

Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in Teaching English as an Elective Course for Non-Specialized Students

Khalid Mohammed Alwahibee

Associate professor of applied linguistics
Imam Mohammed Bin Saud Islamic University
Saudi Arabia

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of using a cooperative learning strategy with students studying English as an elective course in the Arabic College. The study sample consisted of 38 male students divided into two equal groups; an experimental group and a control group. The control group was taught by using the traditional way of teaching in which the teacher is the center source of information, while the experimental group was taught by using the cooperative learning (CL) (Jigsaw) strategy. Both groups had an achievement pre and posttest to check their English language level. An Independent Sample T test and a paired T test were used to analyze the results. The results of the study favored the experimental group. English-language skills were highly improved for the experimental group. This indicates the effectiveness of the jigsaw strategy, which was one of the cooperative learning models. The purpose of this study is to show English teachers for the non-specialized students that they can encourage their students improve their English by using group work tasks. Group work or cooperative learning is significantly considered beneficial for the students to overcome the difficulty of studying individually. Therefore, the impact of this study is expected to be absorbable on students learning. This study recommends that this model and other models of CL be used in teaching English to nonnative English speakers. It also suggests further studies to be conducted to confirm the results of this study.

Keywords: cooperative, effectiveness, elective, jigsaw, technique, model

INTRODUCTION

Students in non-specialized colleges mostly avoid taking English. 101 as an elective course at Imam Mohammed bin Saud Islamic University. Most students think that it is difficult to pass, while others think it is not necessary for their future life. However, teachers of such courses need to pay attention to the attraction activities that may encourage students to enroll in this elective course. One of the most encouraging activities that have been noted by teachers was that students work in groups. In other words, they cooperate together in overcoming their fears and encouraging learning. Some studies assured that cooperative learning (CL) can reduce students' passiveness towards English as a subject. Beckman (1990) claims that students who are asked to work in small groups have a better tendency to learn than when they are working individually. He believed that students working collaboratively retain what they learn longer than when learning individually. Other researchers indicated that students working in groups show active participation and improvement in their academic work (Lord, 2001).

Working in groups or cooperative work could be a good strategy in helping non-specialized students (i.e. students studying this course as an elective course) improve and enjoy English class. In traditional teaching, the class centers around the teacher, and students memorize what they receive from him. Chen

and Wang (2013) stated that "studies have shown that teacher-centered classrooms tend to pour standardized curriculum into the heads of non-standardized students. It also awards just the students who have the right answers" (p. 1258). Therefore, new strategies have evolved to develop students' English language learning. Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (2013) defined cooperative learning as "an instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own, and each other's, learning" (p 3). In this cooperative learning, each student is informed that his success depends on the success of the whole group. This technique is known as positive interdependence. That is, when students mutually and actively participate in sharing their ideas to solve problems and complete tasks cooperatively, they will be more effective students.

Traditional teaching restricts students to a particular environment, physical setting, or to formal seating patterns that reduce eye contact between students, minimize students' interaction with one another, and increase students' passivity (Chen and Wang, 1258). As a result, many students sit passively and wait for other students to answer the teacher's questions. At the end of the day, they forget the information they studied and probably fail the final exam. Therefore, this study will try to examine the effect of cooperative learning with students who are studying

English as an elective course in non-specialized colleges at Imam Mohammed Bin Saud University.

Statement of Problem

English is taught as an elective course in three colleges at Imam Mohammed bin Saud Islamic University. The course is taught in levels 2, 4, and 6 for two credit hours at each level. Some of the English teachers, who are teaching English as an elective subject, complain of the weakness of their students in reading writing, grammar and vocabulary use and the high number of students who drop or fail the class. Those teachers are restricted to follow mostly the grammar translation method (GTM) for this elective course. In other words, they are using a traditional way of teaching. Abdel Rauf (2010) asserts that GTM dominates the Arab world and there is a necessity to use different approaches like CL to teach adult students. Using different methods and strategies with those students could be encouraging and attractive. Cooperative learning or group work could be a good teaching strategy for these type of students since it offers a social environment and active learning in which weak students feel secure because their colleagues support them. Hornby (2009) emphasized that the use of CL can produce positive academic outcomes for the students; therefore, this study will try to investigate the effectiveness of using CL with students studying English as an elective course at other colleges.

Purpose of Study

First: To bring the attention of the teachers who are teaching English as an elective course in other colleges to the importance of using different strategies in teaching English to non-specialized students.

Second: To show the importance of cooperative learning as a teaching strategy for non-specialized students who are studying English as an elective course.

Significance of the Study

Studying English by non-specialized students had been always a point of discussion to find the best way to teach them. Using traditional way of teaching resulted in low grades by those students. The current study showed the great role of the using CL strategy (group work) in improving the learning of non-specialized students.

Research Questions

1. Is there any significant difference in English achievement scores between students taught by the traditional method and those taught by cooperative learning?
2. Is there any significant difference in English achievement scores between the

experimental group's pre and posttest scores?

3. Which of the students' skills improved more after the experiment?
4. What is the attitude of the experimental group of students in regard to the use of cooperative learning strategy?
5. Did the teacher who taught this course feel the difference in use between the traditional and cooperative teaching strategies?

Limitation of the Study

This was limited to:

- The number of students is low to give a general conclusion.
- The duration of the treatment was limited to six weeks.
- Male students studying at the Arabic College.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cooperative learning is not a new strategy. It originated from Piaget and Vygotsky's theories of learning that encouraged the cooperation of students. Vygotsky (1962) believed that when learners are involved in activities and dialogues in a group, they steadily improve the dialogue expressions in their own speech. In 1960, Johnson and Johnson used cooperative learning to train teachers at the University of Minnesota. Cooperative learning had its real start, however, back in the 1970s when it was first meant to be used by children because of the fun it produced for them, which stimulated their learning (Slavin, 1997). Schineke-Llano (1983) stated that cooperative learning gives students the opportunity to be engaged and express themselves with the members of the group as well as with their teacher. Moreover, Oxford (1990) thought that giving students the chance to work in groups as a learning technique would help them practice the same thing when they are out of the class, which will reinforce learning.

In addition to the definition mentioned in the introduction by Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (2013), cooperative learning has also been defined by other researchers. Slavin (1987) said that cooperative learning is a set of instructional activities that require students to work in assorted groups. Slavin (2011) later stated that CL is a teaching method that makes students get involved in the learning process to learn and understand the content of the subject. Moreover, Artz and Newman (1990) defined CL as when a "small group of learners work together as team to solve a problem, complete a task, or accomplish common goal" (p. 448). All of these definitions circle around the cooperation of students who are working in groups to enhance learning.

CL has many benefits as stated by many scholars. In their study, Chen and Ying (2013) summarized the

benefits of implementing CL in classrooms in the speaking class. They found that the highly interactive learning tasks, continual student discussions, students' corrections, and relaxed atmosphere during group work are the most important benefits students can get. Moreover, they asserted that students' attitudes and motivation had increased because of the use of CL in class. In addition, they affirmed that students' social skills had become stronger. Also, they found that the use of CL helped students reduce their anxiety in English oral proficiency. Other researchers, such as Khan, Javaid, and Farooq (2015), reported that the use of CL strategies in teaching English were effective in improving students' language proficiency. Other researchers, such as (Zhou, 2012), stated that students in a group help each other comprehend the materials in tasks, which improves their oral proficiency. CL increases students' self-esteem and self-confidence, which makes them responsible for their own learning (Slavin, 2011).

There are many types of CL, as mentioned in the literature. There are four main types or models that were used in research concerning CL. These include jigsaw, group investigation, student teams achievement divisions, and learning together or learning circle (Aronson, 1978; Sharan, 1988; Slavin, 1995; Johnson, Johnson & Houbec, 1994; and Johnson and Johnson, 2000). However, the most popular model, which will also be used for this study, was the jigsaw strategy developed by Aronson (1978). More details about this model will be presented in the procedures of this paper. It was selected because this type turns students into experts in particular sections of the tasks, which makes them share the right information and answers with their group members. Pica (1994) indicated that using this model proved that the negotiation of the materials in the given task improved participants' understanding in the target language. Therefore, the jigsaw model will be used to conduct this study.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study was a quantitative and qualitative quasi-experimental research. A pretest and posttest control group design was used. The qualitative was used to investigate and describe the attitude of students and teacher in regard to the strategy use. The quantitative was used to check the effectiveness of using cooperative learning with non-specialized students.

Sample

The sample of the study was comprised of 38 students from level 6 at the college of Arabic. They voluntarily participated in this study. All of them were registered in English as an elective course for the fall 2018 semester. English is taught in level 2, 4 and 6. Choosing students from level six indicates that

they had studied English as an elective course in level 2 and 4. Once a student selects an English course in level 2, then he or she must continue taking the rest of the series of English elective courses in the Arabic college. The students participated in this experiment because they wanted to improve their English. All students knew that they would not be using the same book as the original course. The researcher divided them into two groups, with 18 students in the control group and 20 students in the experimental group. The researcher asked the participants for their consent to participate in the study. The experimental group agreed to meet with the teacher at a different time than the control group. Both groups used the same activities taken from different sources, books and the Internet. The activities covered different language skills, including reading comprehension, writing, listening and speaking tasks, as well as grammar and vocabulary. The researcher met with the teacher several times to ensure that he understood the procedures that needed to be used when teaching both groups.

Instruments

Three instruments were used for this research. An achievement test was used twice in this research: The first time was to check their English proficiency level of the students. The second time, it was used to check students' results after the experiment. Both tests included around 50 questions that covered a variety of skills. The test contained passages no less than 150 words followed by different types of questions. Moreover, an attitude questionnaire was used to check students' opinions about the cooperative learning strategy they used. In addition, the teachers' opinion form was used to check his attitude towards the strategy used and students' development in a non-specialized English course.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENTS

Validity of the Achievement Test:

It was sent to three lecturers who had previously taught this course at the same level but with different students in previous semesters to validate the test. The evaluators indicated that the achievement test is suitable and appropriate. They also indicated that it covers most of the components of the course description they are currently teaching.

Reliability of Test:

A pilot test was administered to 10 students. A Cronbach alpha reliability test was calculated. The results showed the following:

| Reliability Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .785 | 40 |

From the above table, it is clear that 0.785 is statistically accepted since it is higher than 0.60 (Abu Hashim, 2003).

Validity of the Attitude Questionnaire:

The questionnaire was presented to the same lecturers (evaluators). They specified that all 15 statements covered all intended information about cooperative learning. They pointed out some grammatical and stylistic mistakes that had been corrected. They also suggested that statements should be translated into Arabic.

Reliability of the Attitude Questionnaire:

The questionnaire was also presented to the same ten students who took the pilot test. They were asked to read the items and use a (✓) in front of each statement at the same time they were asked to tick the one of the two items (clarity and their understanding of the statement). Eight students agreed that all statements were clear and they had understood the purpose of the statement, while only two students marked two statements as unclear and therefore that they did not understand the purpose of them. The researcher explained these statements to the two students, and at the same time, the researcher restated the statements to ensure that all students understood. The result of the Cronbach alpha reliability test was calculated and the result showed the following:

| Reliability Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .801 | 15 |

From the above table, it is clear that 0.801 is statistically accepted since it is higher than 0.60 (Abu Hashim, 2003)

Procedures

All 38 participating students were divided into two groups with 19 students in each group. Both the experimental and the control group met for two hours per week for six weeks. The teacher used books and internet resources to take the activities form. The books were Headway (by Liz and John Soars and Interaction (by Beatrix S. Mikulecky and Linda Jeffries). The teacher and the researcher decided on some activities that cover very interesting topics that students face in their daily lives. General topics were also used. Every selected topic gives students a chance to use all four language skills besides concentrating on the teaching of some essential grammar rules and vocabulary. Topics like food, countries, technology, customs, and clothing were very interesting and encouraged students to participate. The control group was taught using the traditional approach in which the class was mainly centered around the teacher in a formal setting. The students were asked to follow the teacher's instructions. They were given some reading comprehension exercise and asked to answer the

questions own their own. The questions varied; there were comprehension questions, vocabulary questions, grammar questions, and a summary writing. Each student had to do all of these on his own. If the lecture ended, the teacher would leave without correcting the students' answers. Those students who finished earlier, would have their answers corrected. At the beginning of the next meeting, the teacher would go over the answers very quickly without further explanation.

The experimental group was divided into four groups: Three groups of 5 students and one group of 4 students. The teacher explained to the students how they should work in this group and cross-section the other groups. The teacher told them that he would be using a cooperative learning strategy called a jigsaw. Each group would-be given a task to work on that was similar to the tasks and exercises given to the control group. However, the material of this task was divided into parts. Each member of the group would work on one of the parts. Each person in a group is called an expert, therefore, the teacher asked the students working on the same part to come together to work on it. After a few minutes, those expert students went back to their groups to help each other answer the specified part of the task. Since all members worked in the expert groups, they brought with them what was supposed to be the correct answers. Then, the teacher asked all groups to answer the questions and hand in their answers. He discussed the answers with the whole class and corrected any wrong answers. Each group explained how they were able to locate the answers to the questions. This discussion gave all students a chance to speak and express themselves. The experiment lasted for 6 weeks.

At the end of the experiment, the teacher gave both groups the posttest. Similar to the pretest, the posttest contained a medium-length passage followed by comprehension questions, grammar questions, vocabulary questions, and sentence writing. The comprehension questions included direct questions in which the answers were directly stated in the passage as well as inferential questions. The grammar questions included giving the students a chance to correct subject-verb agreement and past and present tenses using multiple choice questions. The vocabulary questions included giving the meaning of the underlined words in the passage, explaining the meaning of words or phrases, or giving the synonyms of words. Finally, students were asked to rewrite sentences by completing the sentences.

DATA ANALYSIS

First: Ensure the equality of both groups. To ensure the equality of both groups, we had to test if there were any statistically significant differences

between them. For this purpose, an Independent Samples t Test was used.

Table # 1: Independent Samples t Test to identify the differences between the two groups pretest

| Skill | Group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---------------|--------------|----|-------|----------------|-------|-----------------|
| Comprehension | Control | 19 | 10.26 | 1.147 | .472 | .640 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 10.42 | 0.902 | | |
| Grammar | Control | 19 | 11.11 | 0.937 | .808 | .425 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 10.84 | 1.068 | | |
| Vocabulary | Control | 19 | 10.21 | 0.855 | .902 | .373 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 10.53 | 1.264 | | |
| Writing | Control | 19 | 11.42 | 1.017 | 1.212 | .233 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 11.05 | 0.848 | | |
| Total | Control | 19 | 43.00 | 2.108 | .225 | .823 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 42.84 | 2.218 | | |

From the above table, we noticed that the mean score for the control group in comprehension skills was 10.26, while it was 10.42 for the experimental group. Also, the mean score for the control group in grammar skills was 11.11, while it was 10.84 for the experimental groups. In addition, the mean score for the control group in vocabulary skills was 10.21, while it was 11.53 for the experimental group. Last, the mean score for the control group in writing skills was 11.42, while it was 11.05 for the experimental group.

We also notice that the mean score of the total exam for the control group was 43.0, while it was 42.84 for the experimental group. This indicates that there were no significant differences between the two groups in their level of individual skills or for the total score since a significant level was greater than 0.05. This

indicated that the two groups were equal before applying the experiment.

Second: Test the hypothesis of the study.

First hypothesis: there is no significant statistical differences at the level of $\alpha \leq .05$ between the mean scores of students' grades from both groups in the posttest, which may refer to the use of cooperative learning.

To check this hypothesis, the following tests were used:

The Independent Samples T test was conducted to identify any significant statistical differences between the mean scores for students' grades in both groups after performing the experiment. For this purpose, Eta square (η^2) was conducted to check students' achievement in both groups using two different strategies. The following table shows the results:

Table # 2: Results of the Independent Samples t Test to identify the differences between the two groups in the posttest

| Skill | Group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | Sig. (2-tailed) | Eta Squared |
|---------------|--------------|----|-------|----------------|--------|-----------------|-------------|
| Comprehension | Control | 19 | 12.95 | 1.353 | 12.043 | .000 | .801 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 18.26 | 1.368 | | | |
| Grammar | Control | 19 | 13.58 | 1.071 | 15.691 | .000 | .872 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 19.11 | 1.100 | | | |
| Vocabulary | Control | 19 | 13.11 | 1.449 | 13.800 | .000 | .841 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 18.68 | 1.003 | | | |
| Writing | Control | 19 | 13.95 | 1.079 | 12.839 | .000 | .821 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 17.84 | 0.765 | | | |
| Total | Control | 19 | 53.58 | 3.388 | 22.277 | .000 | .932 |
| | Experimental | 19 | 73.89 | 2.079 | | | |

From the above table, we noticed that the mean score for the control group in comprehension skills was 12.95, while it was 18.26 for the experimental group. Also, the mean score for the control group in grammar skills was 13.58, while it was 19.11 for the experimental groups. In addition, the mean score for the control group in vocabulary skills was 13.11,

while it was 18.68 for the experimental group. Last, the mean score for the control group in writing skills was 13.95, while it was 17.84 for the experimental group.

We also noticed that the mean score of the total exam for the control group was 53.58, while it was 73.89

for the experimental group. This indicates that there were significant differences between the two groups in their level of individual skills and on the total score of the test since a significant level was less than 0.05. This also indicates that there was a significant effect from using cooperative learning as a teaching strategy for non-specialized students studying English as an elective course.

Moreover, it was clear that the values of the η^2 Eta squared fell into the category of a positive effect, as indicated by Cohen and mentioned in Hassan (2001), which indicates that the effect of the strategy will be considered great if the Eta squared score is greater

than 0.14. Therefore, the use of CL has a positive effect of the students.

Second hypothesis: There is no statistically significant differences at the level of $\alpha \leq .05$ between the mean scores of students' grades from the control group in the pre and posttests.

To check this hypothesis, the following tests were used:

The Independent Samples t Test was conducted to identify any statistically significant differences between the mean scores for students' grades in both pre and posttest for the control group. Table 3 shows the results.

Table # 3: Results of the Paired Samples Tests to identify the differences between the pre and posttest for the control group

| Skills | Test | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | % of improvement |
|---------------|------|----|-------|----------------|--------|----|-----------------|------------------|
| Comprehension | Pre | 19 | 10.26 | 1.147 | 14.267 | 18 | .000 | 26.2% |
| | Post | 19 | 12.95 | 1.353 | | | | |
| Grammar | Pre | 19 | 11.11 | 0.937 | 12.818 | 18 | .000 | 22.2% |
| | Post | 19 | 13.58 | 1.071 | | | | |
| Vocabulary | Pre | 19 | 10.21 | 0.855 | 9.495 | 18 | .000 | 28.4% |
| | Post | 19 | 13.11 | 1.449 | | | | |
| Writing | Pre | 19 | 11.42 | 1.017 | 11.420 | 18 | .000 | 22.2% |
| | Post | 19 | 13.95 | 1.079 | | | | |
| Total | Pre | 19 | 43.00 | 2.108 | 16.861 | 18 | .000 | 24.6% |
| | Post | 19 | 53.58 | 3.388 | | | | |

From the above table, we noticed that the mean score for the control group in the pretest for comprehension skills was 10.26 and became 12.95 in the posttest. Also, the mean score for grammar skills was 11.11 and became 13.58 in the posttest. In addition, the mean score for vocabulary skills was 10.21 and became 13.11. Lastly, the mean score for writing skills was 11.42 and became 13.95 for the posttest.

We also notice that the mean score of the total exam for the control group was 43.00 and became 53.58 after the experiment. This indicates that there were significant differences between the two tests for the control group at the level of significance at 0.05, since the individual results for the individual skills and on for the total score of the pre and posttests was less than 0.05. Although the control group was taught using the traditional method, it showed little positive effect in all skills as well as the total result, as shown in the percentage of improvement in Table 3.

Third hypothesis: There is no statistically significant differences at the level of $\alpha \leq .05$ between the mean scores of students' grades of the experimental group in the pre and posttests.

To check this hypothesis, the following tests were used:

The Independent Samples T test was conducted to identify any statistically significant differences between the mean scores for students' grades in both pre and posttest for the experimental group. Table 4 shows the results.

From the below table, we noticed that the mean score for the experimental group in the pretest for comprehension skills was 10.42 and became 18.26 in the posttest. Also, the mean score for grammar skills was 10.84 and became 19.11 in the posttest. In addition, the mean score for vocabulary skills was 10.53 and became 18.68. Lastly, the mean score for writing skills was 11.05 and became 17.84 for the posttest.

We also notice that the mean score of the total exam for the experimental group was 42.84 and it became 73.89 after the experiment. This indicates that there were significant differences between the pre and posttest for the experimental group on the level of significance at 0.05 since the individual results for skills and for the total score of the pre and posttests was less than 0.05. This indicated that there was a great positive effect and improvement on students' achievement in all skills as well as on the total result, as shown in the percentage of improvement in table 4 when CL was used as a teaching strategy.

Table # 4: Results of the Paired Samples Tests to identify the differences between the pre and posttest for the control group

| Skills | Test | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | % Of Improvement |
|---------------|------|----|-------|----------------|--------|----|-----------------|------------------|
| Comprehension | Pre | 19 | 10.42 | 0.902 | 26.249 | 18 | .000 | 75.2% |
| | Post | 19 | 18.26 | 1.368 | | | | |
| Grammar | Pre | 19 | 10.84 | 1.068 | 28.048 | 18 | .000 | 76.3% |
| | Post | 19 | 19.11 | 1.100 | | | | |
| Vocabulary | Pre | 19 | 10.53 | 1.264 | 35.051 | 18 | .000 | 77.4% |
| | Post | 19 | 18.68 | 1.003 | | | | |
| Writing | Pre | 19 | 11.05 | 0.848 | 30.312 | 18 | .000 | 61.4% |
| | Post | 19 | 17.84 | 0.765 | | | | |
| Total | Pre | 19 | 42.84 | 2.218 | 56.598 | 18 | .000 | 72.5% |
| | Post | 19 | 73.89 | 2.079 | | | | |

Fourth hypothesis: there is no positive attitude of the students in the experimental group towards the use of cooperative learning as a strategy for teaching and learning.

To check this hypothesis, the mean score, standard deviation, and value of the direction were calculated, as shown in Table 5.

Table # 5: Values of the scores on the questionnaire

| Answer | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| Score | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

The values 'interpretations were adjusted as follows:

| Grade Interpretation | Average Scores |
|----------------------|--|
| Very weak | Averages between 1.00 and less than 1.80 |
| Weak | Averages between 1.80 and less than 2.60 |
| Medium | Averages between 2.60 and less than 3.40 |
| High | Averages between 3.40 and less than 4.20 |
| Very high | Averages between 4.20 and 5.00 |

Table # 6: Arrangement of statements according to the mean, standard deviation, and attitude value for the statements of the questionnaire according to opinions of students in the experimental group

| Question | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Rating | Ranking |
|----------|----|------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| Q14 | 19 | 4.89 | 0.315 | Strongly Agree | 1 |
| Q3 | 19 | 4.84 | 0.375 | Strongly Agree | 2 |
| Q10 | 19 | 4.79 | 0.419 | Strongly Agree | 3 |
| Q11 | 19 | 4.68 | 0.478 | Strongly Agree | 4 |
| Q13 | 19 | 4.68 | 0.478 | Strongly Agree | 4 |
| Q15 | 19 | 4.63 | 0.955 | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Q2 | 19 | 4.58 | 0.692 | Strongly Agree | 6 |
| Q6 | 19 | 4.47 | 0.697 | Strongly Agree | 7 |
| Q8 | 19 | 4.47 | 0.697 | Strongly Agree | 7 |
| Q12 | 19 | 4.42 | 0.961 | Strongly Agree | 8 |
| Q1 | 19 | 4.11 | 0.315 | Agree | 9 |
| Q5 | 19 | 4.05 | 0.524 | Agree | 10 |
| Q9 | 19 | 4.00 | 0.667 | Agree | 11 |
| Q7 | 19 | 3.89 | 0.809 | Agree | 12 |
| Q4 | 19 | 3.84 | 0.602 | Agree | 13 |
| All | 19 | 4.42 | 0.505 | Strongly Agree | |

From the above table, we noticed that 10 statements showed very high positive attitudes because the average fell between 4.20 and 5. Also, five statements fell between 3.40 and 4.20 with a high positive attitude. The average of all statements generally showed a very high positive attitude, which meant that the use of cooperative learning from students' perspectives was very useful.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study showed that using both strategies—the traditional way of teaching and CL—had a positive effect; however, with differing sizes of effect. For the traditional way, it proves Krashen's theory of learning i+1 (1981), yet the effect of this strategy was not more than 24.6% as shown in Table 4. On the other hand, the use of CL strategy showed a higher effect on the students' achievement. The total average in Table 5, the average percentage of improvement on all skills, was 72.5%. This indicates that the use of CL was very effective.

When looking at the results of this study, we find that the experimental group showed better scores in the achievement test because of the effect of using jigsaw strategy, which encouraged learners to cooperate with their peers in the group. The results of this study were comparable to the results of other studies that investigated the use of cooperative learning as a strategy in developing English skills (Gomleksz, 2007; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1998). The result of Gomleksz's study revealed a statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in favor of the experimental group in learning vocabulary. In addition, the attitude questionnaire for this study indicated that students liked and benefited from working in groups. This result was similar to Gomleksz's study, in which the attitude questionnaire revealed students' positive attitudes towards learning English using CL. Other researchers investigated the impact of using CL in improving learners' speaking ability. Chen (2005) found that the use of CL in teaching speaking to 100 tertiary students had a positive effect. Al-Salkhi

(2015), who investigated the use of jigsaw strategy in teaching 7th-grade students found that the experimental group did better than the control group. In addition, Al-Salkhi found a positive relationship between students' achievement and their learning motivation. This is similar to what this study found in Item # 11 in appendix A which stated that "I think sharing information with the members of the group about different topics motivates me to learn."

When checking the statistical analysis of both groups, we can clearly see there was a big difference in the scores between the experimental and control group. This can be mainly attributed to the use of jigsaw strategy and it was in favor of the experimental group. The results can be accredited to the new learning environment that the experimental group experienced. Students were given the chance to talk, discuss, ask the teacher questions, use the internet to look for information, and some have used the library. It was found that the use of jigsaw strategy made high achievers communicate with low achievers and pass their knowledge to them (Abu-Snina, 2008).

Answering the Research Questions

First Question: Is there any significant difference in English achievement scores between students taught by traditional method and those taught by cooperative learning?

The answer is yes. The results show that there was a significant difference as shown in Table 2. The significant level was 0.000, which is less than the significant level at 0.05. This indicates that there was a significant effect for using cooperative learning as a teaching strategy for non-specialized students studying English as an elective course.

Second Question: Is there any significant difference in English achievement scores between the experimental group's pre and posttests?

The answer is yes. There was a significant difference in English achievement scores between the pre and posttest for the experimental group. The results showed a significant level of 0.000, which is less than the assigned significant level of 0.05. This indicates that the use of CL was effective.

Third Question: What skills did learners improve most after the experiment?

The arrangement of skills used in both groups before the experiment according to the mean score was as follows: The control group arrangement was: writing, 11.42; grammar, 11.11; comprehension, 10.26; and last, vocabulary, 10.21. On the other hand, the arrangement of the experimental group before the experiment was as follows: writing, 11.05; grammar, 10.84; vocabulary, 10.53; and finally,

comprehension, 10.42. However, after the experiment, the arrangement of skill used according to the mean score was as follows for the control group: writing, 13.95; grammar, 13.58; vocabulary, 13.11; and finally, comprehension, 12.95. On the other hand, the arrangement of the experimental group skills used were as follows: grammar, 19.11; vocabulary, 18.68; comprehension, 18.26; and finally, writing, 17.84.

Fourth Question: What is the attitude of the experimental group's students in regard to the use of cooperative learning strategy?

There was a strong positive attitude. The total result of the questionnaire showed a very high score of the mean, which fell between 4.20 and 5.

Fifth Question: Did the teacher of this course feel the difference in English use between the traditional and cooperative teaching strategies?

The teacher was given the chance to express and state his opinions about the use of CL. He was asked to write a few statements about his experience. Therefore, the answer of these questions was yes. The following quotations show the teacher's attitude towards the use of the CL versus the traditional method:

"It was my first time to use such method and I liked it and think students did"

"Jigsaw group students were joyful but traditional group was passive"

"Jigsaw group finished earlier when doing assignments than traditional"

"Jigsaw group answered correctly most of the time but traditional group sometimes they did not finish"

"most of the time Jigsaw group answered correctly as opposed to traditional group"

These statements support the above statistical analysis results as will the students' responses in the attitude questionnaire.

To conclude, the undertaken results in this study give strong evidence for the importance of using CL strategies in teaching English to non-specialized students who are studying English as an elective course.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since jigsaw strategy had proven to be effective in this study, it is highly recommended to train teachers to use it when teaching English to either specialized or non-specialized English learners. Moreover, lecturers at the university level who are teaching English as an elective course should create a cooperative learning environment to encourage students and make them like learning. This strategy should be used in all levels for students studying

English as an elective course since the results are proven to be effective. The traditional method showed a little positive effect in this study; however, it is recommended to use CL since it showed greater improvement in students' achievement. Students strongly agreed that the use of CL improved their grammar; therefore, it is recommended to use CL to teach grammar to non-specialized English-language learners. In addition, using CL to teach vocabulary would be very effective.

SUGGESTIONS

The results of this study suggest the following:

- Further investigation of the effect of using other CL models.
- Comparison of using CL models.
- Further research on a larger sample to be able to generalize the results of this study.
- Comparison of female and male use of CL jigsaw model.
- A long-term study to confirm the results of this study.
- Investigation on the use of teaching grammar to female Saudi non-specialized English learners.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Raufm** A. (2010). Grammar-translation method: Still alive in Arab TEFL Classroom. *TESOL Arabia Perspectives*, V.17(1), (13-18).
- Abu Hashim**, A. M. (2003). *Statistical Guide in Data Analysis Using SPSS*. Al-Rushd Bookstor, Riyadh.
- Abu Snina, O. (2008). The Effect of Two Forms of Cooperative Learning and Students' Gender on The Immediate and Delayed Achievement of Tenth Grade Students in National and Civic Education in Comparison with The Traditional Method of Learning. *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Research and Studies*, V.14, (85-111)
- Al-Salkhi**, M. (2015). The Effectiveness of Jigsaw Strategy on the Achievement and Learning Motivation of the 7th Primary Grade Students in the Islamic Education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, V5 (4), (111-117)
- Aronson, E. (1978). *Jigsaw classroom*. Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Beckman, M. (1990). Collaborative Learning: Preparation for the Workplace and Democracy? *College Teaching*, V.38(4), (128-133).
- Chen, J. and Wang, Y. (2013). A Study of Cooperative Learning in Higher College English Teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, V. 3, (7), (1258-1263).
- Ghaith, G. and Yaghi, H. (1998). *System*, V. 26, (223-234).
- Gomleksz, M. N. (2007). Effectiveness of cooperative learning (Jigsaw II) Method in Teaching English as a Foreign Language to Engineering Students (case of Firat University, Turkey), *European Journal of Engineering Education*, V.32, (5), (613-625)
- Hassan, I. (2011). *Psychological and educational statistics: Application Using SPSS 18 program*. Cairo, Egypt: Dar Alfikr Alarabi.
- Hornby, G. (2009). The Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning with Trainee Teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, V.35 (2), (161-168).
- Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Holubec, E. (1994). *Cooperative learning in the classroom*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R. T. (2000). *Cooperative learning methods: A Meta-Analysis of competitive and individualistic learning*. *Allen & Bacon*: Boston.
- Johnson, D., Johnson, R., & Smith, K. (2013). *Cooperative Learning: Improving University Instruction by Basing Practice On Validated Theory*. *Journal on Excellence in University Teaching*.
- Khan, S., Javid, C., and Farooq, U. (2015). Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Method Versus Traditional Learning Method on Writing Ability of the Students. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, V.4 (1), (23-32).
- Lord, T. R. (2001). 101 Reasons for Using Cooperative Learning in Biology Teaching. *The American Biology Teacher* V63 (1) (30-38).
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on Negotiation: What Does it reveal About Second-Language Learning Conditions, Processes, and Outcomes? *Language Learning*, V.44, (3), (493 - 527).
- Schineke-Llano, L.A. (1983). Foreigner Talk in content classrooms. In *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*, edited by H. Seliger and M.H. Long, (146-164), (Newbury House: Rowlet, MA).
- Sharan, S. (1988). *Language and Learning in The Cooperative Classroom*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Slavin, R. (1987). *Cooperative Learning and Cooperative School*. *Educational Leadership*, V.45 (3), (7-13).
- Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice*. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Slavin, R. (1997). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Slavin, R. (2011), Instruction Based on Cooperative Learning. In Mayer, R.E. and Alexander, P.A., (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction* (344-360), New York: Routledge

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Zhou, H. (2012). Enhancing non-English Majors' EFL Motivation Through Cooperative Learning. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*,12, PP 1317-1323

Appendix A
Attitude questionnaire

| Statements | strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| 1.I think other members in the group can contribute to my Englishlearning. | | | | | |
| 2.I feel relaxed working in a group. | | | | | |
| 3.I want to answer when I am with my group. | | | | | |
| 4. Working cooperatively helped me know how to look for the right answers. | | | | | |
| 5.Working in a group makes me concentrate more. | | | | | |
| 6.Cooperating with another student in answering one question helped me a lot. | | | | | |
| 7.I think learning from other members in a group is a good use of class time. | | | | | |
| 8.I think learning a new lesson is easier if I am with a group. | | | | | |
| 9. I think teaching my group members helps me improve my English. | | | | | |
| 10. I think dividing the task among group members made learning easier. | | | | | |
| 11.I think sharing information with the members of the group about different topics motivates me to learn. | | | | | |
| 12. I now know the benefits of cooperating with my colleagues. | | | | | |
| 13.I prefer that the teacher not dominate the class. | | | | | |
| 14. I found it easy to learn grammar by working cooperatively with my group. | | | | | |
| 15. It was easy to comprehend the text by working cooperatively with my group. | | | | | |