.50). In much prior studies, researchers stated that CLL was quite effective “for promoting academic achievement, language acquisition, and social development of English language learners.” (Calderon & Salvin, 1999; Ovando & Collier, 1998, as cited in Calderon, 1999, P. 2).

In 2003 Olsher states in his Ph.D. dissertation that:

The novice-level speakers, who at times struggle to communicate, nonetheless possess important interaction skills, including: constructing and projecting the emerging structures of turns-at-talk in real time; using normative practices of turn taking and sequencing organization, including preference organization; and successfully using practice for other-initiated repair, even in cases where initial repair attempts fail. (Olsher,2003, P.21).
His findings include: "evidence that collaborative group projects involving the creation of material products provide a rich context for the practice of interaction skills and the identification of speaking practices that allow language learners to negotiate language form without the explicit use of grammatical meta-language." (Olsher, 2003, P. 102). His study was based on a videotaped group-work in which three students were engaged in a map-making project as part of an English class at a Japanese college. The video data were closely transcribed and analyzed.

Chen (2005) did a research in which she compared Cooperative Learning Approach to Grammar-Translation Method and examined whether CLL promotes motivation and how motivation affects listening, speaking and reading performance. Chen stated in the research that there was no direct evidence between motivation and language skills improvement. Therefore, the researcher assumed that learners’ high scores in listening, speaking and reading are related to “cooperative learning approach…, which fosters English language skills.” (P. 92)

Moreover, Polly(2007) in her M.A thesis suggests that in second language acquisition research finds that small group and pair work are essential tools in language learning, specifically creating optimal conditions for negotiation of meaning. "Using focus group discussion, video-recorded SG/PW activities, and stimulated recall learners perceptions single work and pair work are identified."(Polly, 2007, P.59). She added, "Findings show a majority of learners noted communicative breakdown as motivating and it forced them to negotiate for meaning. Also, learners display positive perceptions toward small group and pair work which reflects an opportunity-rich environment for second language acquisition". (Polly, 2007, P.80)
A more recent research study by Chen (2007) investigated the effectiveness of CLL strategies in the acquisition of English by Taiwanese university students. According to Chen, there was a sort of positive relationship between being involved in CLL and English language acquisition. The researcher added that CLL provided learners with the chance “to teach, which is one of the best ways to learn and provides more sources of information than are available in a traditional class” (Chen, 2007, P. 4). In addition, Chen reported that implementing CLL in the teaching setting helped in increasing learners’ motivation and retention. The development of these factors resulted in noteworthy outcomes; these included developing a positive image of self and English language proficiency (ELP).

Tran (2007) implemented CLL to help learners promote their vocabulary and reading comprehension. For the researcher to accomplish the intended goal, she asked students to read individually and study vocabulary at home, and when they come to class, they can help one another with comprehension activities. Tran then concluded that creating a cooperative environment helped save class time, encouraged learners to be more independent, and allowed comprehension activities to be performed with more depth (P. 62). Though Yongqi Gu (2003) pointed out that vocabulary acquisition is a very learner-centered activity with the effectiveness of the learner’s strategies depending on his/her attitude and motivation towards new vocabulary acquisition.

In 2010 Barron and Hammond suggested that evidence shows that inquiry-based, collaborative approaches benefit students in learning important twenty-first-century skills, such as the ability to work in teams, solve complex problems, and apply knowledge from one lesson to others. The research suggests that inquiry-based lessons and meaningful group work can be challenging to implement. They require changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices changes that are often new for teachers and students.
2.4.2 Arabic Studies

Ghaith (2002) reports in his article on an investigation into the relationship between cooperative learning, perceptions of classroom social support, feelings of alienation from school, and the academic achievement of university-bound learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). One hundred and thirty-five participants (73 males, 61 females, and one participant with missing gender data) enrolled in 10 sections of an introductory English course at a private university in Lebanon participated in the study. The participants completed a modified version of the Classroom Life Measure, and their responses were correlated with their academic achievement. Whereas the analysis of the data revealed that cooperative learning and the degree of academic support provided by teachers are positively correlated with achievement, learners' feelings of alienation from school were found to be negatively correlated with achievement. Likewise, the analysis revealed that cooperative learning is positively correlated with the perceived degrees of academic and personal support provided by teachers and peers, but not correlated with the feelings of alienation from school. (Ghaith, 2002, P.25)

In the recent years, Ghaith and his colleagues have a series of efforts to examine the effects of various cooperative learning methods on EFL students (Ghaith, 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2004; Ghaith & Bouzaineddine, 2003; Ghaith & El-Malak, 2004; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1998). Their studies, like that of Calderon, Hertz-Lazarowitz, and Slavin’s (1998), also demonstrated rigor of scientific inquiries. "Attention in detail was given from research design to data collection and analysis. Fidelity of treatment was carefully ensured" (e.g., Ghaith, 2003a). Cooperative learning methods scrutinized in these studies included Jigsaw II, Learning Together, and Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD). Data collection methods employed included paper-and-pencil tests as well as questionnaires.

Results of the studies indicated that EFL students in cooperative learning groups
performed either significantly better or at the same level, compared to those in whole-class groups. One study showed that the EFL high school students in Learning Together demonstrated higher academic gains than those in the whole-class instruction (Ghaith, 2003a). Another study showed that, while the EFL college students receiving Jigsaw II performed at the same level on literal reading comprehension as their peers receiving whole-class instruction, the Jigsaw II group significantly outperformed the whole-class group in higher-order reading comprehension (Ghaith & El-Malak, 2004).

In addition to the results favoring cooperative learning in the cognitive domain, the studies indicated that students receiving cooperative learning also appeared to feel more academic and personal support from their peers and teachers, less school alienation (Ghaith, 2002), and more class cohesion and fairness of grading (Ghaith, 2003b). Between higher achievers and lower achievers, the latter especially enjoyed the personal and academic support they received from their cooperative learning experience (Ghaith & Bouzeineddine, 2003). Likewise, in a recent study conducted by Sellers (2005), the learners showed a strong sense of group, reduced anxiety, and enhanced motivation after receiving second language instruction through cooperative learning. The cooperative learning method employed in the study was Co-op. Data were collected via individual interviews, focus group interviews, questionnaires, students’ reflection papers, and course evaluations.

In 2006, Shaaban investigated the effects of CLL on reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and motivation to read. Subjects of that study were grade five EFL learners. The researcher reported that the results showed no significant difference between the control and the experimental group on the dependent variables of reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. Regarding the dependent variable of motivation to read, the results came quite significant in favor of the experimental group.
In the same year, Alhaidari (2006) also tested the effectiveness of CLL to enhance reading comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency achievement. Alhaidari stated that CLL in the reading classroom corresponded with Wittrock’s model of generative learning because the interaction among learners in groups might result in improved learning outcomes. According to Alhaidari, “CLL invested in a reading class might allow group members to activate their background knowledge to comprehend any given text” (p. 26). In his study, 57 Arabic male students participated as control and experimental groups. The results of that study pointed out that there was a significant difference in favor of the experimental group in their vocabulary acquisition, reading fluency and attitude toward CLL. On the other hand, findings showed no significant difference between control and experimental groups in their reading comprehension performance and motivation to read.

In Yemen (2006), Al-Mansouri's study aimed at investigating the effect of Slavins strategy in cooperative learning on the first year secondary school pupils achievement in English language grammar in comparison to the current (traditional) method. This was assessed at different achievement levels (high, middle, low). The study sample consisted of 80 female pupils. They were divided into two groups, an experimental group consisting of 40 pupils taught by using the Slavin's strategy, and a control group consisting of 40 pupils studying following the current (traditional) method. The results of the study showed that there was a significant statistical difference at (0.05) level for the means of the pupil's results in the posttest with regard to the experimental group. (Al-Mansouri, 2006, P.60)

2.5. High School Project )Credited Hour System)

The attempts to develop high school education in the Middle East had started in the early 80s. In 1979 Kuwait started applying the credit hours system as a basic flexible system
in high school education. Also in Bahrain in 1978 a new system was used in high school education based on dividing it into sections; there were mathematics section, science section, social studies section and language section. Though these systems were not fully applied in all schools. Nevertheless, they were replaced with the old traditional system. Iraq in 1975 focused on finding a new way of teaching in high schools, something different than the traditional way they used then. They wanted a system built on new objective and new teaching methods where cooperative learning played an important role. So, Iraq established the comprehensive high school in 1976. The system was used in four high schools only and it was funded by the International Bank. (Al-Mune, 1985, p.29). Those attempts did not progress and they were used for a short period of time because of different reasons. One of them is the need for expensive human and technical recourses. (Ministry of Education in Kuwait, 1983, P.2)

Moving to Saudi Arabia, since 1964 there was a serious attempt in changing the traditional system used in high schools. The real refining and developing of high school education system started in 1977 by the establishment of (Al-Yarmok High School) which was called the comprehensive high school. The comprehensive high school gave many opportunities for individuals to deal with different skills and arts. It coupled knowledge with real practice which helped students in developing good practical knowledge. (AlGnaam, 1979, P.15)

After ten years of the establishment of the comprehensive high school, the developed high school was introduced in 1989. Its main focus was to introduce new courses and methods of teaching that can help students in their practical life. Though the systems may have a lot of similarities and follow the credit hour system, the developed high school overcame some of the problems such as repeating a whole year in case of failing a course. Students in this system can retake the course with new courses from the following year.
The system was applied in few schools in Riyadh and Jeddah for a short period of time due to different difficulties the system faced. Some of them were the need for well established premises, the ongoing complaints from students’ parents who had no clue about the system, the lack of well trained personnel and the high expenses such system required. Such difficulties and more led to cancel the system. And after more than 12 years the system is back with many adjustments.

In 2005 Al-Katherei explored the attitudes and perceptions of 10th grade students in Riyadh city toward the implementation of a new secondary school curriculum. A sample of 541 male and female students in five public schools was surveyed. The survey included five parts: the general attitudes toward the new secondary school curriculum, perceptions of learning in the new secondary school curriculum, perceptions of the curriculum organization, perceptions of achievement, and perceptions of guidance.

Later on 2009 a study done by Al-Shamek, Al-Fereh and and Abdulkareem showed, a positive application experience of the new secondary education system and courses. Thus, evidences of the negative prospective that have emerged is the result of incomplete equipment such as (books - lack of human resources and supervision) and not applying the instructions from the competent authorities such as delayed education departments in the areas the disbursement of the budget allocated for the schools of the experiment. Though the program in its third year (50% of schools did not happen to have the budget), which gives an indication that this educational experience requires scientific supervision, continuous assessment and accountability to face the problems of the application of such project.

Though financial and human recourse supports are important factors in this new system, results revealed that most participants held a general, positive attitude toward the new secondary school curriculum. Also, most participants seemed to agree on the processes taken in terms of learning, curriculum organization, achievement, and guidance. Moreover, the
results showed that the higher the participant's grade the more positive attitude and perceptions were found toward the implementation of new secondary school curriculum. In terms of gender, female students' perceptions were positively higher than male students' perceptions.

2.6. Conclusion

The previous review of literature has presented studies, researches, and articles about cooperative learning as well as its relationship to language learning in general and English skills in particular and the new system of high school education. Results and conclusions indicate the following:

1. There is a positive impact of cooperative learning on language learning and teaching.
2. Some of the studies, as stated above, targeted the reading skill and revealed strong influence of cooperation and the teaching of English to develop and enhance EFL learning. Though no enough data regarding vocabulary and grammar.
3. The studies regarding the new high school project, highlights the positive attitude toward the system. Though, the attitude of students and how such a project can help them develop and perform well in English language classes were not discussed in any previous study.

As far as the present researcher knows, this study will be the first to be conducted to incorporate cooperative learning as a method of teaching and the English language teaching in the new high school system in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. What is needed, therefore, is to investigate the effectiveness of using such a method in this new system.
Chapter 3

Research Methodology and Procedure

3.1 Introduction

This section points out the methodological issues related to this study, including a description of the research design, the participants, the instruments set to collect research data and the means to measure the research results.

3.2. Population of the Study

The population of the study is first year high school female students at two public schools, Riyadh, KSA. The schools represent the two teaching systems used in the high school education in Riyadh. The first school uses the "new developed high school program" and the other one uses the traditional way of teaching. The subjects’ age varies between 16 & 17 years old. The students in the first school were exposed to cooperative teaching method from the first day and through all their classes. Group work is focused and emphasized in all subjects.

3.3. Participants of the Study

This study took place during the first semester of the academic year 1431/32 A.H. (2010/11). The sample consisted of two intact groups of first year high school female students. These two groups were selected randomly from first year classes in both schools. The participants had spent no less than 3 years studying English as a subject in their intermediate schools. Course doublers are excluded so as not to affect the study’s results.
The study began with 120 participants. However, due to the exclusion of course repeaters and participants who did not complete the treatment or their data was missing; the subjects were reduced to 97 students: 53 in the traditional group and 44 in the cooperative learning group.

3.4. Research Design

This study is of a comparison design known as the nonequivalent control group design. In this design, the researcher presents one approach in the spectrum of scientific research methods and in some ways is a "hybrid of other methods", drawing on aspects of both experimental science and descriptive research. Similar to experimentation, comparison seeks to decipher the relationship between two or more variables by documenting observed differences and similarities between two or more subjects or groups (Carpi & Egger 2008). In contrast to experimentation, the comparative researcher does not subject one of those groups to a treatment, but rather observes a group that either by choice or circumstance has been subject to a treatment. Moreover, comparative research is similar to experimentation in that it involves comparing a treatment group to a control, but it differs in that the treatment is observed rather than being consciously imposed due to ethical concerns, or because it is not possible. Thus comparison involves observation in a more “natural” setting, not subject to experimental confines, and in this way evokes similarities with description. Comparison is used to determine and quantify relationships between two or more variables by observing different groups that either by choice or circumstance are exposed to different treatments. This kind of research design was significantly strengthened in the late 19th to the early 20th century with the invention and popularization of modern
statistical methods (Carpi, Egger 2008). In this study, the researcher did not compose
the cooperative learning experiment; it was already developed with no interference from
her.

3.5. Instruments of the Study

The researcher used two quantitative tools for data collection in this study: a pre and
post test and a 5 point Likert-type scale questionnaire. The pre and post tests were given to
both groups while the questionnaire was given only to the students in the developed high
school. The questionnaire aimed at measuring students’ attitude towards cooperative learning
in English classrooms and their motivation towards using the target language in the new
system.

Table 3-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Intake assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>(No treatment)</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>(treatment)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 to 10</td>
<td>(treatment)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td>(treatment)</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>(treatment)</td>
<td>Students’ attitude questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1. Pre- and Post-test

In this study, the researcher used the Transparent Language English Proficiency Test
and the Oxford Placement Listening Test 1. The proficiency test has four parts. Ggrammer1,
grammer2, vocabulary and reading comprehension (see Appendix A). It has 50 items divided
among the previous four parts. On the other hand the Oxford Placement Listening Test focus
mainly on the recognition of the word. It is the first stage of listening where students listen to a word and recognize its spelling, and that is suitable for the study sample. The test is of multiple-choice questions designed for English language learners to evaluate their English proficiency. This test is based on the standard English vocabulary and English grammar that one would find in any English language learning material, so that this proficiency test can measure the command of the English language regardless of the English language learning background. The tests meet the content and objectives of the study. The pre-test was administered to both groups to evaluate their English proficiency skills and comprehension abilities in the target language before the treatment (See Appendix A). Participants in this study took the same test after the treatment to measure the extent of their progress, if any, with regard to their performance in English. Additionally, the pre-test was used in this study to ensure that both groups are equivalent and to attribute any resultant differences in student performance after the intervention to the treatment itself and not to any preexisting differences. The purpose of the post-test, on the other hand, was to measure any change in student performance after the treatment through comparing pre- and post-test results. Any detected progress may help one draw conclusions about the technique utilized in this study. The difference in performance of the pre and post test of the two groups helps to evaluate the effectiveness of the teaching technique utilized in this study.

3.5.1.2. Test Validity

As mentioned above the test was obtained from well known resources. Nevertheless, the test was validated before being administered. Two kinds of validation, content and face validity, were obtained. The former refers to the inclusion of items relevant to the purpose of the test (Hughes, 1989, P22).
In addition, face validity was obtained. The test was shown to three supervisors (M.A. holders in TESL) from the English Department in the Ministry of Education in Riyadh. All reviewers had had the chance to teach English courses in public schools in the country for some time. Generally, they all agreed that the test was suitable for the level, and the items covered what they were supposed to test. Only one of the reviewers pointed out that students may have difficulties in comprehending the passage due to the technical terms used in the text. There were also two words that they suggested changing them to suit the cultural accepts. For example, in grammar part I they recommend that the researcher change question (8) which stated:

- I have only a _______ Christmas cards left to write.

They suggested the change of the word (Christmas) to (invitation) to suite cultural texts. As such, their insights were taken into consideration, and their recommended modifications and corrections were carried out.

3.5.1.3. Test Reliability

Test reliability was calculated for the pre- and post-test. According to Heaton (1975), for a test to be valid, it should be reliable in the first place. As defined by Hughes (1989), a test is reliable if it gives the same results when scored by different people or administered on different occasions.

To check test reliability, a pilot study was conducted before the beginning of the experiment on 45 students who were neither part of the experimental group nor the control one. It was given to a group of students in a different high school at the beginning of the first semester. These students received the test with a mean test-retest interval of two weeks. All 45 students were tested twice. Scores obtained from these two administrations were correlated using the Person Correlation Coefficient. Results revealed that the test showed a high degree of correlation. The alpha score was (0.895) which indicates that the test is highly
reliable. Also, scores obtained from these two administrations were correlated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Results revealed that the three tests showed a moderate to high degree of correlation as shown in the table below.

**English Grammar part 1**

Table 3-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**,063,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*,03,0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,080,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>**,0790</td>
<td>1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>**,0873</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0743</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>**,0861</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*,0301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>**,071,</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0073</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*,031,</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*,0374</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>**,04,</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0481</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at (0.001)
* significant at (0.05)

The results shown in table 3-1 showed that all the items correlated at (0.01) except for items number 5,7,9,14 they correlated at (0.05). These results show a moderate inner correlation.

**English Grammar part 2**

Table 3-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**,00,0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**,0764</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,060,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−,0,97</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>**,0439</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,08,9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>**,0630</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0481</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>**,0068</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0083</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>**,070,</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0390</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>**,04,9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**,0831</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at (0.001)
The results shown in table 3-2 showed that all the items correlated at (0.01) expect for item number 2. It showed a low correlation while the other results show high inner correlation.

**English Vocabulary**
Table 3-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**,0064</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>**,044,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0717</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>**,0668</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*,0343</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0,087</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0449</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**,0000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*,0,1</td>
<td>1,</td>
<td>**,0407</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at (0.001)

The results shown in table 3-3 showed that all the items correlated at (0.01) expect for item number 8 it correlated at (0.05). These results show significant inner correlation.

**English Reading Comprehension**
Table 3-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**,07, ,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>**,0819</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,084</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>**,0007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,040,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>**,0491</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*,0339</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>**,00,3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,073,</td>
<td>1,</td>
<td>**,0798</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at (0.001)
* significant at (0.05)

The results shown in table 3-4 showed that all the items correlated at (0.01) expect for item number 9; it correlated at (0.05).While item number 7 show a low correlation
which means that the result is not significant. While the other results show high inner correlation.

**Listening Comprehension Test**  
Table 3-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Serial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**,063,</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>**,07,4</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>**,0960</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0904</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>**,0746</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>**,0916</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0907</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>**,0804</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>**,0907</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,091,</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>**,0890</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>**,0464</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0441</td>
<td>8,</td>
<td>**,06,7</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>**,0901</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>**,0710</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0904</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>**,0848</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>**,0700</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,09,6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>**,0846</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>**,090,</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0900</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>**,0737</td>
<td>6,</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>**,0884</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>**,0848</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0707</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>**,0804</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0871</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>**,0941</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0040</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>**,0907</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>**,09,6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0773</td>
<td>9,</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>**,0603</td>
<td>4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,07,0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>**,0814</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0383</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>**,0738</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>**,090,</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>**,0010</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>**,0833</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>**,0883</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0717</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>**,0441</td>
<td>7,</td>
<td>**,0909</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>**,090,</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>**,0840</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0608</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>**,0901</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>**,0908</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>**,0881</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>**,0904</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>**,0990</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**,0960</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>**,0908</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>**,0019</td>
<td>0,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at (0.001)
The results shown in table 3-5 showed that all the items correlated at (0.01) expect for item number 96; it correlated at (0.05). These results show high inner correlation.

The following table shows the correlation coefficients between each scale item

Table 3-7

The total correlation coefficient of the whole exam parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correlation coefficient</th>
<th>Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**0.994</td>
<td>Grammar 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**0.872</td>
<td>Grammar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**0.879</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**0.761</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**0.996</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the pilot exam showed the exam is reliable and suitable for the students' level.

3.5.2. Questionnaire

At the end of the treatment, the subjects of the experimental group (the students in the new developed high school) filled out a questionnaire to determine their level of motivation to learn English in this new system and their attitude towards cooperative learning. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items which were set to finding out subjects’ attitude towards English cooperative learning in the new high school system and to measure the degree of their motivation. The type of questionnaire implemented in this study is a five-point Likert scale in which students indicated their degree of agreement to each statement. In Likert scaling, respondents are asked to make a decision on their level of agreement with questionnaire statements by checking one of five response categories: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree. Likert scaling is commonly used in survey research as a technique for measuring respondent attitudes (Corbetta, 2003).
The researcher chose a five-point Likert scale for the present study because such questionnaires with fewer options may yield higher mean scores than those with ten options when one considers the highest obtained score (Dawes, 2008).

3.5.2.1. Questionnaire's Validity

To validate the questionnaires, face validity was obtained. The questionnaire was shown to five professors of general education in the collage of education in the University of Hail, and modifications were made based on their recommendations. Their recommendation included rearranging statements. That is putting the questions regarding cooperative learning together as the first part of the questioner and the questions regarding the new high school system together as a second part. Also, they suggested the inclusion of more items to measure motivation.

3.5.2.2. Questionnaire's Reliability

The questionnaire has 20 items divided between two subscales: cooperative learning (15 items), the new developed high school system (5 items). Respondents are asked to make a decision on their level of agreement with questionnaire statements by checking one of five response categories: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

To assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire, correlation between questionnaire items (intended to measure the same characteristic) was calculated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Table 3-8 shows the correlation coefficients between each subscale item and the total of the items belonging to the same subscale.
Table 3-8

*Correlation Coefficients between Each Scale Item and the Total of the Items Related to the Same Subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Pearson's correlation coefficient values (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscale 1: Cooperative learning (group work)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 1</td>
<td>0.672**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 2</td>
<td>0.506**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 3</td>
<td>0.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 4</td>
<td>0.529**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 5</td>
<td>0.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 6</td>
<td>0.628**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 7</td>
<td>0.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 8</td>
<td>0.502**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 9</td>
<td>0.664**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 10</td>
<td>0.456**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 11</td>
<td>0.299*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 12</td>
<td>0.601**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 13</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 14</td>
<td>0.418**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 15</td>
<td>0.293*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscale 2: The new high school program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 16</td>
<td>0.760**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 17</td>
<td>0.608**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement no. 18</td>
<td>0.692**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pearson’s $r$ varies from -1 to +1, with 0 indicating no relationship. If Pearson's correlation coefficient value is +1, it indicates a perfect positive linear relationship, but if it is -1, so there is a perfect negative linear relationship between two variables (Dowdy & Wearden, 1983). As shown above, Pearson's $r$ ranges from 0.29 to 1 indicating a low to high degree of correlation between each subscale item and the total of items in each subscale. Another measure of reliability known as Cronbach's alpha was used for the questionnaire to examine how closely related a set of items are as a group. Alpha scores can be less than or equal to 1, but higher scores of alpha (those of 0.70 or higher) are desirable. For the 15 items of the first subscale the Cronbach's alpha scores were between (0.785-0.747) which is considered highly reliable. For the 5 items of the second subscale in the given questionnaire, the Cronbach's alpha scores were between (0.664-0.587) which considered reliable. Cronbach's alpha for the whole 20 items of the questionnaire was computed to be 0.805; this result indicates that the questionnaire is highly reliable.

3.6. Treatment

The present study was of 12 weeks in the first academic semester of 1432-2011. The first group (n = 53) received traditional in-class instruction, whereas the second group (n = 44) was exposed to a cooperative learning method in teaching under the new high school system formula. The researcher scanned the pioneer high schools in the new developed system. Also, she chose two schools in the same neighborhood one uses the system and the other one uses the traditional way of teaching, the 90% of the freshmen students on these two schools came from the same intermediate school which is using the traditional way of
teaching and they had mainly the same level in English as the pre test shows. The required approvals from the Ministry of Education was taken and meetings with the school principles were scheduled to discuss the researcher's attendance plan. Then, the researcher met the English language teachers and gave them a brief about the study. The teachers organized the visits with the researcher to help her collect the required data. Though recording the interaction in the classrooms was difficult, the researcher depends only on the data collected from the tests and the questionnaire.

3.6.1. Academic Preparation

3.6.1.1. Cooperative Learning

As mentioned before, cooperative learning requires that students work with one another to accomplish a common goal. However, putting students in groups together does not mean that cooperative learning is taking place (Johnson & Johnson, as cited in Dahley, 1994, P7). For that reason, certain elements are addressed and applied to achieve effective cooperative learning. These elements include:

1. Students’ role:

   Each group member must participate in getting the tasks completed and be responsible of learning from others and helping the others to learn. Also students in the cooperative group have to depend on one another to accomplish the goals of each activity. Moreover, students should achieve a level of interaction. This feature is attained when there is a mutual influence among group members. Success of group members is elevated by encouraging, supporting and assisting one another (Dahley, 1994, P8 & Stahl, n.d.).
2. Teacher’s role:

According to Richards & Rodgers (2001), the role of the teacher in cooperative learning environment is to assign students into groups, set goals, plan tasks, and select material and time to carry out the tasks. The teacher during this study fulfilled these roles.

3. Groups organization:

Group formation is a vital element in cooperative learning, and it is one of the teacher’s duties to complete.

Though in this study, the students in the cooperative learning group were already divided and organized to groups by the system of the school.

3.6.2 The Orientation Week & the Pre-test (Week 1)

The researcher attended with both groups on a weekly basis. During the first week, the researcher had a clear picture of the two different methods used in both schools. During the first week, students of both groups were given the pre-test without any previous notice. Two hours were allocated for the pre-test. As mentioned above, the aim of the pre-test was to assess student English language skills and to evaluate their knowledge regarding the information represented in the test. Additionally, the pre-test was used in this study to ensure that both groups are comparable to each other and to attribute any resultant differences in student performance after the intervention to the treatment itself and not to any preexisting differences.

3.6.3 The Post-test and Questionnaire (Weeks 11-12)

The post-test was given to students of both groups during Week 11 and without any previous notice. As mentioned above, the purpose of the post-test was to measure any change
in student performance after the treatment through comparing pre- and post-test results of both groups. Two hours were allocated for the post-test. Any detected progress may help one draw conclusions about the technique observed in this study. One week later, students of the cooperative learning group in the new developed high school were given an attitude questionnaire to examine their attitudes towards the technique of group work under the formula of the new high school system. Students were not asked to write their names on the questionnaire sheets since the purpose of such questionnaire was to obtain honest responses from participants. Thus, students were urged to give honest and objective responses with regard to the technique implemented.

3.7. Data Analysis

To analyze the obtained data, the researcher used descriptive statistics to describe the basic features of the collected data. Descriptive statistics are necessary to show the distribution, the central tendency (mean, median, and mode), and the dispersion (standard deviation) of data. Inferential statistics such as the independent samples $t$ tests, the paired samples $t$ tests, and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient were used to compare the mean scores of both groups, to measure student progress in each group, and to compare student performance on one post-test with that of another.

3.7. Summary

In brief, the present study targeted Saudi female high school students using cooperative learning method offered by the new high school system. To achieve the purpose of the study, the nonequivalent-control-group design was followed, and students were divided into two groups: experimental (the group work) ($n = 44$) and control (traditional group).
(n = 53). The control group received traditional in-class instruction. And the experimental group received a cooperative learning method of teaching.

A pre- and post-test was set to assess student English language skills before and after the treatment, and it was also used to evaluate student knowledge of the information represented in the test. Additionally, an attitude questionnaire was administered at the end of the experiment to explore students' attitude towards the cooperative learning method on the new high school system. To analyze the collected data, a series of t test statistics procedures and descriptive analyses have been used.
Chapter 4

Date Analysis and Discussion of Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings and interpretations of the data collected from the pre- and post-tests, the questionnaire and the classroom observation of the present study. The data collected was used to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the effectiveness of cooperative learning when it comes to learning English as a foreign language for high school students in Saudi Arabia?
2. Do students use linguistic features in their discourse while being involved in cooperative structures?
3. Does it motivate students and encourage them to develop their language skills?
4. What are the students' attitudes toward this project and the using of cooperative learning in English classes?

Two sets of analyses were done in the study including the English Proficiency pre- and post-test, as well as students’ attitudes towards cooperative learning and motivation towards using this method of teaching in the new high school system. For the pre-test analysis, the researcher used a t-test to determine the differences between the two groups, if any. These tests were also used to establish the initial equivalence of the groups. For the post-test, the same methods of analysis were used to measure how effective the usage of such a method was. All in all, the analyses employed to assess, and derive results from the research data included the following:
1. Results of the t-test of the two groups in the pre- and post-test designed to measure the five parts of the test (grammer1, grammer2, vocabulary, reading comprehension and listening).

2. Results of the paired samples t-test to investigate the difference in English skills performance between the pre- and post-tests for the cooperative learning group.

3. Percentages of students’ responses to the questionnaire to investigate students’ attitudes towards cooperative learning in English classrooms.

4. Percentages of students’ responses to the questionnaire to investigate students’ motivation towards cooperative learning in English classrooms in the new high school system.

The results from each datum set are discussed in details in the following sections, and they are compared to other results discussed in the review of literature when appropriate.

4.2 Testing Research Questions

The following section dwells on the findings related to the four questions raised in this study.

4.2.1 Testing Students' English Proficiency

The first research question: Is cooperative learning really effective when it comes to learning English as a foreign language for high school students in Saudi Arabia? And the second question: Do students develop linguistic features while being involved in cooperative structures?

To answer these two questions, one needs to compare the performance of students in both groups before and after the treatment. The pre-test was crucial in determining the initial equivalence between the cooperative learning group and the control (traditional) group.
Table 4-1

**t-test: for the difference in the pre-test of English proficiency between the two groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97.95</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ensure the equality of both groups, the researcher used the independent samples *t* test. Results of the English proficiency pre-test (see Table 4-1) showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups. The mean score of the cooperative learning group (n = 44) was (97.95) with a standard deviation (SD) of (10.32), whereas the control group (n = 53) scored (97.47) with a SD of (9.74).

As shown in Table 4-1, the Sig. (2-tailed) was t(95)= 0.236 , P= 0.814 and it is greater than (0.05); hence one can conclude that there was no significant difference in the mean scores for each of the two groups before carrying out the experiment. The results do not reveal significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups before the starting of the study.

To investigate the gains the cooperative learning group made in their English proficiency test after undergoing the treatment, a *t*-test was applied to the scores of the group’s English proficiency pre and post-test.

Table (4-2)

**t-test: for the difference in the English proficiency pre and post-test of in the CLL group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>97.55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>3.265</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>104.79</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated in table (4-2) showed that the cooperative learning group’s pre test mean score was (97.55) with SD of (10.32) while the post test was (104.79) with SD of
(13.76), and the t-value was (3.265). The variation between the two mean scores indicates that the cooperative learning group improved significantly after undergoing the treatment.

The analysis, as shown in table (4-2), indicates a significant difference, favoring the post test in cooperative learning group. Both means of measurement revealed that the sig (2-tailed) is less than (.01), therefore, the difference in English proficiency between the two tests is statistically significant.

To have more investigation of the gains the CLL group made in their English proficiency after undergoing the treatment, a t-test was applied to the scores of the two groups post-test.

Table (4-3)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Group} & \text{N} & \text{Mean} & \text{Std. Deviation} & \text{t-Value} & \text{Sig. (2-tailed)} \\
\hline
\text{Cooperative learning group} & 44 & 104.79 & 13.76 & 1.795 & 0.076 \\
\text{Control Group} & 53 & 99.66 & 14.24 & & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The results indicated in table (4-3) showed that the CLL group’s mean score was (104.79) with SD of (13.76) while the traditional group was (99.66) with SD of (14.24), and the t-value was (1.795). The variation between the two groups’ mean scores indicates that the CLL group improved significantly in comparison to the control group.

The analysis, as shown in table (4-3), indicates a significant difference, favoring the cooperative learning group. Both means of measurement revealed that the sig (2-tailed) is less than (.01); therefore, the difference in English proficiency between the two groups is statistically significant. Based on this result, the English classes in the new system of high education used now in Saudi Arabia with the use of cooperative learning is effective when it comes to teaching and learning English.
To have a more detailed look at each part of the exam the following table (4-4) illustrates the results

Table 4-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam part</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Cooperative learning group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English grammar I</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English grammar II</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English vocabulary</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Comprehension</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no significant difference in the English grammar I test scores between the post-test of the control group (M= 5.62 , SD= 2.31) and the post-test of the cooperative learning group (M= 7.47 , SD=2.92 ); t- value (95)= 1.608, P= 0.111

- There is a significant difference in the results of English grammar II test between the post-test of the control group (M= 6.11 , SD=2.46) and the post-test of the cooperative learning group (M= 7.95, SD=2.72); t (95) = 3.491, P= 0.001 for the post test of the cooperative learning group.

- There is no significant difference in the English vocabulary test scores between the post-test of the control group (M= 2.96, SD= 1.56) and the post-test of the cooperative learning group (M= 2.63, SD= 1.64); t (95) = 0.997, P= 0.321.

- There is a significant difference in the results of the English reading comprehension test between the post-test of the control group (M= 2.33 , SD= 1.90) and the post-test of the
cooperative learning group (M= 3.52 , SD= 2.57); t (95) = 2.529, P= 0.013. for the cooperative learning group

- There is no significant difference in the results of the Listening test between the post-test of the control group (M= 81.62 , SD= 12.45) and the post-test of the cooperative learning group (M= 83.20 , SD= 10.10); t(95)= 0.677, P= 0.500.

4.3. Attitude and Motivation

4.3.1. Testing Students' attitude and Motivation

The third and the forth research questions ask:

1. Does it motivate students and encourage them to develop their language skills?
2. Do the students have a positive attitude toward this project and the using of cooperative learning?

To answer this question, the researcher used the five-point Likert questionnaire shown in (Appendix B) to gather data. The 20-item questionnaire was administered to the participants of the cooperative learning group at the end of the semester to explore their attitudes towards cooperative learning used in the new high school system. The questionnaire was divided into two subscales exploring the belief that cooperative learning in English classes was helpful to student learning, and the acceptance of the new high school developed system. Each questionnaire item consists of a five-point rating scale and coded as follows:
5 = Strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3= Neutral, 2 = Disagree and 1 = Strongly disagree.

The range was calculated for the scale where the range = 5-1=4. By dividing the range by the number of categories (5), the result would be 4/5= 0.80 which represented the length of each category of the five scales. Then the length of the category was added to the lowest
grade of the scale which is the number (1). So the first category was (1+.80 = 1.08) (Dörnyei, 2003, P 96). This process was applied to the rest of the categories (see Table 4-5).

Table 4-5

*Range of scale used for analyzing the results of the questionnaires*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1.00-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>&gt; 1.81 to 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>&gt; 2.61 to 3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>&gt; 3.41 to 4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>&gt; 4.21 to 5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows the number of responses, the percentage and the mean score out of five.

Table 4-6

*Students' Attitudes Towards Cooperative Learning in the English Classrooms in the New High developed System*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1. I am more motivated</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English due to cooperative learning.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2. I do not get the chance to practice the language in class because of group work.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3. Group work makes me depends on others.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4. Group work helped me overcome the problems I used to face in English courses.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5. The teacher still encourage me to use the target language individually in group work.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6. Group work makes language learning easier and more interesting.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7. I depend on</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>autonomy learning more than group work in the classroom to develop the target language.</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8. Group work distracts me from following the directions and the explanation of the teacher.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9. I think that group work help in building good and effective relationships among students.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10. Group work develops my knowledge.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11. Group work makes students more afraid of making mistakes while using the target language.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12. Group work gives</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. 13. Group work prompts me towards order and distribution of tasks and roles.
    - 42
    - 42.9
    - 25
    - 25.5
    - 9
    - 9.2
    - 15
    - 15.3
    - 7
    - 7.1
    - 3.82
    - 1.32

14. Group work minimizes my teacher's attention towards correcting my mistakes.
    - 8
    - 8.1
    - 19
    - 19.2
    - 24
    - 24.2
    - 16
    - 16.2
    - 32
    - 32.3
    - 2.55
    - 1.33

15. I seek to distinguish my group in the English classroom more than my individual distinction.
    - 8
    - 8
    - 10
    - 10
    - 11
    - 11
    - 28
    - 28
    - 43
    - 43
    - 2.12
    - 1.28

4. 16. Group work gives me the encouragement to discuss my ideas and points of views.
    - 32
    - 32.7
    - 22
    - 22.4
    - 16
    - 16.3
    - 18
    - 15.8
    - 10
    - 10.2
    - 3.49
    - 1.37

7. 17. The new developed system contributes on using
    - 33
    - 33.3
    - 21
    - 21.2
    - 26
    - 26.3
    - 13
    - 13.1
    - 6
    - 6.1
    - 3.63
    - 1.24
The questionnaire above contains 20 items set to check subjects’ level of motivation to
learn English using cooperative learning in the new system of high school and their attitude
towards this new system. Below is detailed explanation of each statement.

As shown above, statement one, *I am more motivated to learn English due to*
cooperative learning, scored (3.34) as its mean score and consequently ranked tenth in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>The new developed system will be used in all my upcoming school years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The new developed system doesn’t help me improve my English language through reading and research outside the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I can see the effective role of my teacher in the new developed system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>The new developed system will be used in all my upcoming school years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The new developed system doesn’t help me improve my English language through reading and research outside the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I can see the effective role of my teacher in the new developed system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>The new developed system will be used in all my upcoming school years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The new developed system doesn’t help me improve my English language through reading and research outside the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I can see the effective role of my teacher in the new developed system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaire above contains 20 items set to check subjects’ level of motivation to
learn English using cooperative learning in the new system of high school and their attitude
towards this new system. Below is detailed explanation of each statement.

As shown above, statement one, *I am more motivated to learn English due to*
cooperative learning, scored (3.34) as its mean score and consequently ranked tenth in the
same subscale. Thus, students' attitudes towards this statement were neutral as indicated in Table (4-5).

The second statement is a negative statement set to find out how valid the subjects’ responses were. If subjects of the cooperative learning group agreed with this item then it contradicts their responses to the previous items 1-5, and thus makes their responses questionable.

Since the statement is a negative one then the scale is reversed as follows:

Strongly Disagree = 5
Disagree = 4
Neuter = 3
Agree = 2
Strongly Agree = 1

This means that the more disagreement the statement gets the more positive the result is. The mean score was (2.13) as its mean score and consequently ranked fifteenth in the same subscale. Thus, students' attitudes towards this statement were strongly disagreeing as indicated in Table (4-5).

Statement three ‘Group work makes me depend on others’ scored the eighteenth and its mean (2.00), indicating that students strongly disagreed with this statement.

As for statement four, Group work helped me overcome the problems I used to face in English courses, the mean score was (3.18) and it was ranked thirteenth in the same subscale. The score showed students' favorable attitude towards this statement.

Statement five, aimed to see if students think that their teacher still encourage them to use the target language individually in group work, scored the twelfth and its mean (3.37) indicating that students agreed on this statement.
The mean score of statement six 'group work makes language learning easier and more interesting' was (3.60) and ranked at 8/20 which showed that the subjects agreed with this statement.

Statement seven aimed at finding out if the subjects depend on autonomy learning more than group work in the classroom to develop the target language. The statement ranked 11/20 with a mean score of (3.42). The score showed that there was agreement on this statement.

For the eighth statement 'group work distracts me from following the directions and the explanation of the teacher', the mean score was (3.76) and thus the statement ranked fifth in the subscale. The score of the statement revealed that the subjects responded in agreement.

Statement nine aimed at finding if students think that group work helps in building good and effective relationships among them, the mean score for that statement was (3.92) and it ranked second in the subscale. That shows that the subjects agreed to it.

Statement ten, twelve and thirteen carried positive attitudes toward cooperative learning. Statement ten 'group work develops my knowledge' and statement thirteen 'group work prompts me towards order and distribution of tasks and roles' which both ranked three and the mean score was (3.82). Also statement twelve 'group work gives the encouragement to discuss my ideas and points of views' which ranked ninth and its mean score was (3.49).

All three statements show agreement responses.

Statement eleven on the other hand, aimed to find if group work will make students more afraid of making mistakes while using the target language. The students did not agree with that statement which ranked seventeenth and its mean score was (2.09).

Statement fourteen 'group work minimize my teacher's attention towards correcting my mistakes' the statement ranked fourteenth on the subscale and its mean score was (2.55) which shows neutral responses.
Statement fifteen 'I seek to distinguish my group in the English classroom more than my individual distinction' the statement ranked (16/20) and its mean score was (2.12) which shows that the students didn’t agree.

Statements sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen and twenty focused on students’ attitude towards the new developed high school project. Statement No.16 was 'the new developed system contributes in making the process of learning English more interesting’, this statement ranked fourth and its mean score was (3,78) which shows agreement.

Statement seventeen 'the new developed system contributes on using the classroom components' this statement ranked seventh and its mean score was (3,63) which show agreement responses.

Statement eighteenth was 'I hope that the new developed system will be used in all my upcoming school years' ranked sixth and its mean score was (3,66) which show that students agreed with this statement.

Statement nineteenth carried a negative attitude toward the new high school system to test if students will give a similar response. The statement was 'the new developed system doesn’t help me improve my English language through reading and research outside the classroom’. The students responded with disagreement to this statement, which ranked (19/20) and its mean score was (1.99).

The last statement 'I can see the effective role of my teacher in the new developed system’ ranked the first and its mean score was (4,09) which shows high agreement to this statement.

To calculate the percentage of the questionnaire responses, first, the mean score of each statement is compared to the scale measure provided in Table (4-5), then, the number of statements that indicate general agreement are added together and divided by the number of
statements the questionnaire had, multiplied by 100. The same thing is done to neuter and
general disagreement statements.

By doing so, it can be seen that 70% of the subjects agreed that they were motivated
to use group work in English class rooms in the new high school developed system. The
analysis of subjects’ responses indicated that items 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,12,13, 16, 17, 18 and
20 all scored above (3.40) which means that the subjects were motivated. 30% of subjects’
responses were undecided for the items mean scores were > (2.60) to (3.40).

In addition, though the majority of the responses showed positive attitude the grand
mean score as stated in the table above was (3.192) which when compared to the scale
measures supports that the subjects were neutral toward the cooperative learning process in
the new developed high school system.

4.4. Discussion of Results
4.4.1 Discussion of the Test Results

The first finding in the study revealed that the experimental group outperformed the
traditional group in their English grammar test. This difference in students’ performance can
be justified on the grounds that the experimental group carried out cooperative work
activities. This technique (i.e., CL) seems to have improved subjects’ grammar level in the
target language. These findings are supported with multiple studies. As Liao(2005) points
out on her paper that cooperative learning was found to have large positive effects on
motivation and strategy use, and medium-to-large positive effects on grammar achievement.
Overall, the findings indicated a consistent pattern in favor of cooperative learning over
whole-class instruction in teaching the Taiwanese learners English grammar. The results of
the exploratory questions indicated that cooperative learning improved motivation and
strategy use of learners across all subgroups, but more so with those performing at higher and
lower levels. Grammar achievement of learners at higher and lower levels was affected positively. Additional analyses also indicated cooperative learning positively affected learning at higher cognitive levels.

Also, According to Olsen and Kagan (1985), cooperative learning provides second language (L2) students more opportunity for language development than traditional language classes do. They argued that, quantitatively, cooperative learning amplifies active use of language when L2 students try to comprehend or produce the language within their cooperative groups. Liang (2002), in a discussion on how cooperative learning could have positively affected the language competence of her experimental learners, emphasized three factors: the increase in student talk for academic and social purposes, the incentive structure of positive interdependence, and the supportive and communicative learning environment. Survey studies conducted by Ghaith (2002, 2003b) indicated that the cooperative learners felt more academic and personal support from their peers and teachers, more class cohesion and fairness of grading, and less school alienation. Another survey study (Ghaith, 2001) suggested clear cooperative structure and lucid guidance as the possible reasons for positive cooperative learning effects. The findings of the present study suggest that these factors may also have played a role in enhancing the experimental learners’ grammar achievement. Other possible reasons can be explained in light of the following motivational theories, social cognitive theories, and cognitive elaboration theories.

First, according to Locke and Latham’s (1990) goal setting theory, human behaviors, which, of course, include learning behaviors, are regulated by goals. Factors influencing the level of learners’ goal setting and goal commitment include whether group goals, encouragement, and feedback exist in the learning situation. Having group goals on top of personal goals leads to stronger goal commitment to the personal goals than having merely personal goals; giving encouragement and performance feedback enhances level of goal
setting. All these three factors group goals, encouragement, and performance feedback—were essential parts of the experimental curriculum parts of the experimental curriculum. Like all other cooperative learning methods, the starting point of the experimental program was having group goals, which would motivate learners to offer both academic and psychological support, including encouragement and feedback, to each other. In the cooperative learning group, feedback was rendered not only through peer assessment and correction but also through routine calculation of individual improvement points and group average improvement points.

As for vocabulary acquisition, the results showed that both groups: cooperative learning and traditional, have no significant improvement in their post-tests. The post-measure of vocabulary acquisition between the two groups showed that the subjects of both groups have no statistically significant difference. Previous studies show that learning vocabulary is an ongoing process that takes time and practice. Nakata (2006) acknowledged that vocabulary acquisition requires continual repetition in order for effective vocabulary learning to take place (p. 19). Vocabulary acquisition is not something a student can spend time learning or memorizing, like grammar, and be successful. Maiguashca (1993) stated that teaching or studying grammar is based on a set of rules with a coherent structure which students follow or remember, but the same is not true of vocabulary (p. 91). Acquisition requires the learner to be disciplined, spending time each day working on words he/she does not know in order for learners to remember high frequency words and put them into their long term memory, Nation and Waring (1997) stated that learners need to encounter the word multiple times in authentic speaking, reading, and writing context at the student’s appropriate level (p. 8).

Yongqi Gu (2003) pointed out that vocabulary acquisition is a very learner-centered activity with the effectiveness of the learner’s strategies depending on his/her attitude and motivation towards new vocabulary acquisition (p.2). That kind of learner center may not be
highly focused in cooperative learning. Also, Shaaban (2006) investigated the effects of CLL on reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and motivation to read. Subjects of that study were grade five EFL learners. The researcher reported that the results showed no significant difference between the control and the experimental group on the dependent variables of reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. Regarding the dependent variable of motivation to read, the results came quite significant in favor of the experimental group.

That finding lead to the third finding of this study, this study showed that there is a significant difference in favor for subjects in the cooperative learning group regarding reading comprehension. In recalling the findings of previous studies we can see that cooperative learning play an important role in developing students' reading comprehension skills. Thornton (1999) used a method that combined traditional instruction with CLL in her reading class. She assigned her students to a group of eight and asked them to work together. The aim of CLL as Thornton mentioned was to allow all students to participate and to ensure comprehension. Regarding the effectiveness of CLL on reading, the researcher said, “Using a combination of traditional instructional methods and cooperative learning groups was an effective way to help students understand and analyze challenging texts” (P. 10).

Also, Chen (2005) did a research in which she compared Cooperative Learning Approach to Grammar- Translation Method and examined whether CLL promotes motivation and how motivation affects listening, speaking and reading performance. Chen stated in the research that there was no direct evidence between motivation and language skills improvement. Therefore, the researcher assumed that learners’ high scores in listening, speaking and reading are related to “cooperative learning approach…, which fosters English language skills.” (P. 92)
In this study, students in the cooperative learning group used to have a reading passage out of 250-350 words once a week that they read and discussed together as a group. This kind of activity was not provided in the traditional group.

As for listening comprehension, the study shows that there is no significant difference in the results of the post tests of both groups. That may be due to the lack of listening practice in both schools. The researcher noticed that there were no language labs in either school. Therefore, teachers used to skip listening exercises in the text books.

All in all, since cooperative language learning in the new developed high school system affected some areas in English language proficiency positively, it is possible to say that the use of such a positive technique in English classrooms in Saudi Arabia would yield the same positive influence if not greater, which is proved in this study findings.

4.4.2 Discussion of the Questionnaire

The analysis of the attitude questionnaire indicated that subjects of the cooperative learning group had a positive attitude towards cooperative learning in the new high school system. Students seem to agree that learning English in this new system with their group members helped them improve their English skills performance. Based on this, it is apparent that students do respond positively to cooperative learning in the new high school system in Saudi Arabia.

In relation to previous studies, Alhaidari (2006) reported in his work that subjects who carried out reading tasks cooperatively showed positive attitude towards this technique. Also, Atsuta (2003) carried out a study to improve unsuccessful learners’ motivation where he incorporated cooperative learning as one of the many motivational strategies employed to achieve the intended goal. The findings of Atsuta showed the many advantages of CLL. These include making students more responsible of their learning,
achieving high level of motivation, and allowing students in a mix-ability environment to help one another and thus promoting the learning process.

Based on what is stated above, it is obvious that learners’ responded positively to cooperative language learning in the new high developed system in Saudi Arabia. In response to the fourth and fifth questions, the study revealed that subjects undergoing the treatment of cooperative learning in the new system were motivated to learn the target language. The implementation of cooperative learning in this new high school system seems to have motivated the participants to practice the English language.

Results reported by Shaaban (2006), Chen (2005) and Jacobs (2000) showed that cooperative language learning increased subjects motivation to read in English. The same positive finding regarding the new high school system was stated by AlKatheri (2005); his study found that students have a positive attitude toward the new system and that they are motivated to learn under its umbrella. Also in 2009 a study done by Al-Shamek, Al-Fereh and Abdulkareem showed, a positive application experience of the new secondary education system and courses.

One can easily conclude that cooperative language learning in the new high developed system leads to the same positive effect: motivation to use and learn the target language, and this was discovered in the findings of this study.

In summary, the results obtained from this study and the findings of other studies in relation to the topic all came in favor of cooperative language learning in the new high developed high school system. It seems to have improved students’ English performance. This approach to learning also appears to be generally accepted by learners. Additionally, this method has enhanced subjects’ motivation to use the target language. Thus, cooperative language learning in the new developed high school system has a positive impact on subjects’ English performance and their attitude and motivation to learn it.
Chapter 5

Summary, Implications and Suggestions

5.1. Introduction

This chapter contains a summary and an overview of the findings in the previous chapter. Also, it presents the theoretical and pedagogical implications of this study. The last two sections of the chapter conclude with the limitations and some suggestions for further research.

5.2. Summary

The general purpose of this study was to determine whether the use of cooperative language learning in the new developed high school system will have a positive effect on students' English proficiency. The new high school system in Saudi Arabia comes with many potential changes to the traditional way of teaching. One of them is using cooperative learning as the basic method in the classroom. The female high school students in Riyadh in two different schools were the subject of this study.

The study aimed to find if cooperative language learning in the new developed high school system would enhance their English proficiency as measured by their abilities in grammar, reading comprehension, vocabulary and listening comprehension. The study also sought to measure students’ attitude towards cooperative learning and motivation to learn English in the new high school system.

For the purpose of the study, a comparison research design in the form of non-equivalent control group design was carried out. The experiment lasted for twelve weeks in which two intact groups from two female high schools in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, were chosen as the study groups, one from a school that is following the new high school system and the other group from a traditional school. Both groups are high school freshman. During the
study, subjects of the cooperative learning group (44 students) attended classes based on cooperative learning. The control group (53 students), on the other hand, did not carry out any additional activities. To control as many variables as possible, the number of classes per week, duration of each class and components to be taught were all the same in both groups.

In order to test the effectiveness of such strategy, two quantitative tools for data collection were used to compile the findings of the study. To begin with, a pre- and a post-test were administered to measure English proficiency before and after the treatment. Afterwards, a questionnaire was designed to measure students’ attitude towards cooperative learning and motivation to study English in the new high school system.

5.3. Overview of the Findings of the Study

In order to answer the first and the second questions of the study, a pre- and a post test in English proficiency with a section about listening comprehension were administered to both groups before and after the treatment. Comparisons were then made between the overall mean scores of the two groups’ measures by applying t-test statistics procedures.

The results obtained from the pre-test measures showed that the two groups were equivalent prior to the treatment. However, post-test measures revealed statistically significant difference between the two groups’ performance in their grammar and reading comprehension in favor of the cooperative learning group. Additionally based on these findings, it was clear that cooperative learning did have a positive effect on the subjects who had undergone the treatment.

As for the third and fourth questions, a questionnaire about motivation to learn and use English in the new high school system and their attitude toward that was given to subjects of the cooperative learning group after undergoing the treatment.
Results based on frequency distribution of subjects’ responses showed that 57% of the experimental group students agreed that they became motivated to learn English using cooperative learning method. Obviously, cooperative learning did motivate subjects involved in the treatment to learn and practice English.

Also, findings showed that 58% of the experimental group students had a positive attitude towards the usage of cooperative learning in the new high school system. Students accepted cooperative language learning as a means of learning and improving English proficiency. Moreover, the findings of the present study show that, while cooperative learning enhances learning motivation and it promotes higher grammar achievement.

Finally, the present study yields some pedagogical implication for practitioners who choose traditional lecture-style instruction as their teaching method. Findings from the present study suggest that one possible reason for the cooperative learners’ better academic performance can be ascribed to zone of proximal development activities (or, in an SLA term, “i + 1” activities) within peer groups. Therefore, even if lecturing is chosen over cooperative learning based on cost effectiveness or any other reason, the instructors should still try to teach within students’ zone of proximal development.

All in all, the results of the study did show that cooperative learning in the new system can positively affect some aspects in the subjects’ English proficiency, their attitude towards cooperative learning in the new system and motivation to learn English.

5.4. Implications of the Study

Based on the results of the present study, several theoretical and pedagogical implications are provided.
5.4.1. Theoretical Implication

This study empirically illuminated the important aspect of interaction among learners. This may encourage language teachers to consider the incorporation of new teaching approaches, such as, cooperative language learning. With such innovative technique, teachers can provide an ongoing interactive environment to their various English language courses.

5.4.2. Pedagogical Implications

First, using cooperative language learning in the new high school system had a positive impact on subjects’ performance in grammar and reading comprehension. Students benefiting from cooperative language learning in the new high school system in English language learning suggest that increased use of this medium may not disadvantage any group of students. In other words, cooperative language learning in the new high school system can be used as an equalizer in terms of participation. Shy and less-verbal students, who are usually quiet during face to face interactions with the teacher, participate in group work as actively as their counterparts.

Second, the results of this research shed some light on the effectiveness of this new project and the possibility of applying it in all female high schools in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, instead of using it on selected schools.

5.5. Limitations of the Study

The main limitations in this study included (a) a brief treatment time, (b) a small number of classes, (c) subjects were freshmen female high school Saudi students in Riyadh, (d) the focus of the study was on comparing the English proficiency skills between the new high developed school and a traditional high school. (e) the study didn’t focus on speaking skills. These limitations may make it difficult to generalize results beyond this study. Future
research on this topic is suggested and specific recommendations to ameliorate these limitations are presented in the section below.

5.6. Suggestions for Further Research

The present study aimed to contribute to the existing body of knowledge in the area of cooperative language learning by investigating the effectiveness of CLL in developing English proficiency skills. As CLL and current teaching approaches are used more and more in today’s foreign language classrooms, it is necessary to investigate its effect on the development of language learning. The followings are some suggestions that merit further investigation in issues related to this study:

1. The current study lasted for twelve weeks (ten weeks treatment and two weeks for tests and questionnaires administration). Thus it would be worthwhile to examine the long term effect of the treatment on subjects’ English proficiency skills.

2. It would be insightful to investigate the interaction among subjects of different groups carrying out CLL. The idea can also be extended to include subjects from higher levels in the new developed schools.

3. It would be useful to examine the effect of the same technique incorporated in this study, CLL, on students' speaking skills in the target language.

4. It might be rewarding to investigate the effect of other aspects of the new high school system like text books, teacher training on developing students’ English language performance.

5. It would be insightful to examine and analyze subjects’ responses types during classes. Results of such analysis would help point put some of the
students’ common weakness and thus target them in the teaching process or in curriculum development.

6. It would be wise to examine the effect of the same technique, CLL, on the new developed high school system on male subjects. This will help in generalizing the findings of this study to include both genders. It will also help to learn more about any difference, if any.
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Appendix A

The Pre- and Post-test

English Proficiency Test

Part I: English Grammar
Select the best answer.

1. Juan ___________ in the library this morning.
   ○ A. is study
   ○ B. studying
   ○ C. is studying
   ○ D. are studying

2. Alicia, ___________ the windows please. It's too hot in here.
   ○ A. opens
   ○ B. open
   ○ C. opened
   ○ D. will opened

3. The movie was ___________ the book.
   ○ A. as
   ○ B. as good
   ○ C. good as
   ○ D. as good as

4. Eli's hobbies include jogging, swimming, and ___________.
   ○ A. to climb mountains
   ○ B. climb mountains
   ○ C. to climb
   ○ D. climbing mountains

5. Mr. Hawkins requests that someone ___________ the data by fax immediately.
   ○ A. sent
   ○ B. sends
   ○ C. send
   ○ D. to send
6. Who is ___________. Marina or Sachiko?
   ○ A. tallest
   ○ B. tall
   ○ C. taller
   ○ D. the tallest

7. The concert will begin _________ fifteen minutes.
   ○ A. in
   ○ B. on
   ○ C. with
   ○ D. about

8. I have only a ________ Christmas cards left to write.
   ○ A. few
   ○ B. fewer
   ○ C. less
   ○ D. little

9. Each of the Olympic athletes ___________ for months, even years.
   ○ A. have been training
   ○ B. were training
   ○ C. has been training
   ○ D. been training

10. Maria _________ never late for work.
    ○ A. am
    ○ B. are
    ○ C. were
    ○ D. is

11. The company will upgrade _________ computer information systems next month.
    ○ A. there
    ○ B. their
    ○ C. it's
    ○ D. its

12. Cheryl likes apples, _________ she does not like oranges.
    ○ A. so
    ○ B. for
    ○ C. but
    ○ D. or
13. You were __________ the New York office before 2 p.m.
   A. suppose call
   B. supposed to call
   C. supposed calling
   D. supposed call

14. When I graduate from college next June, I __________ a student here for five years.
   A. will have been
   B. have been
   C. has been
   D. will have

15. Ms. Guth __________ rather not invest that money in the stock market.
   A. has to
   B. could
   C. would
   D. must

Part II: English Grammar
Select the one underlined word or phrase that is incorrect.
1. The majority to the news is about violence or scandal.
   A. The
   B. to
   C. news
   D. violence

2. Takeshi swam one hundred laps in the pool yesterday.
   A. swammed
   B. hundred
   C. in
   D. yesterday

3. When our vacation, we plan to spend three days scuba diving.
   A. When
   B. plan
   C. days
   D. diving
4. Mr. Feinauer does not take critical of his work very well.
   - A. does
   - B. critical
   - C. his
   - D. well
5. Yvette and Rinaldo send e-mail messages to other often.
   - A. and
   - B. send
   - C. other
   - D. often
6. Mr. Olsen is telephoning a American Red Cross for help.
   - A. is
   - B. a
   - C. Red
   - D. for
7. I had a enjoyable time at the party last night.
   - A. a
   - B. time
   - C. at
   - D. last
8. The doctor him visited the patient’s parents.
   - A. The
   - B. him
   - C. visited
   - D. patient's
9. Petra intends to starting her own software business in a few years.
   - A. intends
   - B. starting
   - C. software
   - D. few
10. Each day after school, Jerome run five miles.
    - A. Each
    - B. after
    - C. run
    - D. miles
11. He goes never to the company softball games.
   ○ A. never
   ○ B. the
   ○ C. softball
   ○ D. games

12. Do you know the student who books were stolen?
   ○ A. Do
   ○ B. know
   ○ C. who
   ○ D. were

13. Jean-Pierre will spend his vacation either in Singapore nor the Bahamas.
   ○ A. will
   ○ B. his
   ○ C. nor
   ○ D. Bahamas

14. I told the salesman that I was not interesting in buying the latest model.
   ○ A. told
   ○ B. that
   ○ C. interesting
   ○ D. buying

15. Frederick used work for a multinational corporation when he lived in Malaysia.
   ○ A. used work
   ○ B. multinational
   ○ C. when
   ○ D. lived in

**Part III. English Vocabulary**
Select the best answer.
1. The rate of __________ has been fluctuating wildly this week.
   ○ A. money
   ○ B. bills
   ○ C. coins
   ○ D. exchange
2. The bus ________ arrives late during bad weather.
   - A. every week
   - B. later
   - C. yesterday
   - D. always

3. Do you ________ where the nearest grocery store is?
   - A. know
   - B. no
   - C. now
   - D. not

4. Jerry Seinfeld, the popular American comedian, has his audiences ________.
   - A. putting too many irons in the fire
   - B. keeping their noses out of someone's business
   - C. rolling in the aisles
   - D. going to bat for someone

5. The chairperson will ________ members to the subcommittee.
   - A. appoint
   - B. disappoint
   - C. appointment
   - D. disappointed

6. The critics had to admit that the ballet ________ was superb.
   - A. procrastinate
   - B. performance
   - C. pathology
   - D. psychosomatic

7. Peter says he can't ________ our invitation to dinner tonight.
   - A. angel
   - B. across
   - C. accept
   - D. almost

8. We were ________ friends in that strange but magical country.
   - A. upon
   - B. among
   - C. toward
   - D. in addition to
9. The hurricane caused ___________ damage to the city.
   - A. extend
   - B. extended
   - C. extensive
   - D. extension

10. Many cultures have special ceremonies to celebrate a person's ___________ of passage into adulthood.
   - A. right
   - B. rite
   - C. writ
   - D. write

Part IV. English Reading Comprehension
Select the best answer.

Directions to Erik's house
Leave Interstate 25 at exit 7S. Follow that road (Elm Street) for two miles. After one mile, you will pass a small shopping center on your left. At the next set of traffic lights, turn right onto Maple Drive. Erik's house is the third house on your left. It's number 33, and it's white with green trim.

1. What is Erik's address?
   - A. Interstate 25
   - B. 2 Elm Street
   - C. 13 Erika Street
   - D. 33 Maple Drive

2. Which is closest to Erik's house?
   - A. the traffic lights
   - B. the shopping center
   - C. exit 7S
   - D. a greenhouse

Date: May 16, 1998
To: Megan Fallerman
From: Steven Roberts
Subject: Staff Meeting
Please be prepared to give your presentation on the monthly sales figures at our upcoming staff meeting. In addition to the accurate accounting of expenditures for the monthly sales, be ready to discuss possible reasons for fluctuations as well as possible trends in future customer spending. Thank you.
3. The main focus of the presentation will be ______________.
   - A. monthly expenditures
   - B. monthly salary figures
   - C. monthly sales figures
   - D. staff meeting presentations

4. Who will give the presentation?
   - A. the company president
   - B. Megan Fallerman
   - C. Steven Roberts
   - D. future customers

The B&B Tour
Spend ten romantic days enjoying the lush countryside of southern England. The counties of Devon, Dorset, Hampshire, and Essex invite you to enjoy their castles and coastline, their charming bed and breakfast inns, their museums and their cathedrals. Spend lazy days watching the clouds drift by or spend active days hiking the glorious hills. These fields were home to Thomas Hardy, and the ports launched ships that shaped world history. Bed and breakfasts abound, ranging from quiet farmhouses to lofty castles. Our tour begins August 15. Call or fax us today for more information 1-800-222-XXXX. Enrollment is limited, so please call soon.

5. Which of the following counties is not included in the tour?
   - A. Devon
   - B. Cornwall
   - C. Essex
   - D. Hampshire

6. How many people can go on this tour?
   - A. 10
   - B. an unlimited number
   - C. 2-8
   - D. a limited number

7. What can we infer about this area of southern England?
   - A. The region has lots of vegetation.
   - B. The coast often has harsh weather.
   - C. The sun is hot and the air is dry.
   - D. The land is flat.

Anna Szewcyzk, perhaps the most popular broadcaster in the news media today, won the 1998 Broadcasting Award. She got her start in journalism as an editor at the Hollsville County Times in Missouri. When the newspaper went out of business, a colleague persuaded her to enter the field of broadcasting. She moved to Oregon to begin a master's degree in
broadcast journalism at Atlas University. Following graduation, she was able to begin her
career as a local newscaster with WPSU-TV in Seattle, Washington, and rapidly advanced to
national television. Noted for her quick wit and trenchant commentary, her name has since
become synonymous with Good Day, America! Accepting the award at the National
Convention of Broadcast Journalism held in Chicago, Ms. Szewczyk remarked, "I am so
honored by this award that I'm at a total loss for words!" Who would ever have believed it?

8. What is the purpose of this announcement?
   - A. to invite people to the National Convention of Broadcast Journalism
   - B. to encourage college students to study broadcasting
   - C. to recognize Ms. Szewczyk's accomplishments
   - D. to advertise a job opening at the Hollsville County Times

9. The expression "to become synonymous with" means
   - A. to be the same as.
   - B. to be the opposite of.
   - C. to be in sympathy with.
   - D. to be discharged from.

10. What was Ms. Szewczyk's first job in journalism?
    - A. She was a T.V. announcer in Washington.
    - B. She was a newscaster in Oregon.
    - C. She was an editor for a newspaper in Missouri.
    - D. She was a talk show host in Chicago
Oxford Placement Test 1
Listening Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Listening</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Grammar</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Look at the example below. Listen to the tape. You will hear the example. Decide which word you hear, ‘soap,’ or ‘soup’:

a. Will you get me some [soap] [soup] at the supermarket?

The word was ‘soup,’ so ‘soup’ is ticked. Now look at these examples, the tape again. This time, you tick the words you hear. For example, I tick ‘shorts’.

b. The team need new [shirts] [shorts].

c. They’ve recently developed a new kind of [vine] [wine] around here.

The words on the tape were ‘shorts’ and ‘wine’, so the correct answers:

b. The team need new [shirts] [shorts].

c. They’ve recently developed a new kind of [vine] [wine] around here.

Now the test will begin. Listen to the tape and tick (✓) the words you hear.
I gather you've been having trouble with your [earring | hearing].

A number of students are expected to join the advanced [composition | conversation] class.

This board of mine is awfully itchy. I'll be glad when it [goes | grows].

I doubt if he's very comfortable in his [present | prison] bed.

Have you played [Dennis | tennis] very much recently?

Martina lives in a great big [freezing | Friesian] barn.

Do you have any idea how long ago it was [found | founded]?

Your letter must have crossed with my own [mine].

One thing I really [loved | loathed] in the late nineties was the style of the clothes.

My sister says he's [she's] a very nice person.

That Dutch friend of mine you met yesterday is a very good [chess | jazz] player.

That's the Euro equivalent of [30p | 40p].

Do we need to change the [cloths | clocks] tonight?

Today's a [holiday | horrid day], isn't it?

Well, I wonder what [joys | choice] they have in store for us this time.

Only 20% of those sampled [can | can't] tell the difference between margarine and butter.

I can't really say if I like jazz or not; sometimes [some kinds] I do.

She's been quite [tearful | cheerful] the last couple of weeks.

Williams now seems unlikely to [regain | retain] her title.

I think it's [Dave | Steve] on the phone.

[Why | Where] are you going to live in London?

It is recommended that dyslexic students follow a remedial [reading | writing] option.

Do you have any idea where my [lass | glass] is?

It was only later we found out he wasn't [injured | insured].

I [can see | consent] to it if it has to be done.

I see the [peaches | pictures] are starting to go yellow.

If it hadn't been for him they [couldn't | wouldn't] have done it.

Have you got any more of this [blended | splendid] butter?

I don't think the management side took any [notes | notice].

At the end of this test the papers will be [corrected | collected] by the invigilators.

If you have any problems, please contact the British [Council | Consul] immediately.

During his holidays he spends most of his time at the Lotus test track [watching | washing] cars.

Liverpool were [really | rarely] dangerous in the first half.

Mind you don't tread on the [glass | grass].

You've got a [lash | rash] just under your eye.
36 Do you think you could **take** talk us through the next bit of the film?
37 How many **tests** texts are we going to need to get all the data we want?
38 There's a fishery somewhere round here where they **hatch** catch trout by the thousand.
39 Are you going to **Penny’s** Benny’s tonight?
40 Do you think we could have **two minibuses** too many buses for the summer courses?
41 Do you think Rick's place is still **buyable** viable?
42 We've gone through **today’s** two days' money in less than an hour.
43 I reckon **Eric** and I need a good holiday.
44 This horse will have to be **shod** shot immediately.
45 Can you get me some **sealing tape** ceiling paint when you're in town?
46 Even if he leaves the country he won't be safe from **persecution** prosecution.
47 Since the accident the only thing he can do is **menial** manual work.
48 She's very much the **committee** committed type.
49 You can get quite a **view** few from up here.
50 What can we do with this **lot** slop to make the timetable work?
51 Keene was **cheered** chaired off at the end of the match.
52 The future of the party now seems to depend on **delegate** delicate decisions to be worked out at local level.
53 Have you done much **riding** writing recently?
54 We've all been **heartened** hardened by recent events.
55 What we have here is essentially a **fiscal** physical problem.
56 Make sure you keep the ropes **tied** tight.
57 I think they **set** sat the exam last week.
58 You'll need a **mass of** massive cheese to make a fondue for that many people.
59 I can't really advise you without knowing the type of **context** contacts you're presupposing.
60 The visit went ahead in **defence** defiance of the government's views.
61 I thought his behaviour was **unexceptional** unexceptionable.
62 Look at the **clouds** crowds over there.
63 Her ambition is to become a **belly** ballet dancer.
64 Did you get a chance to **try** dry it out?
65 If you look very carefully you can see there used to be a **cabinet** cabin up there.
66 Recent EU regulations have been disastrous for British fish **stocks** docks.
67 Pollution is a real threat to the North American **basin** bison.
68 Have you had an invitation to the **lunch** launch?
69 Do you know if she's **Finnish** finished?
70 Yorkshire and Wales are both famous for their pony **trials** trails.
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71 We just didn’t think he’d be armed harmed.
72 I’m not feeling so ill well today.
73 They are old all things they’ve grown out of so you can take them for the jumble sale.
74 My brother-in-law left Houston early this morning, so he should get here tonight.
75 The profitability of North Sea oil rigs is very dependent on the quality of the crew they find.
76 You can buy logs by the barrow barrel load at the local timberworks.
77 I hear you’ve got a new rival arrival.
78 Who was responsible for sending the infantry inventory?
79 We’ll be letting them have a newer system new assistant if they want one.
80 He works for a company called JMB J & B.
81 Have you read the latest book on Watergate by HA AJ Halderman?
82 Some motels now have half-dryers air-dryers in the cloakrooms.
83 Recent legislation makes it imperative that women work together to help each other.
84 The Social Services try to ensure that children who need them get free three meals every day.
85 It’s Richard’s birthday bath day on Sunday, so he’ll have to do it on Monday.
86 I gather their child is autistic artistic.
87 She was terribly scared as a result of the accident.
88 This year Britain’s top oarsman rowed horseman rode to his third world title.
89 He’s an internal student.
90 At Kilimanjaro Wildlife Park they’ve got an Andean Indian buffalo.
91 In England all road users must have a licence.
92 He'd like you to be responsible for the personal side of the deal.
93 He and Ian Woosnam could well turn the tables next week.
94 Who’s going to propose the loyal royal toast?
95 England would never have scored if it hadn’t been for that free kick by Beckham.
96 Such measures have never previously been taken in the absence of a president president.
97 When I saw the terrain I realized I would never catch him.
98 We haven’t had any more news today to date.
99 It’s hard not to lose faith in a situation like that.
100 I’ve just heard that these tests have been piloted in Japan.
Appendix B

Students’ Attitude Questionnaire

Please rate each statement by marking the box below the number according to the following scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)  
2 = Disagree (D)  
3 = Neutral (N)  
4 = Agree (A)  
5 = Strongly Agree (SA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Group work encourages me to learn English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group work does not give me enough chance to practice the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Group work makes me depends on others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group work helps overcome the problem of learning the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Group work gives our teacher a chance to encourage us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Group work makes learning English more interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I depend on myself when it comes to improving my language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Group work distracts me from following the directions of the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Group work builds good relations between students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Group work increases my knowledge income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Group work doesn’t allow me to take risks when it comes to practicing the English language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Group work gives me the chance to express my opinions and points of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Group work encourages me to be more organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My teacher is not keen to correct my mistakes in group work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I aim to have an outstanding group more than my individual success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The credited hour's system makes learning English more interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The credited hour's system seeks to use the entire classroom's material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I hope the new system will be used and applied in the future grades that I will join.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The new system does not help me improve my language outside the classroom through reading and doing research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I see the effective role of my teacher in the new system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>السؤال</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - يحفزني العمل الجماعي على تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - لا يمنحني العمل الجماعي الفرصة الكافية لممارسة اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - يعطي العمل الجماعي أعتمدت على الآخرين.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - يمكنني العمل الجماعي من التقلب على المشاكل في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - يمكن العمل الجماعي معلمنا من تشجيعنا بشكل فردي على ممارسة اللغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - يجعل العمل الجماعي تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية أكثر متعة وسهولة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - اعتمد على نفسي في تطوير لغتي الإنجليزية خارج الفصل أكثر من اعتمادي على العمل الجماعي داخل الصف.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - يشتبه العمل الجماعي إنتباهي في متابعة الشرح والتوجيهات.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - يساهم العمل الجماعي في زيادة الألفة والترابط بين الطالبات.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - يزيد العمل الجماعي من تحصيلي المعرفي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - يزيد العمل الجماعي من خوفي من ارتكاب الأخطاء عند ممارسة اللغة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - يعطي العمل الجماعي أكثر جرأة في طرح أفكاري وأرائي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - يدفعني العمل الجماعي نحو النظام وتوزيع المهام والأدوار.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - يقلل العمل الجماعي من اهتمام.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 15 - أسعى لتميز مجموعتي في حصة اللغة الإنجليزية أكثر من تميزي الفردي.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - يساهم نظام المقررات في زيادة متعة تعلمي للغة الإنجليزية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - يساهم نظام المقررات في الاستفادة من كل مكونات البيئة الصفية.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - أتمنى أن يستخدم نظام المقررات في كل المراحل الدراسية التي ساتحدق بها مستقبلاً.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - لايساعدني نظام المقررات على تطوير لغتي الإنجليزية خارج الفصل عن طريق القراءة وإعداد البحوث.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - أشعر بفاعلية دور معلمي في نظام المقررات.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>