University Students' Views about the Application of Collaborative Learning in Communicative English Language Skills Classes

Befikadu Lemma
Addis Ababa Science and Technology University ROR
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
iD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8675-2753, e-mail: befikadu.lemmay@gmail.com

Abstract. The main purpose of the study is to investigate students' views about the implementation of collaborative learning in English classes. Collaborative learning helps students to improve their English language performance. To achieve this objective, observation and questionnaires were employed. The quantitative data were analyzed using percentage and frequency. Theme analysis technique was used to analyze the qualitative data. The result of the study indicated that most students' applied collaborative learning, but the type of collaborative learning they are applying is not collaborative learning. Most of the teachers simply make their students to sit side by side to talk with each other as they do their individual assignments, and some teachers assign a task to groups. Then, one or two of the group members do the work and the other group members get equal credit. Although each of these is important in collaborative learning, they do not qualify collaborative learning rather traditional group learning. In addition to this, some students were not playing their roles as they are expected. Teachers and other concerned bodies ought to deliver sorts of orientations to the students about the importance of collaborative learning to maximize students' views before implementing collaborative learning.

Keywords: Perception, Implementation, Collaborative learning.

Взгляды студентов университетов на применение совместного обучения на занятиях по коммуникативным навыкам владения английским языком

Бефикаду Л
ROR Аддис-Абебский университет науки и технологий
г. Аддис-Абеба, Эфиопия.
iD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8675-2753, e-mail: befikadu.lemmay@gmail.com

Резюме. Основная цель исследования – изучить представления учащихся о внедрении совместного обучения на уроках английского языка. Совместное обучение помогает учащимся улучшить свои показатели владения английским языком. Для достижения этой цели были использованы методы наблюдения и анкетирования. Количественные данные были проанализированы с использованием процентных соотношений и частоты. Для анализа качественных данных был использован метод тематического анализа. Результаты исследования показали, что большинство студентов применяют совместное обучение, но тип совместного обучения, который они применяют, не является совместным обучением. Большинство учителей просто заставляют своих учеников сидеть бок о бок, чтобы разговаривать друг с другом во время выполнения индивидуальных заданий, а некоторые учителя распределяют задания по группам. Затем один или два члена группы выполняют работу, а остальные члены группы получают равный зачет. Хотя каждый из них важен в совместном обучении, они не квалифицируются как совместное обучение, а скорее как традиционное групповое обучение. В дополнение к этому, некоторые студенты играли свои роли не так, как от них ожидали. Учителя и другие заинтересованные организации должны разъяснять учащимся важность совместного обучения, чтобы максимально расширить представления учащихся, прежде чем внедрять совместное обучение.

Ключевые слова: реализация, восприятие, совместное обучение.

Акӑлчан чӗлхипе усӑ курса хутшӑнма пӗрле вӗрентнине студентсем епле хаклани

Бефикаду Л
Аддис-Абеба ӑслӑлӑхпа техника университечӗ ROR
Аддис-Абеба, Эфиопи.
iD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8675-2753, e-mail: befikadu.lemmay@gmail.com

Аннотаци. Тӗпчевӗн тӗп тӗллевӗ – вӗренекенсем акӑлчан чӗлхи урокӗсенче хутшӑнма пӗрле вӗрентес тӗлӗшпе тунӑ ҫӗнӗлӗхе епле йышӑннине тӗпчесси. Хутшӑнма пӗрле вӗрентни ҫамрӑксен акӑлчанла калаҫас ӑсталӑхне ӳстерме пулӑшать. Тӗпчев тӗллевне пурнӑҫлама сӑнав тата анкетлав мелӗсемпе усӑ курнӑ. Хисеп кӑтартӑвӗсене процент тата

тăтăшлăх енчен пăхса тишкернĕ. Пахалăх кăтартăвĕсене ăнланса илме тематика тишкерĕвĕн мелĕпе усă курнă. Тĕп-чев результачĕ тăрăх, студентсенчен чылайăшĕ темиçе çын пĕрлешсе вĕренет, анчах вĕрентĕвĕн тĕсĕ, чăннипе, пĕрле вĕрентни мар иккен. Чылай учитель ачасене кашни хăйĕн ĕçне тунă май кӳршĕпе каласăр тесе кăна пĕр-пĕринпе юнашар вăйпа лартать. Хăш-пĕр учитель ку е вăл ĕçе ушкăнсене валеççе парса тутарать. Ушкăнра вара, тĕрĕссипе, пĕр е икĕ ача анчах ĕçлет, вĕсем мĕн тунине ыттисем пăхса лараççĕ, анчах та ĕçленĕ ачасемпе пĕр шайрах зачет илеççĕ. Пĕрле вĕрентнĕ чухне, паллах, кашни мел пĕлтерĕшлĕ пулин те урокра тунă ĕç пĕрле вĕрентни шутне кĕме пултараймасть. Куна, тĕрĕссипе, традици картинче ушкăнпа вĕрентни тесе пăхма тивет. Унсăр пуçне хăш-пĕр студент ĕçе преподаватель ыйтнă пек мар, пачах урăхла туни те пулать. Учительсем, ку ĕç пĕлтерĕшне хаклакан организацисем пĕрле вĕренине пурнăçа кĕртес умĕн, студентсен пĕлĕвне май пур таран анлă сарас тĕллевпе, пуçарнă мелĕн усăлăхĕ çинчен каласа ăнлантарма тивĕçлĕ.

Тĕп сăмахсем: акăлчан чĕлхи, пĕрле вĕренни, туйни.

Background of the study

Communicative language teaching marks the beginning of a major paradigm shift within language teaching in the twentieth century, one whose ramifications continued to be felt today (Richards and Rogers, 2001). The general principals of communicative language are today widely accepted around the world. Collaborative learning can help students to be critical thinkers, creators and problem solvers.

Although collaborative language learning instigates outside of language teaching, it is compatible with many of the assumptions of communicative language. It has become a popular and relatively uncontroversial approach to the organization of classroom teaching in many parts of the world. As Putnam (1997) states cooperative learning has emerged as a powerful method for fostering children's achievement and socio-personal development in today's heterogeneous classroom. Collaborative learning is a successful teaching strategy in which small teams, each with students of different levels of ability, use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject. Each member of a team is responsible for not only learning what is taught but also for helping teammates learn and forming an atmosphere.

Implementing collaborative learning can help to bring sound language learning process. It also helps to achieve sound education as well (Jakobs, 1988). Consequently, university students' feeling about the implementation of collaborative learning is worthwhile to see whether they have enough awareness to implement it or not. The reason is that the concept of learning and the roles students play are inseparable and two faces of a coin to implement collaborative learning effectively. Students who are learning English are supposed to be positive and active to engage in collaborative learning since it requires students to engage in-group activities that increase learning and indicates other important dimensions.

According to Brady and Tsay (2010), students who participate equally in-group activities exhibited a higher like hood of receiving high-test scores and course grades at the end of the semester. In the current research context, there are studies about the implementation of group work at secondary school levels (Birhanu G/Michael, 2000). Birhanu tried to see collaborative learning focusing on group work organization of grade eleven. On the other hand, Seifu W/yohhanes (2005) conducted a study about the implementation of group activities. Wondwosen Tesfamichael (2008) investigated an assessment about oral group lessons in promoting cooperative learning

focusing on group work organization in grade eleven. As far as the researcher's experience and reading is concerned, there is no study about university students' perception about the implementation of collaborative learning in English classes. As a result, the researcher is interested to assess students' perception about the implementation of collaborative learning at Addis Ababa Science and Technology University.

According to Birhanu (2000), students have an attempt of employing collaborative learning. The researcher stated that students fail to interact successfully. This may be due to their negative views towards the implementation of it. How about university students' perception about the implementation of collaborative learning in English classes? It was the assumption that the researcher is inspired to assess students' feelings about the implementation of collaborative learning.

1.2 Objectives of the study
1.2.1 General objective

The general objective of this study was to assess students' perceptions about the implementation of collaborative learning.

1.2.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of this study includes the following points

- To assess the types of collaborative learning that students employ during collaborative learning
- To assess students' roles during collaborative learning
- To identify students' perception about the implementation of collaborative learning

2. Research Methodology

The main purpose of the current study is to explore students' views about the implementation of collaborative learning in communicative English skills II classes. The study employed a descriptive method because the researcher was interested to assess the students' perception about the implementation of collaborative learning, type(s) of collaborative learning they apply and their roles during the process of implementing collaborative learning and classroom activities they employ during the process.

2.1. Study area

The study was conducted at Addis Ababa Science and Technology University, with special reference to first year engineering students who took the course communicative English skills II.

2.2. Methods of data collection

To collect data from the respondents, the researcher used questionnaire and classroom observation.

2.3. Questionnaire

Questionnaire is extremely flexible and can be used to gather information on almost any topic involving large or small numbers of people (Abiy et al 2009). Students' questionnaire contained both close ended and open-ended questions. The main purpose of the open-ended questions was to elicit more information from the concerned research participants. This is because open-ended questions can provide rich information since respondents feel comfortable to express their feelings and opinions (Ranjit, 1996).

2.4. Observation

Classroom observation was conducted to check whether students play their roles during the implementation of collaborative learning in response to the questionnaire in the classroom while the actual class lesson was going on.

2.5. Sampling techniques

Three sections were selected randomly as subjects for the questionnaire. This made 120 students. Random sampling as it, according to Bailay (1994), delivers chances for everyone to be a member of the sample.

2.6. Data collection procedure

During the process of collecting data, the following procedures were followed. All selected sections were observed two times each. Along with the co observer, the researcher observed each classroom two times and put (√) for activities that were practiced and (X) for activities that were not practiced.

Second, the questionnaires were administered to a sample of 120 students after explaining the purpose of the study. The researcher did the distribution of the questionnaire in collaboration with classroom subject teachers in each section. All the student participants returned the questionnaire after they filled and completed the questions during the class period.

2.7. Data analysis methods

In this descriptive survey study, quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were used for the reasons that the quantitative as well as qualitative data were gathered. The quantitative data were treated by counting and converting the tallies into percentage and explaining that in line with the research objectives. Mean values were also used to analyze and interpret data regarding students' attitude, roles and classroom activities they employed during the implementation of collaborative learning. The mean value was calculated by multiplying the number of respondents and the scale value divide by total number of respondents.

$$\left(\text{I.e. mean}(X) = \frac{\text{number of respondents}(f) \text{ x scale value}}{\text{Total number of the respondents}} \right)$$

In short, the data gathered through observations were described qualitatively in order to support the data gathered through questionnaire. Finally, the findings obtained by the use of these tools were summarized and concluded. Recommendations were also given based on the conclusions that were drawn.

3. Data Analysis and Discussion

In this part of the research, an attempt has been made to analyze and interpret the data gathered from first year students of Addis Ababa Science and Technology University. Three data gathering tools were used. These were questionnaire and observation.

Accordingly, data obtained from these tools were interactively presented and analyzed in the following organizational scheme. First, students' understanding and experience about the implementation of collaborative learning were analyzed and discussed. Then, students' attitude about the implementation of collaborative

Table 1

No	Item	Variables	f	%
1.	What type (s) of learning does your teacher widely implement during his or her teaching?	Competitive learning	18	15
		Cooperative group learning	90	75
		Individualistic learning	12	10

Table 2

No	Item	Variables	f	%
2.	Are you interested to work with your classmates during collaborative learning?	Yes	100	84
		No	20	16

Table 3

No	Item	Variables	f	%
3.	What type of collaborative learning does your teacher mostly implement in your classroom?	Formal (which lasts from one class period to several weeks)	46	38
		Informal (Which lasts from few minutes to a class period)	48	40
		Base group (lasts for at least a year)	26	22

Table 4

No	Item	Variables	f	%
4.	What do you do while your teacher is implementing collaborative learning?	I work collaboratively on task with my group members	38	32
		I participate actively	32	26
		I simply listen to my teacher	50	42

Table 5

No	Item	Variables	f	%
5.	Which of the following instructional method do you mostly prefer your teacher to implement in your classroom?	Active (learner centered)	84	70
		Traditional (teacher centered)	36	30

Table 6

No	Item	Variables	f	%
6.	What type (s) of groups does your teacher form while he or she is implementing collaborative learning?	Heterogeneous (students with different ability)	100	83
		Homogeneous (students with the same ability)	20	17

Table 7

No	Item	Variables	f	%
7.	Do you believe that your teacher implements collaborative learning in your classroom successfully?	Yes	84	70
		No	36	30

Table 8

No	Item	Variables	f	%
8.	What is your attitude about the implementation of collaborative learning?	Positive	92	76
		Negative	28	24

learning was followed. Finally, students' roles during the implementation of collaborative learning was analyzed and discussed. Data from questionnaires were discussed in the order they are put above. In addition, the data gathered through the three tools were presented in any order as relevant as follow.

3.1. Students' understanding and experience on the implementation of collaborative learning

As can be seen from Table-1 for item 1, 90(75%) of the students said their teacher widely implements collaborative learning, 18(15%) of them said their teacher widely implements competitive learning and 12(10%) of them said their teacher implements individualistic learning. Regarding to the question *"How does your teacher implement collaborative learning in your class"*, majority of the students replied their teacher makes them to sit side by side with each other as they do their individual assignments. However, as to Johnson, and Johnson (1987) collaboration is not having students sit side by side at the same with each other as they do their individual assignments. Some of students said their teacher assigns a task to a group. Then, one or two of the group members do the work, and the rest of the group members get equal credit. Nevertheless, very few of them said their teacher makes them work together toward a common goal. From this, it is possible to say that even though both the teachers and students mostly implement collaborative learning, they are not clear how to implement collaborative learning and the difference between collaborative group learning with the traditional one.

As can be showed from Table 1 above of item 2, 100 (84%) of the students are interested to work with their classmates during collaborative learning and 20(16%) of them are not interested to work with their classmates during collaborative learning. As to Gebeyaw (2007), some students feel that the class time is best spent hearing from the teacher rather than working with students who, they believe, known as little as themselves.

As Table 3 above, 48 (40%) of the respondents explained their teacher mostly implements informal collaborative learning, and 46 (38%) of them said their teacher implements base group collaborative learning. From this, it is possible to conclude both informal and base group collaborative learning are implemented.

As indicated from Table 5 above, 50 (42%) of the students simply listen to their teacher, 38 (32%) of them work collaboratively on tasks with their group members and 32 (26%) of them participated actively. This indicated that students are not that much aware about the role of collaborative learning to improve their language skills.

As can be reported from Table 5 above, 84 (70%) of the student respondents mostly prefer their teacher to implement learner centered method in their classroom; nevertheless, 36 (30%) of them mostly prefer traditional instructional method.

The response of students for the open-ended question "What is the reason to prefer active instructional methods like cooperative group learning?" is the following. Most of them explained that the active instructional learning or active learning helps them to develop their oral communicative skills, to share their experience, knowledge and skill, to make them to avoid stress, and develop confidence. It also helps them to be encouraged to participate actively and to learn best from their mistakes.

According to Table 6 above, most of the students (83%) of them responded that their teachers form heterogeneous groups and 20(17%) of them responded that their teachers form homogeneous groups. The data indicated that teachers give emphasis for heterogeneous type of group formation during the implementation of collaborative learning.

As Table 7 above shows, (70%) of the students confirmed that their teacher implements collaborative learning successfully, but 46(35%) of them said that their teacher does not implement collaborative learning effectively.

Table 9

Scale value			SA	A	Un	D	SD	Total	Mean
Items	Statements	Fr. and %							
1.	Collaboration helps me to prepare for my learning.	f	90	26	3	1	-	120	4.7
		%	75	22	2	1	-	100	
2.	Using collaborative learning is likely to create too many problems in my class.	f	20	40	10	16	34	120	2.9
		%	17	33	9	13	28	100	
3.	If the teacher uses collaborative leaning too many students expect other group members to do the work.	f	38	46	11	12	13	120	3.7
		%	32	38	9	10	11	100	
4.	I do not believe that my teacher can implement collaborative learning successfully.	f	20	18	8	38	36	120	2.5
		%	17	15	7	31	30	100	
5.	Most of the time I would like to work alone than in collaboration.	f	55	18	2	15	30	120	3.4
		%	46	15	1	13	25	100	
6.	I feel that collaborative learning promotes friendship among us.	f	60	48	-	7	5	120	4.2
		%	50	40	-	6	4	100	
7.	I feel my teacher lacks personal commitment to use collaborative learning in the class.	f	40	31	8		40	120	3.25
		%	33	26	7		33	100	
8.	Using collaborative learning develops my oral communicative skills	f	76	28	-	9	7	120	4.2
		%	63	23	-	8	6	100	
9.	Collaborative learning enables us to learn from one another	f	80	33	3	4	-	120	4.5
		%	67	28	2	3	-	100	
10.	Using collaborative learning is time consuming	f	47	39	-	14	20	120	3.6
		%	39	33	-	12	16	100	
11.	I become frustrated to discuss with my group members during collaborative learning.	f	34	61	2	3	20	120	3.4
		%	28	51	1	3	17	100	

Key: *SA-Strongly agree (5)   A-Agree (4)   Un-Undecided (3)   D-Disagree (2)   SD-Strongly disagree (1)*

As can be seen from Table 8, 92 (76%) of the students have positive attitude about the implementation of collaborative learning, but 28 (24%) of them have negative feeling about collaborative learning.

The students' responses for the open-ended statement "Write anything else you would like to say about the implementation of collaborative learning." They discussed that collaborative learning should be encouraged and continued, because it makes students' learning effective and meaningful. They also indicated that collaborative leaning helps students to learn from each other, so it should be sustainable. Finally, they pointed out that there should be stable membership during collaborative learning because group formation is time consuming.

3.2. Students' Perception about the implementation of collaborative learning

As can be seen from Table 10, with regard to item 1, 90 (75) of the students strongly agreed and 26 (22%) of them agreed respectively that collaborative leaning helps them to prepare for their learning. The mean value also inclines to strongly agree (i.e. 4.7). For item 2, 40 (33%) of the students agreed and 20 (17%) of them strongly agreed respectively. However, 16 (18%) of them disagreed and

34 (28%) them strongly disagreed respectively that using collaborative learning is likely to create too many problems in their class with the mean value of 2.9. Concerning to item 3, 46 (38%) of the students agreed and 38 (32%) of them strongly agreed. Nevertheless, 11(9%) of them undecided, 12 (10%) of them disagreed and 13 (11%) of them strongly disagreed for the given statement. This implied that if the teacher uses collaborative leaning, most students expect other group members to do their work. Similarly, the mean value approximates to agree 3.7. This indicated that most of the group members need their group leader to help them, summarize what they did and finally present it.

Regarding to item 4, 38(31%) of the respondents do not supposed and 36 (30%) of them do not strongly thought that their teacher cannot implement collaborative learning successfully. In other words, 31% of them agreed and 30% of them strongly disagreed respectively that their teacher could implement collaborative learning successfully. Majority of the students agreed that their teacher could implement collaborative learning magnificently.

With regard to item 5, 55 (46%) of the students strongly agreed, 18 (15%) of them agreed to statement 5. On the other hand, 2(1%) of them undecided, 15 (13%) of them

Table 10

Items	Statements	Fr. and %	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Not at all	Total	Mean
1.	I work collaboratively with my group members.	f	20	60	40	-	-	120	3.8
		%	17	50	33	-	-	100	
2.	I plan, monitor and evaluate my learning.	f	15	20	71	8	6	120	3.25
		%	13	16	59	7	5	100	
3.	I provide feedback, reinforcement and support for my group members.	f	4	12	23	53	28	120	2.25
		%	3	10	19	44	24		
4.	I participate actively	f	13	72	24	11	-	120	3.7
		%	11	60	20	9	-	100	
5.	I accept other students' weakness and strength.	f	19	37	42	18	4	120	3.4
		%	16	31	35	15	3	100	
6.	My teacher makes sure that we know what is expected of us from collaborative learning.	f	39	53	21	7	-	120	4.03
		%	33	44	17	6	-	100	
7.	My teacher arranges the class into small groups.	f	2	5	12	61	40	120	1.9
		%	2	4	10	51	33	100	
8.	My teacher employs classroom activities, which are appropriate to the objectives.	f	35	75	10	-	-	120	4.2
		%	29	63	8	-	-	100	
9.	My teacher encourages our participation.	f	74	43	3	-	-	120	4.59
		%	62	36	2	-	-	100	
10.	My teacher evaluates our achievement at the end of the lesson.	f	23	38	41	11	7	120	3.49
		%	19	32	34	9	6	120	

disagreed and 30 (25%) of them strongly disagreed that most of the time they would like to work alone than in collaborative learning with the mean value of 3.5. This is an evidence to say that majority of the students prefer competitive and individualistic learning than collaborative learning.

As can be seen from item 6 of the above table, 60(50%) of the students strongly agreed and 48 (40%) of them agreed respectively to the statement. However, 7(6%) of them disagreed and 5 (4%) of them strongly agreed that collaborative learning promotes friendship among them.

With regard to item 7, 40(33%) of the students strongly agreed, 31(26%) of them agreed respectively. However, (7%) of them did not decide with the statement, and 1(1%) of them strongly disagreed that their teacher lacks personal commitment to use collaborative learning. Finally, the mean inclines to undecided with the value of 3.25.

About item 8, 76(63%) of the students strongly agreed, and 28(23%) of them agreed respectively to the statement. However, 9(8%) of them undecided and 7 (6%) of them strongly disagreed that collaborative learning develops their oral communicative language skills. The mean value, which is 4.3, shows that most of the students agreed up on the given statement. As can be seen from item 9, with regard to the statement collaborative learning enables students to learn from one other. 80(67%) of the students strongly agreed and 33(28%) of them agreed to the stated statement respectively with the mean value of 4.5.

According to item 10, 47(39%) of the students strongly agreed and 39(33%) of them agreed; However, 14 (12%) of them disagreed and 20(16%) of them strongly disagreed that collaborative learning is time consuming. Here the mean value is 3.6, which inclines to the agree scale value. Finally, 34 (28%) of the students strongly agreed, 61 (51%) of them agreed to item 11. However, 2(1%) of them, 3(3%) of them disagreed and 20(17%) of them strongly disagreed that students become frustrated to discuss with their friends to improve their language performance. The mean value also shows that most of the students get frustrated to discuss with their group members.

3.3. Students' roles during collaborative learning

As can be seen from Table 10 of the first item, 60(50%) of the students said '*mostly'*, 40 (33%) of them said '*sometimes'*, 20 (17%) of them said always, work collaboratively with their group members with the mean of 3.86. Nevertheless, most students were not interested to work collaboratively with their group members. Therefore, it is possible to say that most students do not work collaboratively with their classmates.

Regarding to item 2 of the above Table, 71 (59%) of the students said *'sometimes'* and 20 (16%) of them said '*mostly'*; 15 (13%) of them said *'always'*, 8 (7%) of them *'rarely'* plan, monitor and evaluate their learning; Nevertheless, 6 (5%) of them did not plan, monitor and evaluate their learning. In addition, the mean value inclines 3.2 to *'sometimes'*. Thus, most of the students sometimes plan, monitor and evaluate their learning.

About item 3, 53 (44%) of the students said *'rarely'* and 23(19%) of them *'sometimes'*. 12 (10%) of them agree to *'mostly'* and 4(3%) of them *'always'*, but, 28(24%) of them do not provide feedback, reinforcement and support for their group members. Moreover, the mean value inclines to rarely (i.e. 2.25). The data show that most of the students rarely provide feedback, reinforcement and support for their group members.

In relation with item 4, 72(60%) of the students choose *'mostly'*, 24 (20%) of them sometimes, 13 (11%) of them always and 11 (9%) of them '*rarely'* participate actively during collaborative learning. Thus, majority of the students were active during the implementation of collaborative learning. In addition, the mean value inclines to *'mostly'* (i.e. 3.7). Similarly, in the observation sections, the researcher has observed that most of the students were not participating actively rather they simply listening to what their group leader said and some students were disturbing the class.

With regard to item 5, 42 (35%) of the students selected *'sometimes'*, 37 (31%) of them said *'mostly'*, 19 (16%) of them choose *'always',* and 18 (15%) of them preferred *'rarely'* accept other students' weakness and strength. However, 4 (3%) of the respondents do not accept other students' weakness and strength. Moreover, the mean value is 3.4. Regarding item 6, 53 (43%) of the students said *'mostly';* 39 (33%) of them selected *'always'*. Besides, 21 (18%) of them selected *'sometimes'* and 7(6%) of them said *'rarely'* agreed that their teacher makes sure that they know what is expected of them from collaborative learning. This indicated that most of the students stated that their teachers mostly make sure that what is expected of them from collaborative learning.

With regard to item 7, 61 (51%) of the students selected *'rarely'*; 12 (10%) of them said *'sometimes'*; 5(4%) of them said *'mostly'* and 2(2%) of them said *'always'* replied that their teacher arranges the class in to small groups. Finally, most of the students said that their teacher arranges the class in to small groups.

During the observation sessions, the groups in all sections were already formed when collaborative learning was established. With regard to item 8, 75 (68%) of the students said '*mostly*', 35(29%) of them always and 10(8%) of them sometimes said that their teacher employs classroom activities which are appropriate to the objectives.

About item 9, 74 (62%) of the students said *'always'*, 43 (36%) of them said *'mostly'* and 3(2%) of them said *'sometimes'* that their teacher encourages their participation. Similarly, in the observed sections, the researcher has observed that all of the observed teachers were encouraging their students' participation. Moreover, the mean value inclines to always (i.e. 4.59).

Finally, concerning to the last item, 11 (34%) of the students said *'sometimes'*; 38 (32%) of them said *'mostly'*; 11 (9%) of them said *'rarely'*, and 7(6%) of them said *'not at all'* that their teacher evaluates their achievement at the end of the lesson. In addition, the mean value inclines to '*sometimes'* (i.e. 3.49).

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

This section consists of conclusions and recommendations of the research results. After the conclusions, some possible recommendations are given. The present study, as mentioned in previously was intended to investigate students' views about the implementation of collaborative learning. For this purpose, three types of data gathering instruments (questionnaire and classroom observation) were used. The data gathered through the instruments were presented, analyzed and discussed in the previous section. Based on the analysis and discussion, the following conclusions and recommendations were made.

4.1. Conclusions

The data obtained from students questionnaire indicated that majority of the students have positive feeling about collaborative learning; however, some of them are resistant to implement collaborative learning. They expect other students to do the work and put their names, and some students become frustrated to discuss with their group members. On the other hand, some other students prefer to work alone than in collaborative learning.

The result obtained from all of the three instruments indicates that most of the students do not play their roles during the implementation of collaborative learning. For instance, most student were not interested to work collaboratively with their group members, plan, monitor and evaluate their learning, provide feedback, reinforcement and support to their group members, accept other students' weakness and strength. In addition, some teachers were not playing their roles as they are expected. For example, they do not arrange the class into small groups and evaluate their students' achievement at the end of the lesson despite they were encouraging their students' participation.

4.2. Recommendations

First, since most of the students are not clear with the difference between traditional learning and collaborative learning; teachers should use different opportunities to train students on the principles of collaborative learning, how to implement it, what roles to play, what types collaborative learning and classroom activities to employ by relating to the instructional objectives designed. As a result, they can implement it effectively and appropriately.

Second, teachers and other concerned bodies ought to deliver sorts of orientations to the students about the importance of collaborative learning to maximize their views before implementing it.

Third, course designers should aim to build students' interest. This can be done by providing interesting and motivating classroom activities, which necessarily appeal to students' age, interest and level of understanding.

References

Abiy, Z. et al (2009) *Introduction to Research Methods*. A.A. AAU.

Bailey, K.D. (1994) *Methods of Social Research* (4th ed) New York. The free press.

Birhanu, G. (2000) *Cooperative Learning Focusing on Group Work Organization*. MA Thesis A.A AAU

Brady, K. and Tsay, J. (2010) A case Study of Cooperative Learning and Communication Strategy. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching, 10*(2) 78–79.

Gebeyaw, T. (2007) The Implementation of Group based cooperative learning as a method of instruction in teacher education collages MA Thesis A.A AAU.

Jakobs, G. (1998) Cooperative Goal Structure. *ELT Journal, 42(2).*

Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R.T. (1987) *Learning Together and Alone*. London prentice Hall Inc.

Putnam, J. (1997) *Cooperative learning in diverse classroom*, New Jersey prentice Hall.

Ranjit, R. (1996) *Teaching language in context*. (2nd ed) Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Richards, J. and Rogers, C. (2001) *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. London. Longman.

Seifu, W. (2005) *Implementation of group activities in promoting cooperative learning*. MA Thesis A.A AAU.

Wondwosen, T. (2008) *Oral group lessons in promoting cooperative learning*. MA thesis A.A AAU.

Список литературы

Abiy Z. Introduction to Research Methods. 2009

Bailey K.D. Methods of Social Research. 4th ed. New York: The free press, 1994.

Birhanu G. Cooperative Learning Focusing on Group Work Organization. 2000

Brady K. A case Study of Cooperative Learning and Communication Strategy / K. Brady, J. Tsay // Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching. 2010. Vol. 10, №2. PP. 78-79.

Gebeyaw T. The Implementation of Group based cooperative learning as a method of instruction in teacher education collages. 2007

Jakobs G. Cooperative Goal Structure // ELT Journal. 1998. Vol. 42, №2.

Johnson D.W. Learning Together and Alone / D.W. Johnson, R.T. Johnson. 1987

Putnam J. Cooperative learning in diverse classroom. 1997

Ranjit R. Teaching language in context. 2nd ed. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 1996.

Richards J. Approaches and methods in language teaching / J. Richards, C. Rogers. London: Longman, 2001.

Seifu W. Implementation of group activities in promoting cooperative learning. 2005

Wondwosen, T. (2008) Oral group lessons in promoting cooperative learning. MA thesis A.A AAU.

Information about the author

Befikadu Lemma (Ph.D), Assistant Professor in English Language Teaching

Addis Ababa Science and Technology University, College of Social Sciences and Humanities,

Department of Humanities, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8675-2753, ResearcherID: JPK-9737-2023, e-mail: befikadu.lemmay@gmail.com

Информация об авторе

Бефикаду Лемма (доктор философии), доцент кафедры преподавания английского языка,

Аддис-Абебский университет науки и технологий, Колледж социальных и гуманитарных наук,

Факультет гуманитарных наук, г. Аддис-Абеба, Эфиопия.

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8675-2753, ResearcherID: JPK-9737-2023, e-mail: befikadu.lemmay@gmail.com

Автор ҫинчен пĕлтерни

Бефикаду Лемма, философи ăслăлăхĕн докторĕ, доцент

Аддис-Абеба ăслăлăхпа техника университечĕ, социологипе гуманитари колледжĕ,

Аддис-Абеба, Эфиопи.

ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8675-2753, ResearcherID: JPK-9737-2023, e-mail: befikadu.lemmay@gmail.com