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Abstract

This study aims at investigating the impact of using cooperative learning (CL) on EFL learners' reading achievement, motivation towards learning English and student-student interaction. The sample of the study consisted of 128 seventh grade participants in the district of Hebron, Palestine. The students were assigned to control and experimental groups. The experimental group was instructed according to the CL Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) method, while the control group was taught according to the traditional method over a period of ten weeks. Three instruments were utilized to analyze the influence of cooperative learning on the students. First, pre and post tests were administrated to assess their achievement in reading comprehension. Second, a questionnaire probing their motivation level was administered before and after the application of cooperative learning techniques. Finally, a modified version of Flanders’ model which analyzes classroom interaction was used to measure the percentage of student – talk in comparison to the percentage of teacher- talk in the two classes. It was also used to measure the percentage of student- student interaction in comparison to teacher- student interaction. Results indicated that CL had a significant effect on low, mid and high achievers' level of reading comprehension as well as on their motivation towards learning English. It is worth mentioning though that high achievers performed better than mid and low achievers. Furthermore, results indicated that CL enhanced student- student interaction and student- centered learning.

1.1 Introduction

In the age of globalization, reading has had an increasingly important role in foreign and second language settings. Eskey (2005) has pointed out that many English as a foreign language students rarely need to speak the language in their daily life but they may need to read it in order to “access the wealth of information” available in today’s world. In fact, the ability to read the written language at a reasonable rate and with good comprehension has been acknowledged to have as much importance as oral skill, if not more. However, even though our students in Palestine can read, they are still very poor readers as they seldom understand what they read, or are even not able to go deeply into the hidden meanings of the reading texts they happen to be handling. Thus, more attention should be given to improve students’ reading comprehension.

Students in Palestine begin learning English in the first grade, hence, seven graders, the subjects of the study, have been learning English for seven years. Seventh grade English For Palestine textbook consists of four sections, namely, reading, language, listening and writing. Reading, therefore, is usually the first lesson of the unit and all the next lessons are based on the reading material. The curriculum, English for Palestine, is based on the communicative language approach which emphasizes student centered learning, communicative competence, student-student interaction and more opportunities for the use of English in the classroom.

However, the reality of what actually takes place in the classroom is quite different. Generally speaking, teacher talk represents a high percentage of the class time, whereas student talk occupies a very low percentage which may create boredom in the classroom, and eventually lead to demotivating the learners.
To overcome such challenges facing teachers in the classroom, many new teaching techniques have been proposed including cooperative learning which is claimed to be an effective teaching method in foreign/second language education contexts all over the world. According to Johnson & Johnson (1999), Cooperative learning is a teaching method where students work together to accomplish shared learning goals. They encourage and support each other to learn and are responsible for their own learning as well as for that of their teammates. The teacher under this model assumes the role of the guide or the facilitator rather than the instructor. Based on Brown’s (1994) belief that “cooperative learning is embraced within a communicative language teaching framework (p.80),” this study aims to examine the effects of cooperative learning activities on reading comprehension, classroom interaction as well as on students’ level of motivation towards learning English.

**Literature review:**

**Definition and principles of CL**

Kagan (1992), Johnson & Johnson (1999), Slavin (1995), Jacobs, Power, & Loh (2002) and Apple (2006) define CL as the instructional use of small groups that is based on principles and techniques used for helping students work together more effectively to accomplish shared learning goals and maximize their own and each others’ learning. It first appeared during the emergence of the modern factory system, when some educational leaders of the time such as Parker, Dewey Washington and Detach advocated the model. Then, it stared to be used in the classroom by some educators. However, it was the work of Johnson and Johnson and Slavin which gave CL true power and brought it into light (Bellanca & Fogarty, 2003 cited in Sejnost, 2009).

Cooperative learning is not a synonym of group work; a learning activity is only described as CL if the following elements are available: heterogeneous grouping, positive interdependence (learn and make sure all other group members learn), simultaneous interaction (Face to face interaction), equal participation, individual accountability and responsibility, Interpersonal and collaborative skills (listening to each other, questioning to clarify ideas, negotiating, asking for, giving reasons) and group autonomy (Johnson, 1999; Slavin, 1995; Kagan, 1994; and Jacobs et al. 2002).

**Theories behind Cooperative Learning**

Slavin (1995); Bordy (1998); Johnson & Johnson (1999); Apple (2006) and McCafferty, Jacobs and Iddling (2009) postulate some major theoretical perspectives to the rational use of CL in education. Constructivism is the main perspective that is associated with cooperative learning as it is basically a learner centered theory based on the assumption that learning is an active process in which learners construct new ideas depending on their current and past knowledge (Bruner, 1966). Teachers only play the role of facilitator who help students develop and construct knowledge. On the other hand, Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes the value in working with others and learning through talking with peers as he believes that knowledge can be built by cooperation. He also explains the differences between what a learner can do without any help and what he or she can do with the assistance of peers (Zone of Proximal Development). Another theoretical perspective, is the Social Interdependence Theory proposed by Johnson and Johnson which is based on the assumption that group
members cooperate to achieve a common goal and that the success of each person is affected by the action of others;( Johnson and Johnson cited in Hertz-Lazarowitz, Miller, 1992). Liang( 2002) argued that the Interaction Hypothesis can also be strongly associated with CL ; that is, negotiation for meaning (the listener asking for repetition or clarification as well as the speaker checking to see that others comprehend the meaning) helps students to increase their comprehensible input as well as their output.

Related Studies

Slavin, (1991) conducted a synthesis study on the effects of CL and found out that it improved students’ achievement and their interpersonal relationships. Johnson et al (2000) also reviewed a group of 164 studies which examined the effects of 8 CL methods on Academic achievements and found out that all the 8 CL methods had a significant positive impact on students’ achievement. After investigating the effects of CL on reading comprehension, Stevens (2003), Chapman and Cope (2004), Alharbi (2008), Alizara (2010), Rahavard (2010), Kassim (2006) and Calderon, Hertz-Lazarowitz, and Slavin,(1998) found that CL improved EFL and ESL reading achievement. Other researchers investigated the effects of CL on students’ motivation towards reading and learning English and found out that CL had positive effects on students’ motivation toward learning English in general and reading in particular (McCurdy, 1996; Coppola, 2007; Liang, 2002; Badawi, 2005, Kassim, 2006, Chen, 2005; Hancock, 2004; Liao, 2006; Wang, 2006, and San Cken, 2008).

Research Questions:

Based on the previous literature review and the theoretical framework, the researchers came up with the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant impact of using cooperative learning activities in reading lessons on students' reading comprehension?

2. Is there a significant impact of using cooperative learning activities in reading classes on students’ motivation towards learning English?

3. Is there a significant influence of using cooperative learning activities in reading classes on classroom interaction?

3.2 Population and sample

The researchers selected the sample of the study purposefully from two schools in Hebron during the first semester of 2013-2014. The two schools are: Al Ja’bary School for Boys and Al-Qawasmi School for Girls.

The sample of the study consisted of 128 participants; 64 of them are female and 64 are male. The sample distribution in terms of gender is shown in table (1.3)

Table (3.1) male-female distribution according to gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior to the implementation of the experiment, the students were given a pre-test that measured their reading comprehension level. They were also asked to fill out a questionnaire to survey their attitude towards learning English. Two classes (one from Al-Qwasmi school for Girls and the other was from Al-Ga’bari school for boys) were assigned to the experimental groups who received 10 weeks of cooperative learning instruction during reading comprehension classes. After 10 weeks, they were given a post-test to measure the effects of cooperative learning on their reading achievement. They were also asked to fill out the questionnaire to measure the effects of cooperative learning on their motivation to learn English.

Students of the experimental and control groups were video recorded after the experiment to analyze classroom interaction and measure the percentage of teacher talk in comparison to student talk in both classes. The analysis was based on Flanders modified classic system of interaction analysis which consists of two major elements: teacher talk and student talk.

**Instruments**

Three instruments were utilized to collect data for the present study, namely, reading comprehension achievement test, students’ motivation to learn English questionnaire, and videotaping.

As for the reading comprehension achievement test, the researcher constructed it to measure the students’ achievement in reading before and after the experiment (appendix 1). It was comprised of two reading passages; the first was an expository one about “Arts and Crafts of Palestine” which was taken from “English For Palestine” for seventh grade. The second one was a narrative text “The Fox and The Grapes” which was taken from an internet site [www.kidsgen.com/fables_and_fairytales/fox_and_grapes.htm](http://www.kidsgen.com/fables_and_fairytales/fox_and_grapes.htm).

In order to measure the Students’ motivation to learn English, the researcher developed a twenty-seven item questionnaire (appendix 3). The questionnaire was divided into three parts: motivation to learn English inside the classroom, outside the classroom and in everyday life.

Another important tool that was utilized to collect data for this research is videotaping. The researcher videotaped 10 minutes of one of the reading comprehension lessons where STAD was used and ten other minutes in a traditional reading class. Following this, Flanders’ model (appendix 4) was used to measure the percentage of student – talk compared to the percentage of teachers’ talk in the two classes. It was also used to measure the percentage of student- student interaction. However, because Flanders model is a bit outdated, the researcher decided to modify Item 8, 9 and 10 (appendix 5). Item 8 (student Talk-Response) “a student makes a predictable response to teacher”, was subcategorized into:

8a. Student makes a response to another student. The response could be answering a question, agreement or disagreement or correcting a mistake.

Item 9 (student Talk Initiation) was also subcategorized into:

9a. Student initiates to ask another student a question.
9b. Student reads facts and explains to other students.

Item 10 (Silence or Confusion) “short periods of silence and periods of confusion” were subcategorized into:

10a. Silence in the interaction during which students record notes or use their own resources such as dictionaries or their own textbooks to search for answers.

**Results:**

Results of this study will be presented in the order of the research questions:

**Is there a significant impact in using cooperative learning activities in reading lessons on students' reading comprehension?**

To answer the above question, the researcher used the Independent Samples T-test to test the differences between the reading comprehension achievement of the experimental and the control groups in the pretest for both males and females. Results are presented in the following table:

**Table (4.1) results of the differences in reading comprehension between the experimental and the control groups in the pretest for males and females.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.94</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the previous table, one may clearly notice that there are no significant differences between the experimental group and the control group in reading comprehension pretest for males and females. The male students’ reading comprehension achievement is approximately the same level for both experimental group (m= 42.94) and control group (m=42.25). Female students’ reading comprehension achievement is also approximately the same level for both experimental group (m=38.81) and control group (m = 41.03).

Then, the researcher tested the differences between the reading comprehension achievement of the experimental and the control group in the posttest for males and females by using Independent Samples T-test. Results are presented in the following table:

**Table (4.2): results of the differences between the experimental and control groups in the posttest for males and females.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous table shows that there is a significant impact of using CL in reading classes on students' reading comprehension. The comparison of the experimental and the control groups on the basis of reading comprehension shows that there is a significant difference between the two groups in reading comprehension posttest for both males and females. It can be noted from the previous table that the experimental group performed better in the reading achievement test (m=54.44) for males and (m=59.13) for females, which are more than that for the control group (mean=43.59) for males and (mean=42.53) for females.

The results of the present study are consistent with some previous studies which were conducted to compare CL with the traditional methods and showed that CL has better influence on students' reading comprehension compared to the traditional method (Stevens et al., 1987; Calderon et al., 1998; Stevens, 2003; Alharbi, 2008; Ghaith, 2003; Alzara, 2010; Hubing et al., 2010; Rahavard, 2010; and Durken, 2011).

4.3 Question Two

Is there a significant impact of using cooperative learning activities in reading classes on students’ motivation towards learning English?

To answer the above question, the researcher used the Independent Samples T-test to test the differences between motivation towards learning English of the experimental and the control groups for males and females before the influence of CL. Results are presented in table (4.3 – 4.4)

Table (4.3): results for the differences between the male experimental and control groups in the motivation questionnaire before the influence of CL.
The previous table shows that there is a significant difference between the male experimental and control groups in terms of their motivation towards learning English inside the English classroom, outside the English classroom, in everyday life and in their overall motivation orientation, because the significant levels (0.01, 0.05 and 0.00) are less than or equal to 0.05. It can be noted that the motivation inside the English classroom for the experimental group (mean=3.46) is higher than that for the control group (mean=2.93). The motivation outside the English classroom for the experimental group (mean=3.32) is also higher than that for the control group (mean=2.610). Likewise, the motivation in everyday life for the experimental group (mean=3.53) is higher than that for the control group (mean=3.190). Finally, the total motivation for the experimental group (mean=3.43) is higher than that for the control group (mean=3.89).

Table (4.4): results for differences between female experimental and control group in the motivation questionnaire before the influence of CL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender\females Inside the English classroom</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside the English classroom</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside the English classroom</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday life</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total motivation</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the previous table, it is clear that there are no significant differences between the female experimental and control groups before the influence of CL in terms of the students’ motivation towards learning English inside the English classroom, outside the English classroom, in everyday life and in the total motivation since the significant levels (0.33, 0.27, 0.29, 0.58) are higher than 0.05. The table shows that the motivation inside the English classroom for the experimental group (m=3.09) is approximately the same level as for the control group (m=3.29). The motivation outside the English classroom for the experimental group (m=2.85) is approximately the same level as for the control group (m=3.08). The motivation in everyday life for the experimental group (m=3.07) is approximately the same level as for the control group (m=2.88). Likewise, the total motivation for the experimental group (m=3.00) is approximately the same level as for the control group (m=3.09).
The researcher then used the Independent Samples T-test to test the differences between the experimental group and the control group for males and females in terms of their motivation towards learning English after the influence of CL. Results are presented in table (4.5)

**Table (4.5): results for differences between the male experimental and control group in terms of their motivation to learn English after the influence of CL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender\Males</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside the English classroom</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the English classroom</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday life</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total motivation</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the previous table, it is clear that there are significant differences between the males experimental and control groups in terms of their motivation inside the English classroom, outside the English classroom, in everyday life and the total motivation after the influence of CL. The significant levels for males are all equal to (0.00) and are less than 0.05. Furthermore, the table above shows that the motivation inside the English classroom for the experimental group (m= 4.34) is higher than that for the control group (m=2.99). The motivation outside the English classroom for the experimental group (m= 3.97) is also higher than that for the control group (m=2.67). Similarly, the motivation in everyday life for the experimental group (m= 3.72) is higher than that for the control group (m=3.21). Finally, the total motivation for the experimental group (m= 4.02) is more than that for the control group (m=2.94). Hence, it can be noted that the males’ experimental group has high levels of motivation while the control group has medium levels of motivation. It is clear that CL has a significant impact on the male students' motivation which changes from medium to high.

**Table (4.6): results for differences between the female experimental and control group motivation to learn English after the influence of CL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender\Females</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside the English</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table above, one may notice that there are significant differences between the females experimental and control groups in terms of their motivation inside the English classroom, outside the English classroom, in everyday life and their total motivation after the influence of CL. The significant levels are all equal to (0.00) and less than 00.5. Results show that the motivation inside the English classroom for the experimental group (mean= 4.45) is more than that for the control group (mean=3.34). Motivation outside the English classroom for the experimental group (mean= 4.17) is also more than that for the control group (mean=2.96). Similarly, the motivation in everyday life for the experimental group (mean= 3.79) is more than that for the control group (mean=2.96). The total motivation for the experimental group (mean= 4.15) is more than that for the control group (mean=3.15). Therefore, it can be indicated that all motivation levels (mean values) are high for the experimental group but are still medium for the control group.

To sum up, the male and the female experimental group motivation towards learning English is significantly influenced by CL.

The findings of the second question in the present study are consistent with many previous studies which found that CL enhances the students' motivation to learn English and enhances their attitudes towards learning English (McCurdy, 1999; Tedesco, 1999; Liang, 2002; Badawi, 2005; Kassim, 2006; Alharbi, 2008; Ching, 2008; Chen, 2004; Hancock, 2004; Liao, 2005; Wang, 2006; and Gomleksiz, 2007).

**Question Three**

**Is there a significant influence of using cooperative learning activities in reading classes on classroom interaction?**

To answer the above question, the researcher used Flanders modified model of classroom interaction analysis to obtain a complete descriptive picture of what behaviors are used during 10 minutes of a cooperative learning lesson in comparison to 10 minutes of a traditional lesson. The following Matrix, describes the behaviors used during a traditional reading lesson:

Matrix (1) analysis of 10 minutes of a traditional reading lesson of the control group in Al Qawasmi school:
The matrix above indicates that the frequencies of the teacher-talk in the traditional class are 61 out of 102 and that the percentage is 60% out of the whole recording whereas the frequencies of the student-talk are only 29 and the percentage is 28%. Such results indicate that the student-talk is less than the teacher-talk in the traditional reading class and that the teacher, who is dominant most of the time, represents the main source of information.

Figure (4.1) The distribution of the teacher-talk in comparison to student-talk in a traditional English reading class.
The analysis also shows that student-student interaction was absent all the time since 26 of the students frequencies referred to item 8 (a student makes a predictable response to teacher), 23 of the teachers frequencies refer to item 4 (teacher asking questions about content), and 20 of the teachers frequencies refer to item 5 (lecturing); besides, item 8a (student responds to another student) and 9a (student asks question to another student) has 0 frequencies. Therefore, in the traditional reading class teacher-student interaction is dominant all the time.

**Figure (4.2) The distribution of the teacher-student interaction in comparison to student-student interaction in a traditional English reading class.**

The researcher also uses Flanders modified model of classroom interaction to obtain a complete descriptive picture of what behaviors are used during 10 minutes of reading comprehension cooperative lesson.

**Matrix (2) analysis of 10 minutes of a cooperative learning reading lesson of the experimental group at Al Qawasmi school:**
The matrix above indicates that the frequencies of the teacher-talk in the traditional class are 27 out of 114 which was 23% out of the whole recording of the classroom interaction, whereas the frequencies of the student-talk are 68 and the percentage was 60%. To clarify, out of the student-talk, item 8a (student responds to another student) has the highest score (25) frequency which is 22% of the whole classroom interaction, item 9a (student explains to another student) has the next highest score (17) frequency which is 15% of the interaction, item 9a (student asks another student) has also a high score (16) which is 14% and item 8 (student makes a predictable response to the teacher) has the lowest score (10) which was 8% of the whole classroom interaction. Thus, even though Item 10a (silence in the interaction during which students record notes or use their own resources such as their textbooks or dictionaries) is not included when the researcher measured the percentage of the student-talk and teacher-talk, the researcher noticed that during these periods of silence, which scores 18 frequencies, students play a passive role and are deeply involved in the process of learning. Concerning the teacher-talk, results indicate that item 3 (accepts or uses ideas of students) has the highest score (8) which is 7% out of the whole classroom interaction, Item 6 (giving directions) has 7 frequencies which occupies 6% of the interaction, item 4 (asks questions) has 6 frequencies which occupies 5% of the interaction, item 5 (praises or encouragement) has 5 frequencies which occupies 4%, and finally item 5 (lecturing) has only 1 frequency 0.09% of the interaction. Hence, the previous results indicate that teacher-talk is less than student-talk in the cooperative learning reading class and that the teacher plays the role of director and facilitator rather than being a lecturer who represents the main source information in the classroom.
Results of the present study are consistent with previous studies that are conducted in the area of the effects of CL on classroom interaction. Widman et al (1987) investigates the impact of various CL methods on the interaction of students and finds that students who have CL social orientation outperform better than those who rely on the competitive and individualistic orientation. Wantanabe et al. (2007) show significant relationship between collaborative patterns of interaction and students achievements as he proves that when learners are engaged in collaborative patterns of interaction, they are likely to achieve higher posttest scores. Besides, Kim et al (2008) indicates the significance of collaborating with interlocutors from different proficiency levels as he find that learners show different pairs of dynamics and more lexical and grammatical language when cooperating with interlocutors from different proficiency levels. Finally Thuy (2010) shows increased amount of students' participation when receiving CL activities and improvement in the nature of participations which emphasized student – student interaction.

The findings of the present study indicate that CL could be a feasible alternative to the dominant teacher – centered teaching of the traditional and grammar translation method since the participants who are influenced by CL gain better academic achievements and are more motivated to learn English than those in the control group.

5.3 Recommendations

The findings of the present study indicate that CL could be a feasible alternative to the dominant teacher – centered teaching of the traditional and grammar translation method since the participants who are influenced by CL gain better academic achievements and are more motivated to learn English than those in the control group. Yet, the researcher would like to suggest the following recommendations for teachers, the Ministry of Education and future researches.

First, the researcher recommends that teachers should take the following points into consideration when implementing CL:

1. Before implementing CL inside the classroom teachers should give enough time to prepare for a suitable CL atmosphere or context. First, students should be carefully divided into heterogeneous groups where self regulations of what they should do and what they shouldn't do are imposed. They should also train students how to distribute roles and keep changing them during the work. Teachers should also provide students with the necessary language skills that enable them to ask for help, agree, disagree, encourage or give thank notes for each others.

2. Teachers should change their dominant and centered roles in the classroom to be only facilitators. They shouldn't be any more the only source of information, instead, they should only direct students, check how much effort each member is contributing on the groups’ work, provide feedback to groups and individuals by checking the worksheets of each group and correcting the individual quizzes.

3. Teachers should be careful to be fair in the process and evaluation which should depend on the STDA scoring system of the improvement points described in chapter three.
4. Teachers should carefully prepare for worksheets that should focus on the main objectives of material and summarize what is being presented in the reading texts.

5. Teachers should use CL in teaching all skills.

   Secondly, since CL is a feasible and practical teaching method that puts communicative approach into action, the researcher recommended that the ministry of Education should:

   1. Organize for intensive training courses that direct teachers on how to implement STDA and CL and emphasize the benefits of doing so to change the educational culture in all subjects as a whole so that CL becomes a model for all students in all subjects.

   2. Provide more time for English classes.

   Finally, although this study suggests that CL has positive effects on students’ achievements, motivation towards learning English and the quality of classroom interaction in AlQawasmi school for Girls and Al – Ga’bari school for Boys in Hebron, these results could be enhanced if the following points are taken into consideration:

   1. This study was conducted only for 10 weeks in an environment where students receive 2 classes of reading comprehension (2 x10) = (20) sessions, it may be more efficient to students to experience CL for more extended period.

   2. Since the present study lasted only for 10 weeks, Future research could expand the amount of time students are exposed to CL for a full year, to allow for the positive effects to become higher on all levels of students equally.

   3. Future research could be conducted to examine the effects of CL on other subjects, and other skills of the languages.
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