Effects of the Learning Together Model of Cooperative Learning on English as a Foreign Language Reading Achievement, Academic Self-Esteem, and Feelings of School Alienation

Ghazi Ghaith
American University of Beirut

Abstract

This study investigated the effects of the Learning Together cooperative learning model in improving English as a Foreign Language (EFL) reading achievement and academic self-esteem and in decreasing feelings of school alienation. Fifty-six Lebanese high school learners of EFL participated in the study, and a pretest-posttest control group experimental design was employed. The results indicated no statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups on the dependent variables of academic self-esteem and feelings of school alienation. However, the results revealed a statistically significant difference in favor of the experimental group on the variable of EFL reading achievement. The author discusses pedagogical implications and suggests recommendations for further research.

Introduction

Cooperative language learning has been proclaimed as an effective instructional approach in promoting the cognitive and linguistic development of learners of English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Kagan, 1995; Kessler, 1992; McGroarty, 1989, 1993). These researchers, among others, have established the theoretical relevance of cooperative learning (CL) in second language (L2) instruction based on the premise that CL provides maximum opportunities for meaningful input and output in a highly interactive and supportive environment. CL also integrates

language and content learning, and its varied applications are in harmony with the pedagogical implications of the input, socialization, and interactive theories of L2 acquisition. This is because CL enhances the motivation and psychosocial adjustment of L2 learners (Cohen, 1994; Dornyei, 1994, 1997).

According to Olsen and Kagan (1992), CL increases interaction among learners as they restate, expand, and elaborate their ideas in order to convey and/or clarify intended meaning. This interaction is important because it contributes to gains in L2 acquisition (Long & Porter, 1985; Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987) and in academic achievement (Bejarano, 1987; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1998; Kagan, 1989). Furthermore, it has been established that CL enables learners to process information beyond the level of receptive understanding by offering redundancy and multiple venues of information access and tasks (Olsen & Kagan, 1992; Webb, 1989). Likewise, CL may be especially useful for ESL/EFL learners based on the assumption that it provides a variety of flexible ways for organizing instruction and integrating language and content learning into various discourse and instructional contexts (Olsen, 1989). In addition, CL encourages active participation in genuine conversations and collaborative problem-solving activities in a class climate of personal and academic support. It also empowers learners and provides them with autonomy and control to organize and regulate their own learning (Clifford, 1999; Thomson, 1998).

Literature Review: Cooperative Learning

Currently, CL is perceived as a generic term for a number of instructional techniques and procedures that address conceptual learning and social development. It encompasses the following instructional models: the Structural Approach (Kagan, 1989), Group Investigation (Sharan & Sharan, 1992), Student Team Learning (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, & Snapp, 1978; Slavin, 1995), Curriculum Packages (Slavin, Leavey, & Madden, 1986), and Learning Together (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1991, 1992, 1994). The Structural Approach is based on using content-free ways of managing classroom interaction called structures. Structures are relatively easy to implement and can be categorized into team and class building, communication, mastery, and critical thinking structures. One example of a structure is Numbered Heads Together. Kagan (1989) describes the procedure of Numbered Heads Together as follows:

Step 1: Students number off within teams.

Step 2: The teacher asks a high consensus question.

Step 3: Students put their heads together to make sure everyone on the team knows the answer.

Step 4: The teacher calls a number at random, and students with that number raise their hands to be called upon to answer the question and earn points for their teams.

Group Investigation divides work among team members, who complete specific tasks and then reconvene to prepare a group presentation. Student Team Learning includes the Jigsaw method and its variations and the Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) method. The Jigsaw method has five major components: reading, expert group discussion, team report, testing, and team recognition. Meanwhile, STAD is organized around the components of teacher presentation, team study, individual quizzes, individual improvement scoring, and team recognition. The main difference between Jigsaw and STAD is that Jigsaw is well suited for teaching material in a narrative form such as a story or chapter, whereas STAD is useful in teaching materials that require single correct answers such as language rules and mechanics. Curriculum Packages are specific programs for teaching math and language and include the Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition program.

The Learning Together model organizes instruction according to the principles of positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive face-to-face interaction, social and collaborative skills, and group processing. Specifically, positive interdependence means that the success of students is linked with the success of their team members and may be structured through mutual goals, joint rewards, shared resources, complementary roles, and a common team identity. Individual accountability means that the performance of each member is assessed and results are given to the team and the individual so that team members cannot get a free ride on the efforts of their teammates. Yet, team members still help, share, encourage, and support each other's efforts to succeed through promotive interaction within their groups. Furthermore, they use and develop their interpersonal and small-group skills of leadership, decision making, trust building, and conflict management. Finally, the team members perform group processing to reflect how well the team is functioning and how its effectiveness may be improved. As such, the main difference between the Learning Together and other CL models is that this model is less discrete and less prescriptive than the Structural and the Student Team Learning models that employ specific steps in lesson planning and somewhat "prepackaged curricula, lessons, and strategies in a prescribed manner" (Johnson & Johnson, 1998, p. 226). Rather, the Learning Together model provides a conceptual framework for teachers to plan and tailor cooperative learning instruction according to their circumstances, student needs, and school contexts. (For further description of the various CL models, see Kluge, McGuire, Johnson, & Johnson, 1999.)

Previous research involving students who spoke English as a first language and who learned content in English has suggested that CL may encourage higher self-esteem and lower feelings of alienation at school (Johnson, 1979). For instance, Norem-Hebeisen and Johnson (1981) reported that self-esteem was positively related with cooperative relationships among 821 White, middle-class secondary school students in a midwestern suburban

American community. These researchers further reported that competitive and individualistic patterns of social interdependence reflected lower self-esteem and greater concerns regarding success and social approval.

However, Johnson, Johnson, Scott, and Ramolae (1985) found no significant differences between the Learning Together CL model and individualistic and competitive forms of instruction in improving the self-esteem of 154 fifth- and sixth-grade students of science in suburban Minnesota. Along similar lines, Oickle (1980) studied the effects of team reward and individual reward structures on the English achievement and self-esteem of 1,031 students from diverse communities enrolled in four American middle schools. This researcher reported positive effects in favor of the team reward structure in promoting achievement in the four schools and in improving self-esteem in only one of the schools. Similarly, Madden and Slavin (1983), who studied the development of self-esteem among regular and special needs elementary school children in Baltimore, Maryland, reported greater general self-esteem effects for STAD but no differences in academic and social self-esteem between STAD and the control group. Conversely, Allen and Van Sickle (1984) reported no differences between STAD and the control group in improving the general self-esteem of 51 ninth-grade students after 6 weeks of experimentation in rural Georgia. Finally, while some researchers found that the Jigsaw method had positive effects in improving students' general self-esteem (e.g., Blaney, Stephan, Rosenfield, Aronson, & Sikes, 1977), Gonzales (1979) reported no such effects.

In the context of ESL/EFL, previous research suggests that CL promotes positive attitudes among learners (Gunderson & Johnson, 1980), intrinsic motivation and satisfaction (Clement, Dornyei, & Noels, 1994; Szostek, 1994; Ushioda, 1996), and active pursuit of group goals (Nichols & Miller, 1994). It also leads to gains in social support for academic excellence (Daniels, 1994), expectancy of successful task fulfillment (Douglas, 1983), and increased self-confidence and less anxiety (Deci & Ryan, 1985). More recently, Ghaith and Yaghi (1998) reported that the STAD method is more effective than individualistic instruction in improving the acquisition of L2 rules and mechanics. Likewise, Calderon, Hertz-Lazarowitz, and Slavin (1998) reported that a bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition intervention improved third-grade achievement during transition from Spanish to English in comparison with control classes that used traditional textbook reading methods. Similarly, Bejarano, Levine, Olshtain, and Steiner (1997) reported that small-group cooperative practice of modified interaction and social interaction strategies improve EFL learners' communicative competence. In like manner, Thomson (1998), in her study of a group of third-year Australian university students in a Japanese language class, found that cooperation among teachers and students increased interaction opportunities among learners and promoted autonomous learning. Finally, Ghaith (2002) reported

that the Learning Together CL model positively correlates with a supportive L2 climate and with learners' perceptions of fairness of grading and academic achievement.

The aforementioned studies underscore the value and potential of CL in the L2 classroom. However, there is still a need to investigate the efficacy of various CL models in promoting gains in the cognitive and non-cognitive domains of ESL/EFL instruction across different languages and cultures. Consequently, the present study set out to investigate the effects of the Learning Together CL model on the achievement, academic self-esteem, and feelings of alienation among Lebanese high school EFL learners studying in a situation characterized by competitive schooling and limited opportunities for meaningful social interaction in English, the target language.

Background of Study

The social and school context of the present study is a multilingual environment where Arabic, the native language, is predominately used in the media and for daily communication. French and English are taught as foreign languages, valued for their educational and cultural significance. Yet, there is more emphasis on teaching English than French because English is perceived to be more important for communication in the domains of science, trade, and technology. However, EFL instruction in the context of the present study remains competitive in nature and does not provide opportunities for active learning and meaningful communication among learners because learners are expected to perform better than their classmates in order to attain higher grades and achieve approval and success.

There is a need to examine the theoretical relevance and efficacy of cooperative learning as an instructional approach in a multilingual and traditional school context such as this one based on the assumption that it would promote active learning and meaningful interaction in the target language of English among learners. Specifically, the study addressed the following questions:

1. Is the Learning Together CL model more effective than whole-class instruction in promoting the EFL reading achievement of multilingual Lebanese learners?
2. Is the Learning Together CL model more effective than whole-class instruction in promoting the academic self-esteem of multilingual Lebanese EFL learners?
3. Is the Learning Together CL model more effective than whole-class instruction in decreasing the feelings of school alienation of multilingual Lebanese EFL learners?

Methodology

Study Design

The study employed a pretest–posttest control group design and focused on the variables of academic self-esteem and alienation from school as well as achievement based on the proposition that interacting positively with other people to achieve common goals tends to increase academic self-esteem and to decrease school alienation (Johnson, Johnson, & Stanne, 2000). Academic self-esteem and psychosocial adjustment at school are of critical importance because they enable learners to withstand the disappointments of life, be confident decision makers, and ultimately be happy and productive individuals (Slavin, 1995). Likewise, the Learning Together CL model was selected as the form of intervention in the present study because it encompasses all the CL elements of heterogeneous grouping, positive interdependence, individual accountability, social and collaborative skills, and group processing. Furthermore, there is at present a need to examine the efficacy of this model in the context of teaching EFL in general, and in the context of the present study in particular, due to the scarcity of previous research.

Participants

Participants in the study were 56 secondary school EFL learners from families with low to medium socioeconomic and educational backgrounds enrolled in a suburban high school in Lebanon. There were 29 males and 27 females, and their ages ranged from 15 to 16 years. The participants were selected from a typical private school in the suburbs of Beirut and were randomly assigned to control and experimental groups; the study lasted for 10 weeks. The experimental group included 28 participants who studied together in seven teams of four members each according to the dynamics of the Learning Together CL model as described in the Study section. Meanwhile, the 28 participants in the control group studied the same material according to procedures in their textbooks.

Instruments

Academic self-esteem was defined in the context of the present study as the "self perception of one as being a capable, competent, and successful student" (Johnson & Johnson, 1996, p. 67) and measured by a five-item Likert subscale adapted from Johnson and Johnson (1996). Likewise, school alienation was measured by an eleven-item Likert subscale also adapted from Johnson and Johnson (1996) (see Appendix A). The internal consistencies (alpha reliabilities) of these subscales were $a = .76$ and $a = .82$ respectively, based on data from the present study.

In addition, an achievement pretest specifically designed for the purpose of the present study was administered to all participants 1 week prior to the treatment. This test was based on a reading selection titled "The New Singles" and included 12 items that measured participants' literal comprehension of ideas directly stated in the passage and higher order comprehension that required inference and interpretation. Finally, the same posttest was administered to the participants in the control and experimental groups at the conclusion of the treatment. This test was a domain-referenced test that covered the learning outcomes and competencies targeted during the period of investigation. These outcomes and competencies included utilizing context clues (syntactic and semantic) and using reading strategies such as previewing, skimming, and scanning to achieve literal and higher order comprehension of printed discourse. The posttest was based on a selection titled "The Problems of Stench" that was not previously read by the participants and included nine multiple-choice, three short-answer, and eight sentence-completion items that measured the outcomes and competencies under investigation. The content validity of the test was established by the researcher, the program coordinator, and the teacher who implemented the study, using a specification table as suggested by Sax (1980). Consequently, it was determined that four items measured literal comprehension, eleven items measured higher order skills, and five items measured the use of context clues to aid comprehension.

The Study

The study consisted of two phases. The first phase was in conjunction with an in-service teacher education program that involved training a group of 24 teachers, including one teacher who agreed to participate in the study by applying the elements of the Learning Together CL model (heterogeneous grouping, positive interdependence, individual accountability, social skills, group processing) in her teaching of EFL. This phase lasted for 2 days and included a total of 8 hours of training that focused on specifying academic and collaborative skills objectives, dividing students into groups, arranging the room, assigning roles, and planning materials. Furthermore, the participating teachers received training in explaining academic tasks, structuring positive goal interdependence, individual accountability, and intergroup cooperation. The teachers also learned how to specify and monitor learners' desired behaviors and enable students to process and evaluate how the group functioned. The purpose of this first phase was to maximize experiment fidelity through careful training of the teacher-experimenter who would implement the second phase of the study.

The second phase of implementation involved working with the program coordinator and the teacher who agreed to participate in the study in order to determine the content and learning outcomes and competencies to be achieved

during the period of investigation. In addition, detailed lesson plans were designed in order to teach the same content and skills to the experimental and control groups. The lesson plans for the experimental group were based on a checklist of teachers' roles and lesson templates designed by Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1987) (see Appendix B). Specifically, the plans included lesson summaries, instructional objectives, and a list of materials needed as well as specifications of time required, group size, assignment to groups and roles, and arranging the room. The lesson plans also included an explanation of tasks, procedures to structure positive interdependence and individual accountability, and criteria for success. In addition, the plans specified the social skills and expected behaviors, and included procedures for group monitoring and processing to see how well the group functioned (see Appendix C). Meanwhile, the lesson plans for the control group focused on reading the same material according to the instructional procedures (activities) suggested in their textbook, *Themes* (see Appendix D). These procedures were organized into three stages of lesson planning: opening, instruction and participation, and closure. These stages provided opportunities for working on various language objectives in the written and oral domains in an integrated matter, using a wide variety of instructional techniques such as whole-class brainstorming, discussion, question and answer, comprehension checks, crossword puzzles, and graphic organizers.

Both the experimental and control group lesson plans addressed the same instructional objectives and were based on the same reading selections and exercises. However, the experimental plans provided opportunities for small-group interaction and for sharing resources among team members. There was also an emphasis on social and collaborative skills and on developing team spirit and collegiality. Conversely, students in the control group worked individually and shared their answers with the class.

As previously noted, one of the teachers who had received training in Phase 1 of the study had agreed to participate in Phase 2. In order to avoid any potential bias in the implementation of the study, the teacher taught both the control and experimental groups and had not been prompted by the researchers to favor cooperative learning over whole-class instruction. Furthermore, the researcher did not work directly with the participants in the study, and the posttest measure of the achievement dependent variable was designed to reduce the chance of researcher bias by avoiding open-ended test items that require subjective judgments. Finally, the treatment fidelity of the experiment was further ensured through careful training of the teacher-experimenter during Phase 1 of the study, writing precise specifications and detailed lesson plans, and observing classes to ensure congruence between teacher experimenter behavior and treatment specifications.

Results

The hypotheses underlying the present study were that the Learning Together CL model would yield higher overall achievement as well as enhance learners' academic self-esteem and decrease their feelings of alienation from school more than regular whole-class instruction. Table 1 presents the results of the Analysis of Covariance test. The treatment conditions (experimental versus control) were used as the independent variable, while achievement, academic self-esteem, and feelings of school alienation were used as dependent variables. The achievement pretest scores of the participants were used as a covariate in order to control for any potential preexisting differences in the performance of the control and experimental groups.

The data in Table 1 indicate that there were no significant differences at the $p < .05$ alpha level between the control and experimental groups in academic self-esteem $F(1, 46) = .48$, $P = .49$, and alienation from school $F(1, 44) = 1.23$, $P = .27$. However, significant differences were observed between the two groups in academic achievement in favor of the experimental group $F(1, 53) = 7.69$, $P = .00$.

Table 1

Analysis of Covariance: Achievement, Academic Self-Esteem, and Alienation

Group	Achievement		Academic self-esteem		Alienation	
	X	*SD*	*X*	*SD*	*X*	*SD*
Experimental N = 28	48.33	16.18	14.73	2.30	31.18	3.56
Control N = 28	44.33	13.36	15.19	2.26	32.00	3.21
F	7.69*		.48		1.23	

* $P < .005$

Discussion

The present study sought to investigate the effects of the Learning Together CL model in promoting learners' achievement, enhancing their academic self-esteem, and decreasing their feelings of school alienation. Although the study did not yield any statistically significant differences between the control and the experimental groups on the dependent variables

of academic self-esteem and feelings of alienation from school, it did indicate that the Learning Together CL model is more effective than comparable regular textbook instruction in improving the EFL reading achievement of Lebanese high school students. This corroborates findings of previous studies regarding the positive effects of CL in improving reading achievement in English as a first language (Greenwood, Delquadri, & Hall, 1989; Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987). The findings of the present study also suggest that reading achievement in L2 can be improved through small-group cooperative interaction among peers in a supportive and stress-reduced environment.

However, as indicated earlier, the results of the present study did not favor CL as superior to whole-class instruction in enhancing students' academic self-esteem and in decreasing their feelings of alienation at school. In fact, the theoretical relevance of CL in enhancing self-esteem and decreasing feelings of school alienation is based on the assumption that students in CL may feel important because they perform roles that are essential to the completion of group tasks. Furthermore, they possess information and/or resources that are indispensable for their teams. Likewise, interaction among team members may decrease students' feelings of school alienation as well as promote their psychosocial adjustment as the individual efforts of every student are encouraged and supported in order to achieve group success. Yet, it seems that significant gains in academic self-esteem and school psychosocial adjustment are unlikely to be achieved in the course of short experiments and cooperative interventions. This is especially so given that previous research evidence regarding the efficacy of the various CL models in enhancing students' self-esteem and psychosocial adjustment has yielded insignificant or inconclusive results as was the case in the present study.

Implications and Conclusions

The findings of this study suggest two aspects of interest. First, the assumed positive reading achievement effects of CL both in monolingual and L2 or foreign-language situations are further supported by evidence from the present study. The pedagogical implications of these findings call for using the dynamics of the Learning Together CL model in the language classroom because it engages learners in meaningful interactions in a supportive classroom environment that is conducive to language learning. This is especially so in multilingual contexts characterized by competitive instruction and limited opportunities for meaningful social interaction in the target language.

Second, despite theoretical relevance, enhancing self-esteem and decreasing feelings of school alienation are unlikely to result from short CL interventions. This calls for further longitudinal and naturalistic studies in order to determine the long-term efficacy of CL in these psychoaffective domains. There is also a need for further research that would describe and

document the conditions under which CL improves achievement and promotes gains in the cognitive and non-cognitive domains of EFL instruction. Of particular interest in this regard would be well-controlled experimental and naturalistic studies that examine the relative efficacy of the various CL models and describe under what conditions these models are likely to be effective in achieving the cognitive as well as the affective outcomes of a modern EFL curriculum across different languages and cultures.

References

Allen, W. H., & Van Sickle, R. L. (1984). Learning teams and low achievers. *Social Education, 48*, 60–64.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, S., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The Jigsaw classroom*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bejarano, Y. (1987). A cooperative small-group methodology in the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 483–504.

Bejarano, Y., Levine, T., Olshtain, E., & Steiner, J. (1997). The skilled use of interaction strategies: Creating a framework for improved small-group communicative interaction in the language classroom. *System*, *25*(2), 203–214.

Blaney, N. T., Stephan, S., Rosenfield, D., Aronson, E., & Sikes, J. (1977). Interdependence in the classroom: A field study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69*(2), 121–128.

Calderon, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Slavin, R. (1998). Effect of bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition on students making the transition from Spanish to English reading. *The Elementary School Journal, 99*(2), 153–165.

Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning, 44,* 417–448.

Clifford, V. A. (1999). The development of autonomous learners in a university setting. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *18*(1), 115–128.

Cohen, E. (1994). *Designing group work* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Daniels, R. (1994). Motivational mediators of cooperative learning. *Psychological Reports, 74*, 1011–1022.

Deci, E., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 78,* 273–284.

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

Douglas, T. (1983). *Groups: Understanding people gathered together.* London: Tavistock Press.

Ghaith, G. M. (2002). The relationship between cooperative learning, perception of social support, and academic achievement. *System, 30,* 263–273.

Ghaith, G. M., & Yaghi, H. (1998). Effect of cooperative learning on the acquisition of second language rules and mechanics. *System, 26,* 223–234.

Gonzales, A. (1979, August). *Classroom cooperation and ethnic balance.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New York.

Greenwood, C. R., Delquadri, J. C., & Hall, R. V. (1989). Longitudinal effects of classwide peer tutoring. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 8,* 371–383.

Gunderson, B., & Johnson, D. (1980). Building positive attitudes by using cooperative learning groups. *Foreign Language Annals, 13,* 39–43.

Johnson, D. (1979). *Educational psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1996). *Meaningful and manageable assessment through cooperative learning.* Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1998). Effective staff development in cooperative learning: Training, transfer, and long-term use. In C. Brody and N. Davidson (Eds.), *Professional development for cooperative learning: Issues and approaches* (pp. 223–242). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. (1987). *Structuring cooperative learning*: *The handbook of lesson plans for teachers.* Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. (1991). *Cooperation in the classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. (1992). *Advanced cooperative learning* (2nd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom.* Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, R. T., Johnson, D. W., Scott, L. E., & Ramolae, B. A. (1985). Effects of single sex and mixed sex cooperative interaction on science achievement and attitudes and cross handicap, and cross sex relationships. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 22,* 207–220.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). *Cooperative learning methods: A meta analysis.* Retrieved October 10, 2003, from http://www.co-operation.org/pages/cl_methods.html

Kagan, S. (1989). The structural approach to cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership*, *47*(4), 12–15.

Kagan, S. (1995). We can talk—Cooperative learning in the elementary ESL classroom. Washington, DC (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 382035).

Kessler, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Cooperative language learning*: *A teacher's resource book.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Kluge, D., McGuire, S., Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Cooperative learning*. Tokyo: JALT.

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19,* 207–228.

Madden, N. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1983). Effect of cooperative learning on the social acceptance of mainstreamed academically handicapped students. *Journal of Special Education, 17*, 171–182.

McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *NABE Journal, 13*(2), 127–143.

McGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D. D. Holt (Ed.), *Cooperative learning* (pp. 19–46). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics & ERIC clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Nichols, J. P., & Miller, R. B. (1994). Cooperative learning and student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19,* 167–178.

Norem-Hebeisen, A., & Johnson, D. (1981). Relationship between cooperative, competitive, and individualistic attitudes and differentiated aspects of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality*, *49*, 415–425.

Oickle, E. (1980). *A comparison of individual and team learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, Baltimore.

Olsen, J. W.-B. (1989). A survey of limited English proficient (LEP) student enrollments and identification criteria. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(3), 469–488.

Olsen, R. E. W.-B., & Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book* (pp. 1–30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(4), 737–758.

Sax, G. (1980). *Principles of educational and psychological measurement*. San Francisco: Wadsworth.

Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1992). *Expanding cooperative learning through group investigation*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning theory, research, and practice*. Needham Heights, MS: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R. E., Leavey, M. B., & Madden, N. A. (1986). *Team accelerated instruction: Mathematics.* Watertown, MA: Charlesbridge.

Stevens, R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative integrated reading and composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22,* 433–454.

Szostek, C. (1994). Assessing the effects of cooperative learning in an honors foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 27*(2), 252–261.

Thomson, C. K. (1998). Junior teacher internship: Promoting cooperative interaction and learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals, 3*(4), 569–583.

Ushioda, E. (1996). *Learner autonomy 5: The role of motivation.* Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.

Webb, N. M. (1989). Peer interaction and learning in small groups. *International Journal of Educational Research, 13,* 21–39.

Appendix A

Classroom Life Measure

Name: _____ Date: _____ / _____ /_____

School: _____ Class: _____

Indicate your sex: Male: _____ Female: _____

Please circle the number that indicates your level of agreement with the statements below:

If the statement is **completely false**, **circle number 1.**

If the statement is **false much of the time, circle number 2.**

If the statement is **sometimes true and sometimes false, circle number 3.**

If the statement is **true much of the time, circle number 4.**

If the statement is **completely true, circle number 5.**

Example:

| I go to school at least five days a week. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1. I am a good student.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I am doing a good job of learning in this class.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Whenever I take a test I am afraid I will fail.[a]	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am doing as well in school as I would like to.	1	2	3	4	5
5. School work is easy for me.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I am often lonely in this class.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I find it hard to speak my thoughts clearly in class.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have a lot of questions I never get a chance to ask in class.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I often feel upset in school.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I often get discouraged in shool.	1	2	3	4	5

[a] Negatively stated. The score on this item is reversed so that a low score indicates high academic self-esteem and a high score indicates low academic self-esteem. For example, a score of 5 becomes 1 and a score of 1 becomes 5.

12. I should get along with other students better than I do.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Schoolwork is not easy for me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Whenever I take a test I am afraid I will fail.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.[a]	1	2	3	4	5
16. Sometimes I think the scoring system in this class is not fair.	1	2	3	4	5

Note. Adapted from *Meaningful and Manageable Assessment Through Cooperative Learning,* by D.W. Johnson and R. T. Johnson, 1996, Edina, MN: Interaction.

[a] Negatively stated. The score on this item is reversed so that a low score indicates high academic self-esteem and a high score indicates low academic self-esteem. For example, a score of 5 becomes 1 and a score of 1 becomes 5.

Appendix B

Checklist for teacher's role in cooperative learning

Check off the areas below in planning your cooperative learning lesson plans.

_____	Specifying academic objectives
_____	Specifying cooperative objectives
_____	Deciding on group size
_____	Assigning students to group
_____	Arranging the room
_____	Planning materials needed
_____	Assigning roles
_____	Explaining the academic task
_____	Structuring positive interdependence
_____	Structuring individual accountability
_____	Structuring inter-group cooperation
_____	Explaining criteria for success
_____	Specifying desired behaviors
_____	Monitoring students' behavior
_____	Providing task assistance
_____	Intervening to teach collaborative skills
_____	Providing closure to the lesson
_____	Evaluating the quality and quantity of student learning
_____	Having groups process their effectiveness
_____	Doing whole-class processing
_____	Having individuals process their effectiveness
_____	Teaching needed cooperative skills
_____	Observing for cooperative skills taught
_____	Giving feedback on cooperative skill use
_____	Rewarding skillful groups
_____	Rewarding skillful students

Appendix C

Sample lesson plan—Experimental group

Subject Area: Reading

Lesson Summary: Group members cooperatively read a selection about crafts (see Appendix E). They generate ideas through brainstorming and free writing, answer comprehension questions, and provide paragraph subheadings and oral summaries of what is read.

Instructional Objectives:

Students should be able to:

1. Generate ideas and complete appropriate graphic organizers.
2. Produce and share expressive writing through oral reading.
3. Comprehend printed discourse.
4. Label paragraphs.
5. Provide information.

Time Required: One 50-minute period

Materials: Textbook, workbook, 2 worksheets

Item	Number needed
Student Book: *Themes*	1 copy per group
Workbook: Exercise 1 (in *Themes Workbook*)	1 copy per group
Worksheet: "How well did I do in helping my group?" (See Appendix F.)	1 worksheet for each student
Worksheet: "How well did the group do?" (See Appendix G.)	1 copy per group

Decisions

Group Size: 4 students per group

Assignment to Groups: Assign a high-, medium-, average-, and low-achieving student to each group. Produce a numbered list of students from highest to lowest achiever based on first-term averages. Choose the top, bottom, and two middle achievers. Assign them to Team 1. Then use the reduced list to assign remaining teams.

Roles: Members will be assigned rotating roles during different activities. For this lesson each group will have a/an:

1. Summarizer to make sure everyone in the group understands what is being learned.
2. Recorder to write down the group's decisions and to edit the group's report.
3. Encourager to reinforce members' contributions.
4. Observer to keep track of how well the group is collaborating.

Arranging the Room: Group members will sit in a circle and be close enough to each other to communicate effectively without disrupting the other learning groups, and the teacher should have a clear access lane to every group.

The Lesson

Instructional Task:

You are to brainstorm and discuss ideas about crafts in your group. When you finish, review your ideas and complete the idea web (Exercise 1) together. Delegate a group member to present your work to the class. Free write for 5 minutes about crafts and share what you have written in your group. Read together the selected text [Appendix E] and agree on group answers to the following questions:

a. What is the difference between amateur and professional craftsmen?
b. How can crafts be used in occupational therapy?
c. Why did the Arts and Crafts Movement begin in England?

Delegate a group member to share your answers with the class. Read the selection once more and agree on a heading for each paragraph in the selection. Finally, delegate a group member to present your responses as well as provide an oral summary of the selection to the class.

Positive Interdependence:

For this assignment, I want you to work cooperatively. You are to help each other do the exercises. I want just one response from your group which includes the answers to all the questions.

Individual Accountability:

You are responsible for getting the group to answer questions on your worksheet and for writing the answers down. You are also responsible for helping your group members answer their questions and get them written down. When you sign your group's paper, it means that you agree with all of the answers and can individually explain why they are correct.

Criteria for Success:

If you get nine or ten of the ten questions right, you are fantastic. Six, seven, or eight is okay. Below six questions right, you need to work the unit again.

Expected Behaviors:

I expect to see the following as I observe the groups:

- *Stay with your group and do not wander around the room.*

- *Use quiet voices.*

- *Take turns.*

- *Use English to communicate.*

- *Make sure that all four students get a chance to help.*

Monitoring and Processing

Monitoring: While the students are working, watch to see how well they are handling the task and how well they are exhibiting the behaviors stressed in setting up the groups. Occasionally, ask a student to explain one of the answers already agreed on and recorded to emphasize the fact that all the group members need to be able to explain the answers. Often, turn students' questions back to the group to solve, or ask students to check with a neighboring group.

Intervening: When a group is obviously struggling, watch for a moment, and then intervene. Point out the problem and ask the group what can be done about it. This establishes the teacher's role as one of consultant rather than answer giver. *"What is the group going to do about this?"* is a useful phrase in the cooperative goal structure. Suggest possible answers and/or ways to complete the task(s) they need to perform. Then, refocus the group on the task and move on.

Processing: At the end of the lesson, ask each student to fill out the checklist "How Well Did I Do in Helping our Group?" (Appendix F.) Then, have each group discuss the questions on the worksheet "How Well Did Our Group Do?" (Appendix G.) Finally, lead a discussion on how well the groups worked together. It's important to model good processing techniques by sticking close to actual observations and stressing positive behaviors.

Appendix D

Sample lesson plan—Control group

Crafts

Objectives

Students should be able to:
1. Generate ideas and complete appropriate graphic organizers.
2. Produce and share expressive writing through oral reading.
3. Comprehend printed discourse.
4. Label paragraphs.
5. Provide information based on what is read.

Materials

Student Book (*Themes*) pp. 32–33
Workbook (*Themes Workbook*) p. 21

Opening

Class discussion and brainstorming of ideas related to crafts

Instruction/Participation
1. Students individually complete the idea web about crafts and present their work to class: Exercise 1 in their workbooks.
2. Students free write for 5 minutes about crafts and share their writing with the class.
3. Students read the selected text about crafts (Appendix E) and write down their answers to the following questions based on what they have read:

    d. What is the difference between amateur and professional craftsmen?

    e. How can crafts be used in occupational therapy?

    f. Why did the Arts and Crafts Movement begin in England? Students share their answers with the class.
4. Read the selection once more and write subheadings for the paragraphs. Students share their answers with the class.

Closure

Students volunteer to provide oral summaries of the selection to the class.

Appendix E

Crafts

Crafts are as old as human history. Originally fulfilling utilitarian purposes, they are now a means of producing beautiful handmade objects in a world dominated by mechanization. Among the earliest crafts are basketry, weaving, and pottery. Nearly every craft now practiced can be traced back many hundreds or even thousands of years. Crafts today include weaving, basket making, embroidery, quilting, pottery, woodworking, and jewelry making. They are made by amateur craftsmen at home as a hobby, and by professionals with regular markets for their products.

Crafts are used in occupational therapy. For example, patients may be taught crafts to strengthen weak muscles. Emotionally disturbed people are also taught crafts as an outlet for feelings. Crafts also provide the disabled with an occupation that diverts attention from their handicaps. Prisoners-of-war have also been known to produce crafts of high quality.

Crafts work formed the basis of town and city economies in many parts of the world until the Industrial Revolution. Suddenly in the early 19th century there were huge factories manufacturing millions of items. Goods, which had formerly been made by craftsmen/women, were now being made by machines. Once items could be mass produced individual artisans were no longer needed. In reaction to the effects of industrialization, the Arts and Crafts Movement began in England. The adherents of the movement wanted a different society. On the whole, they failed, despite the fact that there is still today a strong interest in crafts all over the world.

Appendix F

How Well Did I Do In Helping Our Group?

1. I contributed my ideas and information
   Always   Sometimes   Never

2. I asked others for their ideas and information
   Always   Sometimes   Never

3. I summarized all our ideas and information
   Always   Sometimes   Never

4. I made sure everyone in our group understood how to do the school work we were studying
   Always   Sometimes   Never

5. I helped keep the group on task
   Always   Sometimes   Never

6. I included everyone in our work
   Always   Sometimes   Never

Appendix G

How Well Did Our Group Do?

1. We made sure all of us got a chance to help
   Always Sometimes Never

2. We listened carefully to each other's ideas
   Always Sometimes Never

3. We said so when we did not understand an answer or question
   Always Sometimes Never

4. We said so when we thought someone's idea was good
   Always Sometimes Never

Acknowledgment