

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING CLASSES**

THESIS BY
Özgür ERBEK

SUPERVISOR
Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU
(İstanbul Aydın University)

MASTER OF ARTS

MERSİN, MARCH 2017

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We **certify** that thesis under the title of “**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING CLASSES**” which was prepared by our student **Özgür ERBEK** with number **20148011** is satisfactory for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the department of **English Language Education**.


.....
Supervisor-Head of Examining Committee: Assist Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

Istanbul Aydın University


.....
Member of Examining Committee: Assist Prof. Dr. Kim Raymond HUMISTON


.....
Member of Examining Committee: Assist Prof. Dr. Gülden TÜM

Cukurova UNIVERSITY

I certify that this thesis conforms to formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.



Assist Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ

Director of Institute of Social Sciences

Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis whether original or quoted from other sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After an intensive period of almost seven months, today is the day: writing this note of thanks is the finishing touch on my thesis. It has been a period of intense learning for me, not only in the scientific area but also on a personal level. Writing this thesis has had a big impact on me. I would like to reflect on the people who have supported and helped me so much throughout this period.

I would first like to thank my thesis supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya Yumru without whose passionate participation and input, the validation of survey could not have been successfully conducted. Many thanks to jury members Assist Prof. Dr. Kim Raymond Humiston and Assist Prof. Dr. Gülден Tüm.

I must also express my very profound gratitude to my English Language Instructor colleagues working at Ahi Evran University, Erciyes University and Bozok University for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement through the process of researching and writing the thesis.

Finally, special recognition goes to my family for their support, encouragement and patience during my pursuit of the thesis. To my lovely wife Nilgün who inspired me and provided constant encouragement during the entire process as well as continuously proofing my document. To my two little sweet daughters Öznil and Bahar who missed out on a lot of daddy time while I sought intellectual enlightenment. I thank all three of you for your patience and love more than you will ever know.

March, 2017

Özgür ERBEK

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE DİL ÖĞRETİMİ DERSLERİNDE İŞBİRLİKLİ ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİNİN UYGULANMASI

Özgür ERBEK

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Yard. Doç. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

(İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi)

2017, 60 Sayfa

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı İngilizce okutmanlarının işbirlikli öğrenmeyi uygulama kararlarını etkileyen faktörleri incelemektir. İşbirlikli öğrenme yöntemi en verimli öğrenme yöntemlerinden biri olarak değerlendirilmektedir. İşbirlikli öğrenme metodunun uygulanmasının birçok alanda çok sayıda avantaja sahip olduğu kanıtlanmıştır. İşbirlikli öğrenme, ders tabanlı sınıfları desteklemek üzere tasarlanmış bir grup tabanlı öğretim stratejisidir. 1960'lı yıllardan beri ilköğretimde, 1990'lı yıllardan beri de yüksek öğretimde yaygın olarak kullanılan işbirlikli öğrenme yetişkin eğitimiyle ilgili zengin bir teori, araştırma ve uygulama geçmişine sahiptir. Literatür taraması, çalışma için yapılan analizle desteklenmektedir. Çalışma sonunda, işbirlikli öğrenmenin okutmanlar tarafından genel olarak sınıflarda kullanılmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Sonuç olarak araştırmanın bulguları okutmanların işbirlikli öğrenme yöntemlerini, bu yöntemle ilgili eğitim eksiklikleri olduğu için, olması gerektiği kadar kullanmadıklarını göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: İşbirlikli öğrenme stratejileri, Grup-tabanlı öğrenme, İngilizce öğretimi

ABSTRACT

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING CLASSES

Özgür ERBEK

M.A. Thesis, Department of English Language Education

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

February 2017, 60 Pages

The main purpose of this study is to examine the factors that influence English language instructors' decision to implement cooperative learning strategies. Cooperative learning method is considered as one of the most efficient learning methods. The outcomes of implementation cooperative learning method have proven to have many advantages in many fields of subject. Cooperative learning is a group-based instructional strategy designed to supplement the lecture-based classroom. Used extensively in the elementary and secondary levels since the 1960's and in higher education since the 1990's, cooperative learning has a rich history of theory, research, and practice related to adult education. The literature review is supported by the analysis conducted for the study. At the end of the study, it was found out that cooperation learning is not generally used in classrooms by instructors. As a result the findings of the research suggest that instructors do not use cooperative learning methods as frequently as they should as they lack the education for this method.

Key words: Cooperative learning strategies, Group-based learning, Teaching English

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Realiability Statistics.....	19
Table 2. ANOVA for Nonadditivity	19
Table 3. Frequency Analysis of the First Section of the Questionnaire.....	19
Table 4. Frequency Analysis of the Second Section of the Questionnaire	30
Table 5. Frequency Analysis of the Third Section of the Questionnaire	32
Table 6. Chi-Square Test.....	33
Table 7. Symmetric Measures.....	33
Table 8. One-Sample Test Between the Sections	34
Table 9. Paired Differences Between Section II subtitles and comparison with Section I and Section III.....	34
Table 10. ANOVA Analysis of Section I and Section III.....	35
Table 11. ANOVA Analysis of Section I and Section II	36
Table 12. ANOVA Analysis of Section II and Section III	36
Table 13. Correlations of Sections	36
Table 14. Correlations of Section I and Section III	37
Table 15. Correlations of Section II and Section III	38
Table 16. Correlations of Section I and Section II.....	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER	I
APPROVAL PAGE	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
ÖZET	IV
ABSTRACT	V
LIST OF TABLES	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the study	1
1.2. Significance of the study.....	1
1.3. Purpose of the study.....	2
1.4. Research question	2

CHAPTER II

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
2.1. Group work in learning.....	3
2.2. The aim of group work	7
2.3. Designing group work in classroom	8
2.3.1. Minimizing the salience of social categories	8
2.3.2. Providing opportunities for personalization	9
2.3.3. Developing students' interpersonal competencies.....	9
2.4. Teacher's role in cooperative learning.....	10
2.5. Student's role in cooperative learning	12
2.6. Results of group work in school life.....	13

2.7. Results of group work in social life	13
2.8. Advantages of cooperative learning	14

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY	17
3.1. Research design	17
3.2. Participants.....	17
3.3. Data collection	18
3.4. Data analysis	18

CHAPTER IV

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	19
4.1. Findings from the first section of the questionnaire.	19
4.2. Findings from the second section of the questionnaire.....	30
4.3. Findings from he third section of the questionnaire	31
4.4. Findings of chi-square tests and symmetric measures.....	33
4.5. Findings of one-sample test and paired differences.....	34
4.6. Findings of ANOVA tests.....	35
4.7. Findings of correlations tests	36

CHAPTER V

5. CONCLUSION	39
6. REFERENCES.....	44
7.APPENDICES.....	48
7.1.Appendix 1. Questionnaire For Teachers On Cooperative Learning	48

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

There are different definitions of cooperative learning and group work and in general all represent the same meaning. The definitions are written below one by one:

- Cooperative learning is an instrumental strategy in which students work actively and purposefully together in small groups to enhance both their own and their teachers' learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1994).
- Cooperative learning is a form of active learning where students work together to perform specific tasks in a small group (Cohen, 1986).
- In cooperative learning, students work together in small groups on a structured activity. They are individually accountable for their work, and the work of the group as a whole is also assessed. Cooperative groups work face-to-face and learn to work as a team (Bejarano, 1987).
- Cooperative learning is a teaching method where students of mixed levels of ability are arranged into groups, and rewarded according to the group's success, not the success of an individual member (McDonell, 1992).

As it is clear from definitions, all represent the same meaning in different words emphasizing that cooperative learning entails small groups working on specific tasks and that it is impossible to teach and work without being aware of cooperation. Literature review of cooperative learning and group work is examined throughout the chapter.

1.2. Significance of the study

Teachers are willing to do group work, the designing group work and see the effects of it on students and the results of it on students' school and social lives. But, they have difficulties in how to encourage students to participate in the cooperative learning. Moreover, they have difficulties in encouraging them. They have to learn how

to make students enjoy participation. Therefore, this study gives some clues, important principles about the group work and the ways of designing it in order to solve these problems. It is very important to investigate teachers' attitudes toward the group activities and change the negative thoughts about it.

Since the main concern of the study is focused on the benefits of cooperative learning, all aspects of cooperative learning are discussed in detail. When investigating the subject it is also important to present the disadvantages of cooperative learning and discuss its benefits for all parties that are involved in the process. Therefore investigating the subject in detail is important for the success of students and teachers. As the students become more successful in learning, instructors' success also increases accordingly.

1.3. Purpose of the study

In literature, it is argued that teachers can learn how to change students' social abilities with the help of the group work in classes. Teachers can change the capacity of our society. Therefore, we can come across a lot of successful individuals in society. Drawing on this premise, the purpose of the study is to evaluate the factors, which influence English language teachers' decision whether or not to implement cooperative learning during their teaching process.

1.4. Research question

- What are the factors, which influence English language teachers' decision whether or not to implement cooperative learning?

1.5. Definition of the terms

Cooperative learning is described as a group-based strategy designed to supplement the lecture-based classroom.

CHAPTER II

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section of the thesis presents the literature review related to cooperative learning. This chapter initially explains the concept of cooperative learning in general and its history. When examining its historical background, the core theories behind cooperative learning are discussed briefly. Then, a discussion on the benefits of cooperative learning for students and teachers is presented.

2.1. Group work in learning

The literature about the subject suggests that group work or cooperative learning increases student ratings of instruction and learning results with both adult and child students. Astin (1993) states cooperative learning method produces superior outcomes as compared to traditional learning methods.

Group work or cooperative learning is defined as a set of teaching strategies used to promote face-to-face interaction among students and help them reach specific learning and interpersonal goals in structured groups (Johnson and Johnson, 1994; Slavin, 1997). For Cohen (1986) as students work together in small groups everyone can participate on a task that has been assigned. In other words, 'small group instruction means that a class of students taught in several, small groups' (Lou, Abrami and Spence, 2000, p. 101). In cooperative situations individuals perceive that they can reach their goals if and only if the other group members also do so. Cohen conveyed, "Students are free to accomplish their task in the way they think best, but they are accountable to the teacher for the final product" (Cohen, 1986, p. 93).

Although most definitions can be considered as similar to each other, the implementations of cooperative learning may vary in a number of ways. Cooperative learning methods may be informal groupings to allow students to work together. Whereas the learning process may be structured with students having specific tasks in their group that usually consists of four members depending on the project. As Slavin states groups may work together for a few minutes or for months also depending on the complexity of the project (Slavin, 1997).

On the other hand, Johnson and Johnson (1994) define three types of cooperative learning groups: cooperative base, informal cooperative learning and formal cooperative learning groups. Whereas Richards and Rodgers (2001) add another category to the definition suggesting that cooperative base groups are long term heterogeneous learning groups and they have a stable membership moreover they can last more than a year. This style of grouping aims to provide support, encouragement and assistance among students to thrive for the shared goals. All the students that belong to the group are responsible for other students' responsibility, attendance to lessons and completion of tasks. Also they may share their personal problems in learning (Johnson and Johnson, 2003).

On the contrary, informal cooperative learning groups are short-term groupings in which membership is usually random. The main aim of this type of groups is to focus students directly on the subject in question and achieve a successful learning process during the activity. In this kind of groups, students work together on specific tasks to achieve shared learning goals or complete a given assignment. In these kinds of group-working activities students develop learning and sharing skills in short terms compared to long terms of cooperative learning methods. Besides, short-term cooperative learning methods, such as informal cooperative learning groups, students tend to have more fun and develop more intimate relationships since the term of the assignment is shorter.

The research on cooperative learning clearly suggests that no matter what form cooperative learning takes within classrooms, when well-structured, it offers many benefits for both teachers and students. Cooperative learning helps teachers in classroom management and provides an alternative instructional practice while creating a more learner-centered atmosphere (Cangelosi, 2000; Sharan, 1994). Students tend to develop management skills with cooperative learning method (Jacob et al., 1996; Stahl, 1995; Wohl and Klein-Wohl, 1994).

As mentioned earlier, cooperative learning started to be used as a structured learning method in 1970's. Slavin (1997) points out the fact that cooperative learning started to be used in elementary and secondary schools in North America (Slavin, 1997). But through substantial research it is pointed out that cooperative learning activities are successful both in child and adult education (Ghaith, 2003; Zimbardo 2003; Fox-Cardamone, 2003; Morgan, 2003).

When the success of cooperative learning activities is proven in child and adult education, a variety of models and activities have emerged for the implementation of

cooperative learning. Most important of these models are summarized as in the following:

- The Learning Together Method (Johnson and Johnson, 1994),
- Group Investigation (Sharan and Sharan, 1994),
- Teams-Games-Tournament,
- Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (Slavin, 1994),
- Jigsaw (Aranson as cited in Good and Brophy, 2000),
- Jigsaw II (Slavin, 1994),
- Asking Together,
- Learning Together (Açıkgöz, 2002),
- Think-Pair- Share (Olsen and Kagan, 1992),
- Numbered Heads Together (Stone and Kagan, 1995).

All of these methods are developed within the same perspective of cooperative learning; however, the implementations and goals of these methods can vary. Instructors should choose among these methods considering the status of their student profiles.

As for the basis of the present study cooperative language learning is grouping students within the classroom, having them study on specific assignments cooperatively and providing benefits for each team member to practice the target language while interacting with each other (Kessler, 1992). In language teaching cooperative learning has five major objectives:

- 1- to provide opportunities for naturalistic second language acquisition through the use of interactive pair and group activities,
- 2- to provide teachers with a methodology to enable them to achieve this goal and one that can be applied in a variety of curriculum settings (e.g., content-based, foreign language classrooms; mainstreaming),
- 3- to enable focused attention to particular lexical items, language structures, and communicative functions through the use of interactive tasks,
- 4- to provide opportunities for learners to develop successful learning and communication strategies,

- 5- to enhance learner motivation and reduce learner stress and to create a positive affective classroom climate (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 193)

Although cooperative learning enthusiasts have advocated its use in teaching a variety of subjects and its successful use has been widely researched over a number of years (Richards and Rodgers, 2001), it has only recently gained importance in language instruction (Dörnyei, 1997). The failure of cooperative learning to be an area of major interest may result from its similarity to typical group work activities in communicative language teaching.

Cooperative learning offers benefits for students as well as teachers. Research has pointed to cooperative learning's positive effect upon student's self-management skills. Good and Brophy (2000) suggest that cooperative learning teaches management skills to students since it encourages student responsibility for each other. Each student has a task in the group and without completing each task and coordinating with others, group work cannot be completed. Several tasks associated with cooperative learning such as organizing materials, keeping the group working, watching the time, and following directions also seem to be factors that help improve the management skills of students (Baloche, 1998; Orlich et al., 1998).

Kagan and Kagan (1994) state that students acquire social skills with cooperative learning. They underline when cooperative learning is used, students learn to understand, respect, and support one another. In addition, other studies in the field have shown that cooperative learning improves students' self-esteem, enables them to establish positive interpersonal relationships, and fosters positive interdependence (Johnson and Johnson, 1992).

Cooperative learning assists students in developing higher level academic skills in different academic disciplines. In language arts Wohl and Klein-Wohl (1994) suggest that cooperative learning activities assist students in acquiring skills for effective communication by creating learning environments similar to real life situations. Stahl (1995) notes that cooperative learning encourages students to interact, ask and answer questions, solve problems, and make decisions. Stahl (1995) also states that because it improves academic skills of students in language arts such as synthesizing, generalizing, summarizing, drawing conclusions, and determining relevant and irrelevant ideas, cooperative learning activities useful in teaching reading. In their study Jacob et al.

(1996) also reports that second language learners have opportunities to improve their academic skills while cooperatively studying on reading texts.

2.2. The aim of group work

Designing and evaluating the group work tasks is a classic case of creative problem solving where 'two heads are better than one'. According to Nunan, students work together to accomplish shared goals which enable them mutual benefits in order to maximize their own and each other's learning (Nunan, 1992, p.13). Lou, Abrami & Spence claims that:

There are several reasons for using small group instruction. First, the emphasis on peer learning means that the teachers may have more time to provide either remedial assistance to students experiencing difficulties or enrichment activities to students who have already mastered prescribed content. Second, using within-class grouping means that teachers may have greater flexibility in adjusting the learning objectives and the pace of instruction to meet individual learning needs. Third, students in small groups may rehearse material orally, explain it to others, discover solutions, debate, and discuss content and procedural issues, and so forth. Fourth, students who learn together in small groups may be motivated by cooperative, as opposed to competitive, incentive structures. Fifth, small group instruction means that students may have the opportunity to develop social and communication skills because of the need and opportunity to work with others to learn (Lou, Abrami & Spence, 2000, p.102).

Hertz-Lazorowitz & Miller note that "it is the natural tendency of children to grow and learn through social interaction, and share the belief that understanding cooperative interactions within school contexts will not only help children achieve educational goals but also create long-term benefits for humankind" (Hertz-Lazorowitz & Miller, 1992, p.154).

Therefore it can be assumed that the most important goal of cooperative learning is teaching through developing certain skills like interdependence, responsibility and sharing information.

2.3. Designing group work in classroom

As mentioned above, designing group work in classrooms has a variety of options. Instructors can benefit from these pre designed activities or alter these pre designed activities due to their needs. In that sense, instructors should be aware of all the types of cooperative learning and which type of activities are proper for their teaching activities.

2.3.1. Minimizing the salience of social categories

Students bring the social attitudes and prejudices of their own culture to the classroom setting. People use stereotypes to process information about others, exaggerate the differences between social groups and evaluate members of their own group more favorably and prefer to be with them than with others. According to Hertz-Lazorowitz & Miller, characteristics of culture, such as external social status and associated stereotypes, can have significant impact on inter group relations (Hertz-Lazorowitz & Miller, 1992, p.161). Nunan notes that students can be recategorized along a different dimension that does not correlate or converge with category membership. They may be grouped by their interests in certain aspects of the subject matter (Nunan, 1992, p.153). And also by periodically rotating team membership or creating different teams for different subject matter, instructor can ensure that students have more intimate experience with all class members. This rotation can result in developing independence skills and self-esteem.

Besides, research about child developmental psychology states that children like adults are prone to form social groups and outcast other children. With the rotation system of cooperative learning method children become more attached to one another regardless of forming groups. As a result students gain more positive outcomes compared to traditional learning methods results. In traditional learning methods students only gain or absorb knowledge or information directly from the instructors. However, in cooperative learning method, instructor designs the activity and forms the groups with a specific goal but students gain this information with group work. In other words, students learn with shared experience.

2.3.2. Providing opportunities for personalization

To know and be known by others is a large part of the life because relationships with a moderate or high level of intimacy become increasingly more important during the school stage and their development is a cornerstone of socialization. Nunan conveys that with more personalized contact, the other's complexity increases, and in turn, social characteristics become less salient. Simultaneously, the probability increases that perceived similarity between self and other will develop (Nunan, 1992, p.153). Personalization instructions lead to significantly more positive team interaction than the impersonal instructions. Cohen suggests that to develop personalization of participations, firstly dependent outcomes may require greater attention to relevant attributes of individuals and a greater need for accuracy in impression formation. Secondly, the teacher may instruct students to form accurate impressions of one another and justify these instructions by reference to task goals (1986, p.3). Apart from teacher's attitudes, students also need to develop skills in expressing themselves to others, listening to others, understanding differences, and so on, to be effective teammates.

2.3.3. Developing students' interpersonal competencies

Students need an opportunity to interact in a situation in which cooperative behaviors can be manifested; they need a motivation to behave cooperatively; a reason to believe that such actions will be beneficial to them, and they need some skill in particular behaviors that we label as cooperative (Hertz-Lazorowitz & Miller, 1992, p.147). Nunan claims that in a well-functioning cooperative group there is a sense of joint responsibility where learners care about and get committed to each other's success as well as their own; a sense of 'sinking or swimming together' (Nunan, 1992, p.85). Besides, how we take part in an activity depends on how we think our contributions will be valued. If the teacher-class dialogue is strongly shaped by the teacher's sense of relevance, this will affect the pupils' sense of competence and their approach to small group work (Cohen, 1986, p.93). Thus, teachers should show that they value their pupils' contributions. They feel themselves as an important person for their teachers. On the other hand, if students in a group celebrate each other's achievements and help one another, more positive peer relationships will exist as well as support resulting in higher

self-esteem and academic achievement. Besides, the notion of responsibility is secured by other group members.

2.4. Teacher's role in cooperative learning

Research suggests that cooperative learning provides benefits for teachers. Orlich et al. (1998) states that cooperative learning helps classroom management and instruction. Cangelosi (2000) states that use of cooperative learning activities provides student engagement in lessons, helps students develop intrinsic motivation, contributes to solutions for conflicts among students, and reduces disruptive behaviors of students. Thus, he suggests that language teachers should organize cooperative learning groups to have more efficient classroom management. The study conducted by Gwyn-Paquette and Tochon (2003) has shown that teachers who include cooperative learning activities in their teaching plans have fewer classroom management problems.

In addition, the use of cooperative learning activities provides an alternative instructional practice for teachers by creating more learner-centered classes and focusing on students' learning needs (Nunan, 1992). Teachers using cooperative learning activities concentrate on engaging students in the learning process rather than concentrating on the presentation of instruction through direct teaching. During cooperative learning activities teachers have opportunities to observe each student's difficulties in learning, strengths, and learning styles. This information helps teachers in organizing and presenting the instruction to be taught (Sharan, 1994).

Neither children nor adults necessarily know how to work successfully in the group. This problem can be overcome with proper preparation of the task and of the students. Hertz-Lazarowitz & Miller claim that movement along this continuum does not require the discarding of one strategy and substitution of another but, rather, restructuring of teacher behaviors (Hertz-Lazarowitz & Miller, 1992, p.148). The teacher plays a critical role in helping the team set goals, providing resources to the team, offering constructive feedback on their performance, modeling desired behaviors, and establishing the reward system for the class. Therefore, Johnson et al. (1991a) suggests that 'teachers should systematically control the groups to evaluate group processing' (cited in Onwuegbuzie, 2001, p.165). Another important rule to teach when training students to discuss, to make decisions, and to do creative problem solving is the norm for equal participation. When students feel that everyone ought to have their say

and receive a careful hearing the problems of inequality and dominance can be solved (Cohen, 1986, p.31). After solving participation problem, teacher may give same instructions to the class as a whole or give different instructions to the each group (Lou, Abrami& Spence, 2000, p.101). These groups may be in small or large sizes. Small ones enable to coordinate the activity easily among group members, but in large ones there are a lot of resources to use in activities (Lou, Abrami& Spence, 2000, p.102). Unless the teachers think everything in advance, they will find themselves trying to be more than one place at once, straightening out the problems their lack of planning causes.

In other words, the role of the teacher in the classrooms where cooperative language learning is implemented is significantly different from the traditional teacher-centered classrooms (Bejarano, 1987; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Cooperative learning allows teachers to create more learner-centered classes and focus upon students' learning needs instead of the manner in which instruction is presented by the teacher.

The teacher is “no longer a lecturer or transmitter of material, but rather a facilitator of learning who focuses on the learning process by encouraging cooperation among the students” (Bejarano, 1987, p. 485). In the role of facilitator, the teacher gives students the opportunity to learn the material by themselves while helping them if need arises. Teachers interact with students, encourage them to solve the problems they encounter by using thinking skills, give feedback, clarify difficulties, and empathize as a facilitator (McDonell, 1992).

Teachers in cooperative language classrooms are also observers. For instance, they listen to learners while they are studying in cooperative groups to discover the needs, interests, problems, and strengths of learners. These observations help teacher gather information about the learning process of the students, and organize plans and activities according to this process (McDonell, 1992). Teachers as observers also may intervene in the cooperative group activities if students in the group need assistance or redirection towards the objectives of the given tasks (Sharan, 1994).

In order to achieve the objectives of cooperative language learning and provide maximum benefit, teachers have to create well-structured tasks, set the goals of activities clearly, organize groups and assign students to different roles, and select suitable materials to be taught (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). The success of all these preparations and effectiveness of cooperative language learning depend on the belief and the attitude of the language teacher towards cooperative language learning.

The research in the field shows that language teachers who utilize cooperative learning in language classes have positive beliefs and attitudes towards it. For instance, Gwyn- Paquette and Tochon (2003) in their study ask four final year pre-service language teachers to include cooperative learning activities, namely Think-Pair-Share, Snowball, Learning Together, Cooperative Review, Jigsaw, and Group Investigation, into their planning. These teachers were observed in classrooms over one year during their teaching period. The conversations between the supervisors and the teachers and between the students and the teachers were reported. According to the results, all teachers were enthusiastic about using cooperative learning activities in their lessons. In spite of the problems they encountered, such as noise, they developed the confidence to implement those activities and tried to solve the problems that emerged.

Another study conducted by Horwitz, Bresslau, Dryden, McLendon, and Yu (1997) also supports the idea of teachers' having positive attitudes towards cooperative language learning. The participants of the study are class members of a graduate course that helps language teachers prepare for language instruction. The topics in the course are learnt by the participants in cooperative learning groups. At the end of the course they are asked to reflect on their ideas about collaboration. Most of the participants state that they increase the amount of cooperative learning activities in the classes they taught. They also report that cooperative learning activities enabled them to understand the needs and abilities of the learners better and offered them a chance to see the perspectives of language learners.

In the study conducted by Bailey, Dale, and Squire (1992), several EFL teachers are asked to reflect on their opinions about using cooperative learning activities in instruction. The questionnaire results show that the language teachers had a positive attitude towards the implementation of these activities. In the same questionnaire most of the teachers also agree on their students' positive reactions towards use of cooperative learning activities.

2.5. Student's role in cooperative learning

Skill in obtaining and utilizing help from others takes a special importance in a cooperative learning context. Cohen conveys that students are expected to carry out their task without direct and immediate supervision of the teacher. They should not be turning to the teacher for constant direction, evaluation and assistance; they should use

their peers instead (Cohen, 1986, p.92). Furthermore, Webb (1989, 1991) notes that they may have benefit when the help is timely. When they really need help, teacher should give some necessary explanations. Otherwise, this help cannot be beneficial for them (cited in Gillies, 1999, p.357). Apart from these, responsiveness to the needs of the group is a skill required for any kind of cooperative task. Students need to learn how to take the part of other members of the groups and to feel responsible for helping them for the sake of the group product (Cohen, 1986, p.126). After that the groups make sure that everyone understands what to do; the group helps to keep everyone on task; and group members assist one another. Instead of the teacher having to control everyone's behavior, the students control themselves and others.

2.6. Results of group work in school life

Students have much to gain from participating in cooperative learning. According to Nunan, pupils make frequent use of one another's contributions by extending or modifying them. They address one another to explain or extend what they have already said. They deal with disagreement in open discussion in order to reach verbal clarification of the difference (Nunan, 1992, p.16). The more they talk and work together, the more they learn how to be successful. Cohen notes that students ask ruminative questions of themselves and their statements are tentative, explanatory, inviting elaboration by others. They freely find new questions to ask of one another, and see further possibilities in the materials beyond what the task explicitly requires. Besides, they preserve trying to organize their ideas, so that discussions are often lengthy. They sometimes turn back in order to summarize or repeat what has already been said.

2.7. Results of group work in social life

Students in a group communicate about their task with each other. This may include asking questions, explaining, making suggestions, criticizing, listening, agreeing, disagreeing, or making joint decisions. Interaction may be nonverbal, such as pointing, showing how, nodding, frowning, or smiling. According to the social research, when people work together, there are a number of desirable effects on people's feeling for one another. When members of a group engage in cooperative tasks, they are more

likely to form friendly ties, to trust each other, and to influence each other that when the task stimulates competition among members. Therefore, in small group instruction, students may have the opportunity to develop social and communication skills because of the need and opportunity to work with others to learn. Hertz-Lazorowitz & Miller say that having students experience making decisions on their own rather than telling them exactly what to do will have a desirable political socializing effect on them. They will have more of a sense of control of their own environment, and they will learn how to be active citizens.

2.8. Advantages of cooperative learning

Cooperative learning offers many advantages in language classroom settings, such as reducing anxiety, increasing motivation, and assisting in the development of the language skills of learners. Cooperative language learning helps teachers create a positive affective classroom atmosphere in which psychological barriers, such as student anxiety, are lowered and self-confidence and self-esteem are increased (Crandall, 1999; Dörnyei, 1997; Oxford, 1997). As Crandall (1999) states, students' anxiety results from the fear of making mistakes, especially when they are asked a question to be answered individually. When students are allowed to study together, they have more time to think, to share their opinion with other students, receive feedback from them, and correct any mistakes. As a result, their anxiety level is reduced, and they become willing to participate in answering the questions of the teacher. This often results in enhanced self-confidence and self-esteem (Crandall, 1999; Dörnyei, 1997).

One of the other reasons of anxiety is interpersonal competition among students. Interpersonal competition may take place in traditional classes and causes high anxiety, poor communication among students, a sense of uselessness. However, in intergroup competition, which is provided by cooperative learning, anxiety is reduced, interaction among students increase and student confidence is enhanced. In interpersonal competition, the goal is winning whereas in intergroup competition the goal is group success (Johnson and Johnson, 1994).

In language classrooms where student anxiety is lowered and self-confidence and self-esteem are enhanced, it is not surprising that motivation increases. More motivated students in the language classroom tend to use the target language more which helps them improve their language proficiency. In cooperative learning groups,

students assist their classmates in learning. Because each member of the group is responsible not only for his own learning but also for other members' learning, students support each other. With support, shy, insecure or uninterested students are often motivated (Crandall, 1999; Dörnyei, 1997). In addition, because the groups have specific goals to achieve and sometimes a reward to win, cooperative learning activities are enjoyable for students. Enjoyable activities encourage learners to participate in lessons; hence they contribute to motivation (Crandall, 1999). Cangelosi (2000) concluded that engaging students in cooperative learning activities, especially those which focus on problem solving, promotes intrinsic motivation which is crucial in learning.

Cooperative language learning also empowers learners to acquire increased language skills (Crandall, 1999; Jacob, Rottenberg, Patrick and Wheeler, 1996; Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Because cooperative language learning promotes interaction, learners have more opportunities to listen to, talk and produce the language (Crandall, 1999), which means more practice in the target language (DeVillar, 1991).

Other research suggests improvement in specific language skills through the use of cooperative learning. In her study, Bejarano (1987) implements two small-group cooperative techniques in two different EFL classrooms and compared their effects with another classroom in which the traditional whole-class method of instruction is used. Her research shows that cooperative learning techniques help students improve their listening comprehension in both classes more than with the whole-class method of instruction. Total achievement test scores of these students are higher than the students exposed to whole-class method.

Another study conducted by Jacob et al. (1996) shows that the implementation of cooperative language learning helps L2 learners acquire language skills while improving their academic English. Their study explores whether cooperative learning influences opportunities for acquiring academic English. The participants of the study are 625 K-6 grade elementary school students from different ethnic backgrounds, including African Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans. The teacher in the classroom implements The Learning Together Method in her classroom instruction. The class is observed for one year and 6 cooperative learning groups are videotaped. In addition, regular interviews with the teacher and the students are conducted throughout the year. The students are observed while assisting each other in explanation of meaning and correct pronunciation of words. They also help each other

succeed in learning difficult academic concepts. It is also observed that even the most silent students are invited to produce more language and contribute to the group task. At the end of the study, it is concluded that use of cooperative learning activities provide significant opportunities for L2 learners to acquire academic English and improve language skills.



CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter of the study explains the details of the research conducted for the study. The methodology of the study is explained in detail and the analysis method for the research is explained. The participants and data collection tools are presented. After presenting these details about the research the results of the analysis is explained in detail and the most significant results are highlighted. The results of the gathered data are discussed in the conclusion part of the study.

3.1. Research design

This is mainly a descriptive study using a quantitative method that has been conducted to determine the views of English Language Instructors towards cooperative learning strategies. Kayseri Erciyes University, Yozgat Bozok University and Kırşehir Ahi Evran University are the research sites for this study. In this particular study the researcher wants to gain numerical data to indicate instructors' views on cooperative learning. The questionnaire survey technique is a very effective quantitative technique since it enables large-scale numerical data to be obtained over a short period of time.

The questionnaire was designed to identify factors, which may have influenced the teachers' decision about whether or not to implement cooperative learning.

3.2. Participants

There have been one hundred (100) English Language Instructors full-time faculty members teaching in different programmes at Kayseri Erciyes University, Yozgat Bozok University and Kırşehir Ahi Evran University. This population is comprised of instructors teaching at four (4) departments of study: Faculty of Education, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, School of Foreign Languages. These instructors have various levels of expertise and have been teaching diverse courses that require varying teaching methods to better facilitate students understanding and retention. These particular institutions have been chosen because the researcher works at Ahi Evran University and the other

two institutions are close; therefore it becomes easy to obtain data by questionnaire or survey.

3.3. Data collection

Cooperative Learning Implementation Questionnaire has been used in the study. The questionnaire prepared for the teachers has three sections, first of which consists of forty-eight items on professional view on cooperative learning, second of which consists of eleven items on demographics and the last section consists of nine questions about the teachers' current teaching methods. Therefore; totally the questionnaire includes sixty-five (65) items designed to measure the cooperative learning skills of teachers'. The participants have been asked to tick the choice whether 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree' which has been prepared in a Likert type.

In this chapter; The main mass / universe of the research, the group (sample) to which the selected research techniques have been applied in order to understand the whole, its unit, measurement tools, the plan and model of the research, the data collection method, the assumptions of the research and the techniques used to solve the research data. In light of this data, the findings obtained by the questionnaire survey were combined and the research was concluded with a general evaluation.

3.4. Data analysis

A survey conducted with teachers is found in the study. The universe of the research consists of teaching staff working in these three universities. In this regard, the survey was chosen as the "easy sampling method" in which all respondents to the questionnaire sent to the 100 participants included sampling. In this study, information was gathered from teachers who are the main mass, through questionnaires and scales easily.

CHAPTER IV

4. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Findings of the present study are explained in this chapter and the significant results that are crucial to the study are highlighted. The reliability of the analysis is given below to emphasize the reliability of the research.

Table 1. Reliability statistics

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,869	65

Table 2. ANOVA for nonadditivity

ANOVA with Tukey's Test for Nonadditivity						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between People		1085,031	99	10,960		
	Between Items	2906,420	64	45,413	31,536	,000
	Nonadditivity	172,967 ^a	1	172,967	122,416	,000
Within People	Residual	8950,983	6335	1,413		
	Total	9123,949	6336	1,440		
Total		12030,369	6400	1,880		
Total		13115,400	6499	2,018		

Grand Mean = 3,2200

a. Tukey's estimate of power to which observations must be raised to achieve additivity = -,923.

In the validity test, the factor loadings of the scales were found to be in a significant range according to ANOVA with Tukey's Test for Nonadditivity.

4.1. Findings from the first section of the questionnaire.

The first section of the questionnaire consists of forty-eight items which ask about the professional view of instructors on cooperative learning.

Table 3. Frequency analysis of the first section of the questionnaire

Section I - Professional Views on Cooperative Learning	Options	N	%	Σ	σ	μ
1. If I use cooperative learning, the students tend to veer off task.	Strongly Agree	18	18,0	2,96	1,40648	1,978
	Agree	27	27,0			
	Undecided	15	15,0			
	Disagree	21	21,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			

Table 3

2. I understand cooperative learning well enough to implement it successfully.	Strongly Agree	25	25,0	2,52	1,28299	1,646
	Agree	33	33,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	17	17,0			
	Strongly disagree	9	9,0			
3.The costs involved in implementing cooperative learning are great.	Strongly Agree	20	20,0	2,82	1,29786	1,684
	Agree	26	26,0			
	Undecided	14	14,0			
	Disagree	32	32,0			
	Strongly disagree	8	8,0			
4.Competition best prepares students for the real world.	Strongly Agree	21	11,0	3,24	1,28802	1,659
	Agree	22	22,0			
	Undecided	17	17,0			
	Disagree	32	32,0			
	Strongly disagree	18	18,0			
5. The amount of cooperative learning training I have received has prepared me to implement it successfully.	Strongly Agree	16	16,0	3,03	1,3292	1,767
	Agree	22	22,0			
	Undecided	21	21,0			
	Disagree	25	25,0			
	Strongly disagree	16	16,0			
6. Cooperative learning holds bright students back.	Strongly Agree	10	10,0	3,24	1,27224	1,619
	Agree	22	22,0			
	Undecided	21	21,0			
	Disagree	28	28,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			
7. There are too many demands for change in education today.	Strongly Agree	3	3,0	3,96	1,12744	1,271
	Agree	13	13,0			
	Undecided	8	8,0			
	Disagree	37	37,0			
	Strongly disagree	39	39,0			
8. Cooperative learning is consistent with my teaching philosophy.	Strongly Agree	19	19,0	2,64	1,27541	1,627
	Agree	39	39,0			
	Undecided	10	10,0			
	Disagree	23	23,0			
	Strongly disagree	9	9,0			
9. My students presently lack the skills necessary for effective cooperative group work.	Strongly Agree	56	56,0	1,93	1,34281	1,803
	Agree	22	22,0			
	Undecided	5	5,0			
	Disagree	7	7,0			
	Strongly disagree	10	10,0			
10. For me to succeed in using cooperative learning depends on receiving support from my colleagues.	Strongly Agree	2	2,0	4,23	1,03333	1,068
	Agree	10	10,0			
	Undecided	2	2,0			
	Disagree	35	35,0			
	Strongly disagree	51	51,0			
11. Using cooperative learning is likely to create too many disciplinary problems among my students.	Strongly Agree	6	6,0	3,94	1,21289	1,471
	Agree	10	10,0			
	Undecided	10	10,0			
	Disagree	32	32,0			
	Strongly disagree	42	42,0			
12.Using cooperative learning enhances my career advancement.	Strongly Agree	11	11,0	3	1,30268	1,697
	Agree	34	34,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	22	22,0			
	Strongly disagree	17	17,0			

Table 3

13.For me to succeed in using cooperative learning requires support from the school administration.	Strongly Agree	6	6,0	3,34	1,23272	1,52
	Agree	27	27,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	35	35,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			
14.Cooperative learning contradicts parental goals.	Strongly Agree	7	7,0	3,9	1,25931	1,586
	Agree	9	9,0			
	Undecided	15	15,0			
	Disagree	25	25,0			
	Strongly disagree	44	44,0			
15.Cooperative learning is a valuable instructional approach.	Strongly Agree	38	38,0	2,26	1,29973	1,689
	Agree	27	27,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	15	15,0			
	Strongly disagree	7	7,0			
16.Peer interaction helps students obtain a deeper understanding of the material.	Strongly Agree	7	7,0	3,66	1,20789	1,459
	Agree	11	11,0			
	Undecided	20	20,0			
	Disagree	33	33,0			
	Strongly disagree	29	29,0			
17.My training in cooperative learning has not been practical enough for me to implement it successfully.	Strongly Agree	5	5,0	3,81	1,22016	1,489
	Agree	15	15,0			
	Undecided	10	10,0			
	Disagree	34	34,0			
	Strongly disagree	36	36,0			
18.Cooperative learning is appropriate for the grade level I teach.	Strongly Agree	12	12,0	3,24	1,37157	1,881
	Agree	24	24,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	24	24,0			
	Strongly disagree	24	24,0			
19.If I use cooperative learning, too many students expect other group members to do the work.	Strongly Agree	11	11,0	2,82	1,24219	1,543
	Agree	42	42,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	22	22,0			
	Strongly disagree	12	12,0			
20. It is impossible to implement cooperative learning without specialized materials.	Strongly Agree	1	1,0	4,06	1,02317	1,047
	Agree	11	11,0			
	Undecided	10	10,0			
	Disagree	37	37,0			
	Strongly disagree	41	41,0			
21.I feel pressured by the administration to use cooperative learning.	Strongly Agree	21	21,0	2,38	1,12618	1,268
	Agree	45	45,0			
	Undecided	14	14,0			
	Disagree	15	15,0			
	Strongly disagree	5	5,0			
22.Cooperative learning places too much emphasis on developing students' social skills.	Strongly Agree	4	4,0	4,12	1,11265	1,238
	Agree	8	8,0			
	Undecided	8	8,0			
	Disagree	32	32,0			
	Strongly disagree	48	48,0			
23.I believe I can implement cooperative learning successfully.	Strongly Agree	11	11,0	3,11	1,32494	1,755
	Agree	30	30,0			
	Undecided	15	15,0			
	Disagree	25	25,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			

Table 3

24.I have too little teaching experience to implement cooperative learning successfully.	Strongly Agree	2	2,0	4,44	0,94623	0,895
	Agree	5	5,0			
	Undecided	5	5,0			
	Disagree	23	23,0			
	Strongly disagree	65	65,0			
Section I - Professional Views on Cooperative Learning						
	Options	N	%	Σ	σ	μ
25. Engaging in cooperative learning enhances students' social skills.	Strongly Agree	18	18,0	3,09	1,4571	2,123
	Agree	23	23,0			
	Undecided	15	15,0			
	Disagree	20	20,0			
	Strongly disagree	24	24,0			
26. It is impossible to evaluate students fairly when using cooperative learning.	Strongly Agree	14	14,0	2,75	1,24215	1,543
	Agree	39	39,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	20	20,0			
	Strongly disagree	11	11,0			
27. There is too little time available to prepare students to work effectively in groups.	Strongly Agree	28	28,0	2,22	1,12439	1,264
	Agree	42	42,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	8	8,0			
	Strongly disagree	6	6,0			
28. There are too many students in my class to implement cooperative learning effectively.	Strongly Agree	4	4,0	4,16	1,06097	1,126
	Agree	4	4,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	30	30,0			
	Strongly disagree	49	49,0			
29. Using cooperative learning promotes friendship among students.	Strongly Agree	38	38,0	2,33	1,35628	1,839
	Agree	25	25,0			
	Undecided	11	11,0			
	Disagree	18	18,0			
	Strongly disagree	8	8,0			
30. My students are resistant to working in cooperative groups.	Strongly Agree	14	14,0	3,07	1,35777	1,844
	Agree	27	27,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	27	27,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			
31. Engaging in cooperative learning interferes with students' academic progress.	Strongly Agree	13	13,0	3,12	1,28927	1,662
	Agree	22	22,0			
	Undecided	21	21,0			
	Disagree	28	28,0			
	Strongly disagree	16	16,0			
32. Implementing cooperative learning requires a great deal of effort.	Strongly Agree	18	18,0	3	1,37069	1,879
	Agree	24	24,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	30	30,0			
	Strongly disagree	15	15,0			
33. Cooperative learning is inappropriate for the subject I teach.	Strongly Agree	6	6,0	3,5	1,28315	1,646
	Agree	22	22,0			
	Undecided	17	17,0			
	Disagree	26	26,0			
	Strongly disagree	29	29,0			
34. Cooperative learning enhances the learning of low-ability students.	Strongly Agree	7	7,0	4,01	1,29876	1,687
	Agree	10	10,0			
	Undecided	11	11,0			
	Disagree	19	19,0			
	Strongly disagree	53	53,0			

Table 3

35. I feel pressured by other teachers to use cooperative learning.	Strongly Agree	5	5,0	4,08	1,11627	1,246
	Agree	5	5,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	31	31,0			
36. Cooperative learning is an efficient classroom strategy.	Strongly disagree	46	46,0	2,43	1,09411	1,197
	Strongly Agree	22	22,0			
	Agree	37	37,0			
	Undecided	18	18,0			
37. Cooperative learning helps meet my school's goals.	Disagree	22	22,0	3,24	1,27224	1,619
	Strongly disagree	1	1,0			
	Strongly Agree	10	10,0			
	Agree	23	23,0			
38. Implementing cooperative learning takes too much class time.	Undecided	18	18,0	2,89	1,28625	1,654
	Disagree	31	31,0			
	Strongly disagree	18	18,0			
	Strongly Agree	16	16,0			
39. Using cooperative learning fosters positive student attitudes towards learning.	Agree	28	28,0	4,38	0,97214	0,945
	Undecided	19	19,0			
	Disagree	25	25,0			
	Strongly disagree	12	12,0			
40. I find that cooperative learning is too difficult to implement successfully.	Strongly Agree	3	3,0	2,27	1,17941	1,391
	Agree	2	2,0			
	Undecided	11	11,0			
	Disagree	22	22,0			
41. Cooperative learning would not work with my students.	Strongly disagree	62	62,0	3,15	1,32859	1,765
	Strongly Agree	30	30,0			
	Agree	38	38,0			
	Undecided	11	11,0			
42. I prefer using familiar teaching methods over trying new approaches.	Disagree	17	17,0	3,13	1,39012	1,932
	Strongly disagree	4	4,0			
	Strongly Agree	12	12,0			
	Agree	26	26,0			
43. If I use cooperative learning, my classroom is too noisy.	Undecided	16	16,0	3,31	1,47501	2,176
	Disagree	27	27,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			
	Strongly Agree	18	18,0			
44. I believe I am a very effective teacher.	Agree	18	18,0	3,48	1,36685	1,868
	Undecided	15	15,0			
	Disagree	31	31,0			
	Strongly disagree	18	18,0			
45. Implementing cooperative learning takes too much preparation time.	Strongly Agree	20	20,0	3,59	1,26407	1,598
	Agree	12	12,0			
	Undecided	10	10,0			
	Disagree	33	33,0			
	Strongly disagree	25	25,0	3,48	1,36685	1,868
	Strongly Agree	12	12,0			
	Agree	16	16,0			
	Undecided	12	12,0			
	Disagree	32	32,0	3,59	1,26407	1,598
	Strongly disagree	28	28,0			
	Strongly Agree	9	9,0			
	Agree	13	13,0			
	Undecided	15	15,0	3,59	1,26407	1,598
	Disagree	36	36,0			
	Strongly disagree	27	27,0			
	Strongly Agree	9	9,0			

Table 3

46. I feel a personal commitment to using cooperative learning.	Strongly Agree	23	23,0	2,94	1,45519	2,118
	Agree	20	20,0			
	Undecided	16	16,0			
	Disagree	22	22,0			
	Strongly disagree	19	19,0			
47. Cooperative learning gives too much responsibility to the students.	Strongly Agree	16	16,0	3,54	1,43843	2,069
	Agree	9	9,0			
	Undecided	13	13,0			
	Disagree	29	29,0			
	Strongly disagree	33	33,0			
48. The physical set-up of my classroom is an obstacle to using cooperative learning.	Strongly Agree	15	15,0	3,27	1,45543	2,118
	Agree	23	23,0			
	Undecided	9	9,0			
	Disagree	26	26,0			
	Strongly disagree	27	27,0			

As it can be seen in Table 3, for the findings of section I - professional views on cooperative learning, participants were asked to make judgments based on 48 items and within the scope of Strongly Agree, Agree Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree choices. According to the results obtained, the first five items and their results that come out in terms of descriptive analyzes (frequency value, percentage value, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values) are as follows;

For the 1st item of the questionnaire which is “If I use cooperative learning, the students tend to veer off task” 45 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 40 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 15 % answered as undecided.

58 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 2nd item of the questionnaire “I understand cooperative learning well enough to implement it successfully” while 26 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 16 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“The costs involved in implementing cooperative learning are great” which is the 3rd item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 46 % of the teachers. 40 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 14 % answered as undecided.

For the 4th item of the questionnaire “Competition best prepares students for the real world” 43 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 40 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 17 % answered as undecided.

38 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 5th item of the questionnaire “The amount of cooperative learning training I have received has

prepared me to implement it” while 41 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 21 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Cooperative learning holds bright students back” which is the 6th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 32 % of the teachers. 47 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 21 % answered as undecided.

For the 7th item of the questionnaire “There are too many demands for change in education today” 16 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 76 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 8 % answered as undecided.

58 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 8th item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning is consistent with my teaching philosophy” while 32 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 10 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“My students presently lack the skills necessary for effective cooperative group work” which is the 9th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 78 % of the teachers. 17 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 5 % answered as undecided.

For the 10th item of the questionnaire “For me to succeed in using cooperative learning depends on receiving support from my colleagues” 12 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 37 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 51 % answered as undecided.

16 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 11th item of the questionnaire “Using cooperative learning is likely to create too many disciplinary problems among my students” while 42 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 42 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Using cooperative learning enhances my career advancement” which is the 12th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 45 % of the teachers. 39 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 16 % answered as undecided.

For the 13th item of the questionnaire “For me to succeed in using cooperative learning requires support from the school administration” 33 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 54 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 13 % answered as undecided.

16 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 14th item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning contradicts parental goals” while 69 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 15 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Cooperative learning is a valuable instructional approach” which is the 15th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 65 % of the teachers. 22 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 13 % answered as undecided.

For the 16th item of the questionnaire “Peer interaction helps students obtain a deeper understanding of the material” 18 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 62 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 20 % answered as undecided.

20 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 17th item of the questionnaire “My training in cooperative learning has not been practical enough for me to implement it successfully” while 70 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 10 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Cooperative learning is appropriate for the grade level I teach” which is the 18th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 36 % of the teachers. 48 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 16 % answered as undecided.

For the 19th item of the questionnaire “If I use cooperative learning, too many students expect other group members to do the work” 53 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 34 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 13 % answered as undecided.

12 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 20th item of the questionnaire “It is impossible to implement cooperative learning without specialized materials” while 78 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 10 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“I feel pressured by the administration to use cooperative learning” which is the 21st item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 66 % of the teachers. 20 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 14 % answered as undecided.

For the 22nd item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning places too much emphasis on developing students’ social skills” 12 % of the teachers answered as agree

or strongly agree while 80 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 8 % answered as undecided.

41 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 23rd item of the questionnaire “I believe I can implement cooperative learning successfully” while 44 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 15 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“I have too little teaching experience to implement cooperative learning successfully” which is the 24th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 7 % of the teachers. 88 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 5 % answered as undecided.

For the 25th item of the questionnaire “Engaging in cooperative learning enhances students’ social skills” 41 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 44 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 15 % answered as undecided.

53 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 26th item of the questionnaire “It is impossible to evaluate students fairly when using cooperative learning” while 31 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 16 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“There is too little time available to prepare students to work effectively in groups” which is the 27th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 70 % of the teachers. 14 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 16 % answered as undecided.

For the 28th item of the questionnaire “There are too many students in my class to implement cooperative learning effectively” 8 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 79 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 13 % answered as undecided.

63 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 29th item of the questionnaire “Using cooperative learning promotes friendship among students” while 26 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 11 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“My students are resistant to working in cooperative groups” which is the 30th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 41 % of the teachers. 46 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 16 % answered as undecided.

For the 31st item of the questionnaire “Engaging in cooperative learning interferes with students’ academic progress” 35 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 44 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 21 % answered as undecided.

42 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 32nd item of the questionnaire “Implementing cooperative learning requires a great deal of effort” while 45 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 13 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Cooperative learning is inappropriate for the subject I teach” which is the 33rd item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 28 % of the teachers. 55 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 17 % answered as undecided.

For the 34th item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning enhances the learning of low-ability students” academic progress” 17 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 72 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 11 % answered as undecided.

10 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 35th item of the questionnaire “I feel pressured by other teachers to use cooperative learning” while 77 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 13 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Cooperative learning is an efficient classroom strategy” which is the 36th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 59 % of the teachers. 23 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 18 % answered as undecided.

For the 37th item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning helps meet my school’s goals” academic progress” 33 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 49 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 18 % answered as undecided.

44 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 38th item of the questionnaire “Implementing cooperative learning takes too much class time” while 37 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 19 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Using cooperative learning fosters positive student attitudes towards learning” which is the 39th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by

5 % of the teachers. 84 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 11 % answered as undecided.

For the 40th item of the questionnaire “I find that cooperative learning is too difficult to implement successfully” academic progress” 68 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 21 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 11 % answered as undecided.

38 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 41st item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning would not work with my students” while 46 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 16 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“I prefer using familiar teaching methods over trying new approaches earning” which is the 42nd item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 36 % of the teachers. 49 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 15 % answered as undecided.

For the 43rd item of the questionnaire “If I use cooperative learning, my classroom is too noisy” 32 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 58 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 10 % answered as undecided.

28 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 44th item of the questionnaire “I believe I am a very effective teacher” while 60 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 12 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“Implementing cooperative learning takes too much preparation time” which is the 45th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly agree by 22 % of the teachers. 63 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 15 % answered as undecided.

For the 46th item of the questionnaire “I feel a personal commitment to using cooperative learning” 43 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree while 41 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree and 16 % answered as undecided.

25 % of the teachers answered as agree or strongly agree for the 47th item of the questionnaire “Cooperative learning gives too much responsibility to the students” while 62 % answered as disagree or strongly disagree. 13 % of the teachers’ answers were undecided.

“The physical set-up of my classroom is an obstacle to using cooperative learning” which is the 48th item of the questionnaire was answered as agree or strongly

agree by 38 % of the teachers. 53 % of the teachers answered as disagree or strongly disagree while 9 % answered as undecided.

4.2. Findings from the second section of the questionnaire

The second section of the questionnaire consists of eleven items on demographics.

Table 4. Frequency analysis of the second section of the questionnaire

Section II - Tell Us About Yourself	Options	N	%
Gender	Female	49	49,0
	Male	51	51,0
Ability composition of your class(es)	Mostly above average ability students	8	8,0
	Mostly average ability students	31	31,0
	Mostly below average ability students	38	38,0
	Mixed (all ability levels)	23	23,0
Typical class size	Less than 18 students	18	18,0
	18 to 24 students	23	23,0
	25 to 29 students	15	15,0
	30 to 34 students	28	28,0
	More than 34 students	16	16,0
Which of the following comes closest to your teaching environment?	I have my own classroom.	54	54,0
	I usually go to different classrooms to teach.	46	46,0
	None	28	28,0
Number of years you have been implementing cooperative learning	Less than 2 years	33	33,0
	Between 2 and 4 years	16	16,0
	Between 4 and 8 years	13	13,0
	More than 8 years	10	10,0
Amount of workshop training in cooperative learning that you have received	None	29	29,0
	Less than a full day	26	26,0
	Between 1 and 2 days	13	13,0
	Between 3 and 6 days	23	23,0
	More than 6 days	9	9,0
Method(s) in which you have been trained (mark all that apply)	None	16	16,0
	Learning Together (Johnsons)	23	23,0
	Structural Approach (Kagan)	15	15,0
	STAD and TGT (Slavin)	18	18,0
	Name of method was not given/Do not remember name of method	10	10,0
	Other methods of cooperative learning (please specify on answer sheet)	18	18,0
Type of follow-up support in cooperative learning that you have received (mark all that apply)	None	16	16,0
	With trainer	29	29,0
	With fellow teacher(s)	13	13,0
	With administrator(s) (e.g., principal, curriculum consultant)	28	28,0
	Other (please specify on answer sheet)	14	14,0

According to demographic characteristics of respondents to the survey findings given in Table 4; The gender of the participants; 51% male were male while 49% were female.

The respondents about the ability composition of your class(es); 8% were mostly above average ability students, 31 % were mostly average ability students, 38% were mostly below average ability students and 24% were mixed (all ability levels).

The respondents of the typical class size; 18% of the classes were less than 18 students, 23% of them were from 18 to 24 students, 15% were 25 to 29 students, 28% were 30 to 34 students and 16% of the classes were more than 34 students.

Respondents were asked which of the following comes closest to your teaching environment? According to the question; 54% replied as “I have my own classroom” and the reply of 46% was “I usually go to different classrooms to teach”.

Number of years you have been based on the cooperative learning of re-implementing; 28% said None, 33% replied as Less than 2 years, 16% answered between 2 and 4 years, 13% gave an answer between 4 and 8 years and 10% said more than 8 years.

The amount of workshop training in cooperative learning that you have received; 29% answered as None, 26 % answered as less than a full day, 13 % answered between 1 and 2 days, 23 % answered between 3 and 6 days and 9 % answered as more than 6 days.

The method (s) in which you have been trained (mark all that apply); The reply of 16 % was none while 23 % replied as learning together (Johnsons). 15 % were structural approach (Kagan), 18 % as stadium and TGT (Slavin), 10 % did not give the name of method or do not remember the name of the method and 18 % was other methods of cooperative learning (please specify on answer sheet).

Type of follow-up support in cooperative learning that you have received (mark all that apply); the answer of 16 % was none, 29% was with trainer, 13 % was with fellow teacher (s), 28 % was with administrator (s) (e.g., principal, curriculum consultant) and 14 % was other (please specify on answer sheet).

4.3. Findings from the third section of the questionnaire

The third section of the questionnaire consists of nine items about the teachers' current teaching methods.

Table 5. Frequency analysis of the third section of the questionnaire

Section III - Current Teaching Practices	Options	N	%	Σ	σ	μ
Rate the extent to which cooperative learning is part of your current classroom routine.	Entirely	6	6,0	3,97	1,25895	1,585
	Largely	11	11,0			
	Somewhat	11	11,0			
	Slightly	24	24,0			
	Not at all	48	48,0			
Rate the extent to which you think cooperative learning will be integrated into your classroom routine in the future.	Entirely	10	10,0	3,69	1,33102	1,772
	Largely	11	11,0			
	Somewhat	15	15,0			
	Slightly	28	28,0			
	Not at all	36	36,0			
Rate the extent to which you structure your cooperative learning activities to ensure that all group members actively work together.	Entirely	1	1,0	4,33	0,96457	0,93
	Largely	7	7,0			
	Somewhat	8	8,0			
	Slightly	26	26,0			
	Not at all	58	58,0			
In a typical cooperative learning activity in your class, rate the extent to which group members actively participate.	Entirely	6	6,0	3,74	1,31518	1,73
	Largely	18	18,0			
	Somewhat	12	12,0			
	Slightly	24	24,0			
	Not at all	40	40,0			
In a typical cooperative learning activity in your class, rate the extent to which your students complete their share of the group task.	Entirely	6	6,0	3,81	1,16943	1,368
	Largely	11	11,0			
	Somewhat	10	10,0			
	Slightly	42	42,0			
	Not at all	31	31,0			
Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to increase academic achievement.	Entirely	11	11,0	3,21	1,33557	1,784
	Largely	26	26,0			
	Somewhat	15	15,0			
	Slightly	27	27,0			
	Not at all	21	21,0			
Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to improve social skills.	Entirely	9	9,0	3,6	1,34089	1,798
	Largely	19	19,0			
	Somewhat	6	6,0			
	Slightly	35	35,0			
	Not at all	31	31,0			
Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to motivate students.	Entirely	11	11,0	3,38	1,37642	1,895
	Largely	23	23,0			
	Somewhat	9	9,0			
	Slightly	31	31,0			
	Not at all	26	26,0			
Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to raise self-esteem.	Entirely	9	9,0	3,87	1,34581	1,811
	Largely	11	11,0			
	Somewhat	10	10,0			
	Slightly	24	24,0			
	Not at all	46	46,0			

Please answer questions 62 through 68 ONLY IF you use cooperative learning in your classes.

As observed in Table 5, for the findings of section III - current teaching practices, participants were asked to evaluate 9 items directed as Entirely, Largely, Somewhat, Slightly and Not at all. According to the results obtained in descriptive

analysis (frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and variance), the first three that stand out in terms of the judiciary and the results are as follows:

For the first items of the questionnaire “Rate the extent to which cooperative learning is part of your current classroom routine”; 48% answered as Not at all. Arithmetic mean value is 3,97 and standard deviation value is 1,25895.

For the third item of the questionnaire “Rate the extent to which you structure your cooperative learning activities to ensure that all group members actively work together.”; 58% responded Not at all. Arithmetic mean value is 4,33 and standard deviation value is 0,96457.

For the 9th item of the questionnaire “Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to raise self-esteem.”; 46% replied as Not at all. Arithmetic mean value is 3,87 and standard deviation value is 1,34581.

4.4. Findings of chi-square tests and symmetric measures

Table 6. Chi-square tests

Chi-square tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3,181 ^a	4	0,528
Likelihood Ratio	3,216	4	0,522
Linear-by-Linear Association	1,432	1	0,232
N of Valid Cases	100		

a. 2 cells (20,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2,94.

The Chi-square tests were used to question the existence of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables on which the scales were exposed. According to the findings obtained from this test, there is no significant relationship between independent variables and dependent variables (scales).

Table 7. Symmetric measures

Symmetric measures					
		Value	Asymptotic Standardized Error ^a	Approximate T ^b	Approximate Significance
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	0,12	0,098	1,199	,233 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	0,112	0,099	1,12	,266 ^c
N of Valid Cases		100			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

The total value was tested by a symmetric comparison method and found not to be in the significant range.

4.5. Findings of one-sample test and paired differences

Table 8. One-sample test between the sections

One-sample test						
Test Value = 0						
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Section I	75,714	99	,000	3,24167	3,1567	3,3266
Section II	49,250	99	,000	2,51250	2,4113	2,6137
Section III	38,475	99	,000	3,73333	3,5408	3,9259

The relationship between section I, section II and section III was questioned in the t test. There was a significant positive correlation between P <0.05 significance level (p = 0,00).

Table 9. Paired differences between section II subtitles and comparison with section I and section III

Section II Subtitles; Comparison with section I and section III	Paired differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Gender - Section I	-1,73167	,60054	,06005	-1,85083	-1,61251	-28,835	99	,000
Ability composition of your class(es) - Section III	-,97333	1,30451	,13045	-1,23218	-,71449	-7,461	99	,000
Typical class size - Section I	-,23167	1,45107	,14511	-,51959	,05626	-1,597	99	,114
Which of the following comes closest to your teaching environment? - Section III	-2,24333	1,17139	,11714	-2,47576	-2,01090	-19,151	99	,000
Number of years you have been implementing cooperative learning - Section I	-,80167	1,47043	,14704	-1,09343	-,50990	-5,452	99	,000
Amount of workshop training in cooperative learning that you have received - Section III	-1,16333	1,71606	,17161	-1,50384	-,82283	-6,779	99	,000
Method(s) in which you have been trained (mark all that apply) - Section I	,12833	1,80396	,18040	-,22961	,48628	,711	99	,479

Table 9.

Type of follow-up support in cooperative learning that you have received (mark all that apply) - Section III	-,78333	1,68696	,16870	-1,11806	-,44860	-4,643	99	,000
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------	---------	--------	----------	---------	--------	----	------

According to the t test analysis conducted, there is a significant and negative relationship between Gender and section I $p = 0,000$.

There is a significant and negative relationship between $p = 0,000$ and ability composition of your class (es) – section III.

Which of the following is the closest to your teaching environment? There is a significant and negative relationship between section III and $p = 0,000$.

There is a significant and negative relationship between $p = 0,000$ and number of years you have been implementing cooperative learning - section I.

There is a significant and negative relationship between $p = 0,000$ and section III.

There is a significant and negative relationship between $p = 0,000$ and section III, which is a type of follow-up support in cooperative learning that you have received (mark all that apply).

4.6. Findings of ANOVA tests

Table 10. ANOVA analysis of section I and section III

		ANOVA				
		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Section I	Between Groups	2,554	17	,150	,790	,699
	Within Groups	15,593	82	,190		
	Total	18,148	99			
Section III	Between Groups	15,343	17	,903	,950	,520
	Within Groups	77,866	82	,950		
	Total	93,210	99			

According to the ANOVA test;

Participants' personal information is the top variable; There is no correlation between $p = 0.005$ meaningful interval between cooperative learning professional views and current teaching practice views.

Table 11. ANOVA analysis of section I and section II

		ANOVA				
		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Section I	Between Groups	11,993	27	,444	5,196	,000
	Within Groups	6,155	72	,085		
	Total	18,148	99			
Section II	Between Groups	9,691	27	,359	1,608	,057
	Within Groups	16,075	72	,223		
	Total	25,766	99			

According to the ANOVA test;

There is a significant relationship between $p < 0.005$ ($p = 0.00$) between the views of cooperative learning and current teaching practice.

There is no significant relationship between the personal information of the participants and the present teaching practices ($p < 0.005$) ($p = 0.57$).

Table 12. ANOVA analysis of section II and section III

		ANOVA				
		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Section II	Between Groups	15,819	58	,273	1,124	,350
	Within Groups	9,947	41	,243		
	Total	25,766	99			
Section III	Between Groups	71,849	58	1,239	2,378	,002
	Within Groups	21,361	41	,521		
	Total	93,210	99			

According to the ANOVA test;

There is no significant relationship between the professional views of Cooperative Learning and the personal information of the participants. $p < 0.005$ ($p = 0,350$)

There is a significant relationship between the views of cooperative learning and the views of current teaching practice in the $p < 0.005$ interval. ($p = 0.02$).

4.7. Findings of correlations tests

Table 13. Correlations of sections

		Correlations	
		Section 1	Section 2
Section 1	Pearson Correlation	1	-,129
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,202
	N	100	100
Section 2	Pearson Correlation	-,129	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,202	
	N	100	100

Table 13.

Correlations			
		Section3	Section2
Section3	Pearson Correlation	1	-,303**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,002
	N	100	100
Section2	Pearson Correlation	-,303**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	
	N	100	100
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			
Correlations			
		Section3	Section1
Section 3	Pearson Correlation	1	,669**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	100	100
Section 1	Pearson Correlation	,669**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	100	100
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

When the relationship between section I, section II and section III is questioned without control variant; There is no significant relationship between section I and section II. There is a significant relationship between section II and section III. There is a significant relationship between section I and section III.

According to these results, it can be stated that the scale of “Professional Views on Cooperative Learning” and “Current Teaching Practices Directions” certainly came to the fore. According to this;

Table 14. Correlations of section I and section III

Correlations			
Control variables		Section I	Section III
Section I	Correlation	1,000	,667
	Significance (2-tailed)	.	,000
	Df	0	97
Section II	Correlation	,667	1,000
	Significance (2-tailed)	,000	.
	Df	97	0

According to the Correlation $p < 0.005$ level of significance;

There is a meaningful relationship between the personal information of the participants and the professional views on Cooperative Learning. ($P = 0,000$)

There is a meaningful relationship between the personal information of the participants and the present teaching practice views. ($P = 0,000$)

Table 15. Correlations of section II and section III

Correlations				
Control variables		Section III	Section II	
Section I	Section III	Correlation	1,000	-,294
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	,003
		Df	0	97
	Section II	Correlation	-,294	1,000
		Significance (2-tailed)	,003	.
		Df	97	0

According to the significance level correlation;

There is a significant relationship between the professional views of Cooperative Learning and the personal information of the participants. $P = 0.003$.

There is a meaningful relationship between the views of professionalism related to cooperative learning and current teaching practice. $P = 0.003$.

Table 16. Correlations of section I and section II

Correlations				
Control variables		Section II	Section I	
Section III	Section II	Correlation	1,000	,105
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	,302
		Df	0	97
	Section I	Correlation	,105	1,000
		Significance (2-tailed)	,302	.
		Df	97	0

According to the $p < 0.005$ significance level correlation;

There is no significant relationship between the current teaching practice views and the personal information of the participants. $P = 0.302$.

There is no significant relationship between current teaching practice views and cooperative learning related professional views. $P = 0.302$.

CHAPTER V

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter gives us a summary of the study, implications for teachers, and some suggestions for further studies. It also discusses the findings and includes a brief conclusion. The answer to the research question will also be discussed.

5.2. Conclusion and discussion

Although the method has proven to be very beneficial for both the students and teachers who use it, we observe that it isn't being implemented as deserved because of some reasons. Cooperative learning is great to use in all classrooms but it can be very hard to implement in the classroom. To ensure that the students are working in cooperative learning groups, the teacher should make the students fully aware of what is expected of them while participating in their groups. If the teacher and the students can establish a cooperative learning setting, the results will be outstanding. Having proposed all of the advantages and positive outcomes brought about by using this teaching method in the classroom, one might question why this method rarely occurs. Traditional classrooms are generally competitive and/or individualized. Students focus mainly on extrinsic motivation and tend to learn for all of the wrong reasons. When children do learn, it is typical that the concepts, terms and topics go in one ear and out the other. A competitive environment develops competitive individuals in which one student's success equals another student's failure.

A popular reaction to cooperative learning is that it creates discipline problems and renders the teacher helpless in controlling the noise level and appropriate conversations in the classroom. Another problem occurs when selecting groups. Some students might have problems with working with others when the groups are teacher selected. However, if the teacher allows the students to form their own groups the results can be just as adverse. Groups may form of all low or high achievers or groups could form because of distinct ethnic groups or color. Student selecting can also bring about feelings of hostility or hurt when students are the last to be selected and placed in a group.

If this is the first experience with cooperative learning, it could be extremely difficult to effectively use this learning style in the classroom. It is a strange transition from a transitional and competitive way of learning to a more innovative and collaborative style of learning for the student. In this situation, the procedures and social skills necessary for effective group work need to be taught to the students.

First, groups must be rewarded for working well as a group and second, the group's success must depend on the individual learning of each group member. This can be implemented by adding together each member of the group's quiz scores to form a total quiz score. These factors must be present when using cooperative learning methods because they motivate each individual student to take their teammate's achievement seriously. In the past, students have been programmed to think that helping others and sharing answers with their classmates is cheating. By basing the group's success on individual learning, it intensifies the student's concern for the overall academic achievement of their group members. With cooperative learning, the success of the group is dependent on the learning of each individual member, the activity of the group is then focused on explanations and discussions within the group to ensure that any problems can be exposed and resolved.

Although mastering a cooperative learning style of teaching in the classroom takes hard work and effort for both the teacher and the students, once the goal is attained, it can prove to be a powerful, worthwhile and unforgettable experience for the entire class. In a time of demanding expectations and insufficient resources for schools, we should not turn our backs on such an effective way of teaching our students.

When instructors were asked about the difficulties, they reported concern with the socializing that occurred in the groups, time management, and the organization required to implement cooperative learning. Other issues that challenged the instructors included the composition of the group (e.g., gender, ability, friendship), and the type of task needed to motivate students. Interestingly, all instructors agreed that preparation needed to occur if students were to work successfully in groups and this included training students in the social skills, including how to manage conflict. Assessing students' work in small groups presented a challenge for some instructors with some instructors making informal assessments of students' progress while others encouraged students to self-evaluate and reflect on their progress. Group presentations were also used as a way of assessing students' work, however, a number of instructors acknowledged that they experienced difficulties with assessing students' achievements. Finally, while a number

of instructors reflected positively on their experiences of Cooperative Learning and made the comment that it should be used more widely, others indicated it was a challenge and required commitment on the part of the instructors if it was to be implemented effectively.

Implementations of cooperative learning should be increased. For a variety of reasons instructors tend to discard this method and continue their lessons with traditional methods of teaching. However as a necessity of the rapid changing world and understanding of education as well as information the implementation of new methods is crucial for preparing students to compete in the 21st century.

One of the other reasons that new ways of teaching such as cooperative learning method should be preferred is that the profile of students drastically changed due to the recent developments throughout the world. Students became less socialized as a result of technological developments in that they spend more time by the computers doing uneducational activities such as chatting or useless games whereas they should be dealing with the computers by using interactive technology which contributes to socialization by connecting large numbers of people in an electronic environment. Using these learning methods it should be aimed to reverse this negative effect of technology by encouraging them to work in groups with their peers and also interactive technology. However as mentioned earlier instructors tend to avoid using cooperative learning methods in classrooms since it is different than the traditional method. As a result of the study it can be suggested that initially instructors should be educated about the subject and their confidence should increase in order to implement cooperative learning activities in their classrooms. The advantages of cooperative learning should clearly be explained to the instructors and the positive outcomes of implementations should be shared with other instructors. Besides it also is argued that cooperation learning method should be implemented to the Turkish education system hence instructors would be forced to use these methods and create activities according to the curriculum.

The results of the study suggest that cooperation learning is not generally used in classrooms by instructors and they generally do not prefer to use these methods as a tool for teaching. It can be assumed that lack of training in this method is the utmost reason for instructors to avoid implementing cooperative learning activities. As a result the findings of the research suggest that instructors do not use cooperative learning methods as frequently as they should because they lack the education for this method.

Further research about the subject would support the data gained by this present study and more research about the subject will give foresight to the subject and highlight the importance. Moreover the results of implementation of this method should also be investigated and comparative studies should be conducted in order to reflect the differences between cooperative learning methods and traditional teaching methods. Since the success of a teaching or learning method is measured by the outcomes comparative studies with different target groups can be considered as the deficiency about the field.

5.3. Implications

Since English continues to hold the first place in languages and people all over the world are learning English, one of the aim of foreign language teaching is considered to give learners communicative competences in a new and changing era of language education.

The research question of this study was searching the factors, which influence English language teachers' decision whether or not to implement cooperative learning. After the study was completed we observed that the answers hypothesized for the research question were almost true. Most of the teachers are trained in cooperative learning but do not use it in their classrooms sufficiently enough and since they do not use, they are about to forget. As observed also in the questionnaire, the most important factors that influence teachers' decisions can be ranked as;

- students get bored
- the costs are high
- students lack the skills
- there is no support from other instructors and administration
- disciplinary problems
- students expect from other group members
- lack of evaluation.

The teachers think that cooperative learning fosters learning, which also was true since the instructors in the questionnaire replied in this respect. Instructors/teachers believe that by cooperative learning they will spend less time for teaching and they are also aware of the advantages of cooperative learning. According to the answers given by the instructors, it can also be said that students like cooperative learning and they

think that they learn easily when they are assigned in groups. This also makes them socialize both at school also in the community.

5.4. Suggestions for further studies

Further research about the subject would support the data gained by this present study and more research about the subject will give foresight to the subject and highlight the importance. Moreover the results of implementation of this method should also be investigated and comparative studies should be conducted in order to reflect the differences between cooperative learning methods and traditional teaching methods. Since the success of a teaching or learning method is measured by the outcomes comparative studies with different target groups can be considered as the deficiency about the field.

It can also be said that since this study was carried out with the instructors teaching at universities, the results may vary in different types of educational institutions. So it is suggested that this study can be replicated with different level students such as elementary, pre-intermediate, intermediate, upper-intermediate, or advanced students in order to see the effect of cooperative learning strategies widely. It can be conducted in a primary, secondary or high school.

6. REFERENCES

- Açıkgöz, KÜ. (2002). Aktif Öğrenme. İzmir: Eğitim Dünyası Yayınları.
- Bailey, KM., Dale, T., Squire, B. (1992). Some reflections on collaborative language teaching. In D. Nunan (Ed.), Collaborative language learning and teaching (pp. 162-178). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baloche, LA. (1998). The cooperative classroom: Empowering learning. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bejarano, Y. (1987). A cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 483-501.
- Cangelosi, JS. (2000). Classroom management strategies (4thed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cohen, EG. (1986). *Designing Group Work*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crandall, JJ. (1999). Cooperative learning and affective factors. In J. Arnold (Ed.), Affect in language learning (pp. 226-245). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeVillar, RA. (1991). Cooperative principles, computers, and classroom language. In M. E. McGroarty & C. J. Faltis (Eds.). Languages in school and society (pp. 247-261). Berlin: Mouten de Gruyter.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. The Modern Language Journal, 81, 482-493.
- Fox-Cardamone, L., Rue, S. Students' responses to active-learning strategies: An examination of small-group and whole-class discussion. [Electronic version]. Research for Educational Reform, 8(3), 3-13
- Ghaith, G. (2003). Effects of the learning together model of cooperative learning on English as foreign language reading achievement, academic self-esteem, and feelings of school alienation. Bilingual Research Journal, 27, 451-474.
- Gillies, RM. (1999). Maintenance of Cooperative and Helping Behaviors in Reconstituted Groups. *The Journal of Educational Research*. 92, 357-363.
- Good, TL., Brophy, JE. (2000). Looking in classrooms (8thed.). New York: Longman.
- Gwyn-Paquette, C., Tochon, FV. (2003). The role of reflective conversations and feedback in helping preservice teachers learn to use cooperative activities in their second language classrooms. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59, 503- 545.

- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Miller, N. (1992). *Interacion in Cooperative Groups*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1992). Understanding interactive behaviors: Looking at six mirrors of the classroom. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz & N. Miller (Eds). *Interaction in cooperative groups* (pp. 71-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horwitz, EK., Bresslau, B., Dryden, M., Mclendon, ME., Yu, J. (1997). A graduate course focusing on the second language learner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 518-526.
- Jacob, E., Rottenberg, L., Patrick, S., Wheeler, E. (1996). Cooperative learning: Context and opportunities for academic English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 253-280.
- Johnson, DW., Johnson, RT. (1992). Positive interdependence: Key to effective cooperation. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, & N. Miller (Eds). *Interaction in cooperative groups* (pp. 174-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, DW., Johnson, RT. (1994). Learning together. In S. Sharon. (Ed.), *The handbook of cooperative learning methods* (pp. 55-65). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Johnson, DW., Johnson, RT. (2003). Student motivation in co-operative groups: Social interdependence theory. In R. M. Gillies & A. F. Ashman (Eds.) *Co-operative learning* (136-176). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Kagan, S., Kagan, M. (1994). The structural approach: Six keys to cooperative learning. In S. Sharon. (Ed.), *The handbook of cooperative learning methods* (pp. 115-133). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Kessler, C. (1992). Part one: Foundations of cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning* (v-xiv). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lou, Y., Abrami, PC., Spence, JC. (2000). Effects of Within-class Grouping on Student Achievement: An Exploratory Model. *The journal of Educational Research*. 94, 101-111.
- McDonell, W. (1992). Language and cognitive development through cooperative group work. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning* (pp. 51-64). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Morgan, BM. (2003). Cooperative learning in higher education: Undergraduate student reflections on group examinations for group grades. [Electronic version]. *College Student Journal*, 37(1), 40-50.

- Nunan, D. (1992). *Collaborative language Learning and Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992). Introduction. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching* (pp. 1-10). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olsen, REW., Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning* (pp. 1-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Onwuegbuzie, AJ. (2001). Relationship between Peer Orientation and Achievement in Cooperative learning-Based Research Methodology Courses. *The journal of Educational Research*. 94, 164-169.
- Orlich, DN., Harder, RJ., Callahan, RC., Gibson, HW. (1998). *Teaching strategies*, (5thed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Oxford, RL. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 443-456.
- Richards, JC., Rodgers, TS. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharan, S. (1994). Cooperative learning and the teacher. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *The handbook of cooperative learning methods*, (pp. 336-348). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sharan, Y., Sharan, S. (1994). Group investigation in the cooperative classroom. In S. Sharan. (Ed.), *The handbook of cooperative learning methods*, (pp. 97-114). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Slavin, RE. (1994). *A practical guide to cooperative learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, RE. (1997). Co-operative learning among students. In D. Stern & G. L. Huber (Eds.), *Active learning for students and teachers* (pp. 159-173). Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Stahl, RJ. (1995). Cooperative learning: A language arts context and an overview. In R. J. Stahl. (Ed.), *Cooperative learning in language arts* (pp. 1-16). Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Stone, JM., Kagan, S. (1995). Integrated language arts instruction: The structural approach. In R. J. Stahl (Ed.), *Cooperative learning in language arts* (pp. 111-135). Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

- Wohl, A., Klein-Wohl, E. (1994). Teaching and learning the language arts with cooperative learning methods. In S. Sharan. (Ed.), *The handbook of cooperative learning methods* (pp. 177-192). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Zimbardo, GG., Butler, LD., Wolfe, VA. (2003). Cooperative college examinations: More gain, less pain when students share information and grades. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 71(2), 101-125.



7.APPENDICES

7.1.Appendix 1. Questionnaire For Teachers On Cooperative Learning

Section I: Cooperative Learning Implementation Questionnaire

1. If I use cooperative learning, the students tend to veer off task.
2. I understand cooperative learning well enough to implement it successfully.
3. The costs involved in implementing cooperative learning are great.
4. Competition best prepares students for the real world.
5. The amount of cooperative learning training I have received has prepared me to implement it.
6. Cooperative learning holds bright students back.
7. There are too many demands for change in education today.
8. Cooperative learning is consistent with my teaching philosophy.
9. My students presently lack the skills necessary for effective cooperative group work.
10. For me to succeed in using cooperative learning depends on receiving support from my colleagues.
11. Using cooperative learning is likely to create too many disciplinary problems among my students.
12. Using cooperative learning enhances my career advancement.
13. For me to succeed in using cooperative learning requires support from the school administration.
14. Cooperative learning contradicts parental goals.
15. Cooperative learning is a valuable instructional approach.
16. Peer interaction helps students obtain a deeper understanding of the material.
17. My training in cooperative learning has not been practical enough for me to implement it successfully.
18. Cooperative learning is appropriate for the grade level I teach.
19. If I use cooperative learning, too many students expect other group members to do the work.

20. It is impossible to implement cooperative learning without specialized materials.
21. I feel pressured by the administration to use cooperative learning.
22. Cooperative learning places too much emphasis on developing students' social skills.
23. I believe I can implement cooperative learning successfully.
24. I have too little teaching experience to implement cooperative learning successfully.
25. Engaging in cooperative learning enhances students' social skills.
26. It is impossible to evaluate students fairly when using cooperative learning.
27. There is too little time available to prepare students to work effectively in groups.
28. There are too many students in my class to implement cooperative learning effectively.
29. Using cooperative learning promotes friendship among students.
30. My students are resistant to working in cooperative groups.
31. Engaging in cooperative learning interferes with students' academic progress.
32. Implementing cooperative learning requires a great deal of effort.
33. Cooperative learning is inappropriate for the subject I teach.
34. Cooperative learning enhances the learning of low-ability students.
35. I feel pressured by other teachers to use cooperative learning.
36. Cooperative learning is an efficient classroom strategy.
37. Cooperative learning helps meet my school's goals.
38. Implementing cooperative learning takes too much class time.
39. Using cooperative learning fosters positive student attitudes towards learning.
40. I find that cooperative learning is too difficult to implement successfully.
41. Cooperative learning would not work with my students.
42. I prefer using familiar teaching methods over trying new approaches.
43. If I use cooperative learning, my classroom is too noisy.
44. I believe I am a very effective teacher.
45. Implementing cooperative learning takes too much preparation time.

46. I feel a personal commitment to using cooperative learning.
47. Cooperative learning gives too much responsibility to the students.
48. The physical set-up of my classroom is an obstacle to using cooperative learning.
49. Gender
- A. Female
 - B. Male
50. Ability composition of your class(es)
- A. Mostly above average ability students
 - B. Mostly average ability students
 - C. Mostly below average ability students
 - D. Mixed (all ability levels)
51. Typical class size
- A. Less than 18 students
 - B. 18 to 24 students
 - C. 25 to 29 students
 - D. 30 to 34 students
 - E. More than 34 students
52. Which of the following comes closest to your teaching environment?
- A. I have my own classroom.
 - B. I usually go to different classrooms to teach.
53. Number of years you have been implementing cooperative learning
- A. None
 - B. Less than 2 years
 - C. Between 2 and 4 years
 - D. Between 4 and 8 years
 - E. More than 8 years
54. Amount of workshop training in cooperative learning that you have received
- A. None
 - B. Less than a full day
 - C. Between 1 and 2 days

D. Between 3 and 6 days

E. More than 6 days

55. Method(s) in which you have been trained (mark all that apply)

A. None

B. Learning Together (Johnsons)

C. Structural Approach (Kagan)

D. STAD and TGT (Slavin)

E. Name of method was not given/Do not remember name of method

F. Other methods of cooperative learning (please specify on answer sheet)

56. Type of follow-up support in cooperative learning that you have received (mark all that apply)

A. None

B. With trainer

C. With fellow teacher(s)

D. With administrator(s) (e.g., principal, curriculum consultant)

E. Other (please specify on answer sheet)

57. Rate the extent to which cooperative learning is part of your current classroom routine.

58. Rate the extent to which you think cooperative learning will be integrated into your classroom routine in the future.

59. Rate the extent to which you structure your cooperative learning activities to ensure that all group members actively work together.

60. In a typical cooperative learning activity in your class, rate the extent to which group members actively participate.

61. In a typical cooperative learning activity in your class, rate the extent to which your students complete their share of the group task.

62. Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to increase academic achievement.

63. Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to improve social skills.

64. Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to motivate students.
65. Rate the extent to which you implement cooperative learning in order to raise self-esteem.

