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ABSTRACT

Cooperative learning is a teaching arrangement that refers to small, heterogeneous groups of students working together to reach a common goal. Its effectiveness had been documented through numerous research studies. However, very few published materials have been done on the relationship between the use of cooperative learning as a teaching method to increase students' achievement in learning English literature in secondary school. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between cooperative learning and achievement in English language acquisition in a literature class in a secondary school. It is hoped that this study could help overcome the problems of students who have low English language proficiency in secondary schools. This study was conducted in a rural secondary school. A total of 59 respondents from Form 4 classes have participated. The experimental group received teaching method using cooperative learning strategies, while the control group received traditional lecture method. Qualitative and quantitative data were gathered in this study using four types of instruments: pre-test and post-test questions, questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews. Data analysis was done using SPSS version 9.0 program. It was found that all respondents showed a low and moderate performance in English Literature before the treatment. However, after the treatment, respondents from the experimental group showed a significant improvement. Those from the control group did not show similar improvement. Thus, the use of cooperative learning played an important role in acquiring English language in an English literature class. Furthermore, the qualitative data showed that cooperative learning could enhance students’ social development as well as interest in the learning of English literature. In conclusion, this study had proven that cooperative learning enhances students’ achievement in learning English literature.
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1.1 Introduction

English language is considered as a very important subject in secondary schools in Malaysia. However, the standard of achievements amongst the students is still very poor especially in rural secondary schools. Results from the Government Exams such as PMR and SPM have shown that students in secondary schools perform poorly in English subject. Because of this, numerous efforts have been taken by the ministry of Education to overcome it. Several programs like ‘Extra English Tuition’, ‘Class Tuition Albukhary’, ‘Etems’ and ‘EST’ have been introduced.

Despite all these efforts, the results were still not very encouraging. The Minister of Education, Dato ‘Hishamuddin Tun Hussein (2005) stated that the levels of achievement among the secondary schools students in English language were still unsatisfactory. Many students were still facing problems in speaking and writing in English due to the lack of interest and exposure in using the language.

The problems faced by the students affect the students’ English results in the PMR and SPM examinations. Hence, it is hoped that by introducing a strategy like Cooperative learning will help to enhance students’ achievement in English language acquisition in secondary schools.
Cooperative learning is described as a large group of instructional strategies in which students collaborate in order to reach a common goal. Cooperative learning has been practiced throughout human history and is a part of educational practice. Its effectiveness has been documented through numerous research studies (Johnson & Johnson, 1986; Kagan, 1986; Slavin, 1988).

Daniel et al (1991) stated that cooperative learning is now widely recognized as one of the most promising practices in the educational field. Olsen & Chen (1998) also pointed out that many of the originators of cooperative learning emphasized on the importance of heterogeneity in forming groups in the classroom where non-English speakers and native English speakers were members of the same group.

Based on Sapon-Shevin’s study (1994), he found out that Cooperative learning is a successful teaching strategy at all levels, from pre-school to post secondary. He further stated that Cooperative learning groups do not separate students on the basis of class, race, or gender and the goals of middle schools are consistent with the goals of Cooperative learning theories. Cooperative learning is a peer-centered pedagogy that can promote academic achievement and build positive social relationships (Sapon-Shevin, 1994).

Because of the significant achievement in using Cooperative learning in the classroom by many researchers, this study will focus on the relationship between Cooperative learning and students’ achievement in English language acquisition in a literature class in secondary school. Students need to acquire the skills of learning English literature so that they can answer the questions in the PMR and SPM English papers.
1.2 Background of the Study

Secondary school students, especially from rural areas in Sarawak, always face major difficulties in acquiring English. They come from different backgrounds, cultures, education and language proficiency. Based on the researcher and his colleagues’ experiences, it was found that the exposure of rural students in English language occurs mainly in the classroom. They hardly speak English outside the classroom. Instead, they speak in their mother tongue to their family members at home and to their friends in their communities. They do not like learning English because they think that English language is a very difficult subject and they do not have the interest to learn and acquire it. This affects the students’ English performance in the PMR and SPM examination.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Students in Secondary schools face a lot of problems with their English in terms of grammar and vocabulary. The level of their English proficiency is low. Continuous observation revealed that this situation existed due to the lack of exposure to English in their daily life, as well as lack of interest in learning and using English. Furthermore, they do not have much interest in reading materials in English language because they do not understand what is being read. Therefore, they perform badly in their public examinations like PMR and SPM. Furthermore, recent statistics from the education department showed that the secondary school was the beginning of a high rate of dropouts. Therefore, it is hoped that cooperative learning can enhance students’ achievement in their acquisition of English language.
1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between cooperative learning and achievement in English language acquisition in a literature class amongst Form 4 students in a secondary school.

1.5 Objective of the study

This study is to find out whether cooperative learning can improve the students’ English language acquisition in a literature class in a secondary school.

1.6 Research Questions

The research questions to be answered in this study are as follows:

i. Is there any relationship between cooperative learning method in an English literature class and students’ achievement in acquiring English Language?

ii. If there is relationship, is this relationship positive or negative?
iii. In what aspects does the positive or negative relationship affect students’ learning of the English language?

1.7 Significance of the study

This study benefits the participating school, the subject teacher as well as the subjects of the study.

The participating school will benefit because the results will be a guideline for the teachers to determine the specific difficulty encountered by the students in acquiring English. The teachers can find ways to improve their teaching methods. The subject teacher will benefit since he is actively involved in the study. He can discover some of the problems faced by the students and continue to rectify the problems.

The students can gain a lot of benefits because cooperative learning approach can give students the chance to develop positive and productive relationships. It gives students opportunities to learn from one another rather than receive information from the teacher or text alone.

It was also hoped that by discovering this relationship, the students would benefit in terms of English language acquisition. There is a possibility that the success of those
few could be extended to the others in the same circumstances. Therefore, this could help overcome the problem of students having low English language proficiency in secondary schools.

1.8 Limitation of the study

The study is limited in several factors. Firstly, the size of the sample is small. The research was conducted only in one Form 4 class in a secondary school. Therefore, the generalizability of the results is also limited by the small scale of the study. There might be extraneous variables that can invariably affect the findings such as the cultural and educational background of the students, thus affecting the reliability of the findings.

Time constraint was another limitation. It is impossible for the researcher to carry out an extensive study in such a short period of time. The respondents were not able to get enough practice in the class especially the interpersonal and small group skills. Due to the time-constraints, the actual time needed for each activity had to be shortened and this might have effects on the outcome of the lessons conducted.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Cooperation is working together to accomplish shared goals. Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups to let students work together to maximize their learning in order to achieve their goals. Cooperative learning is now one of the most promising practices in the field of education. Many research show that cooperative learning results in (a) higher achievement and greater productivity; (b) more caring, supportive, and committed relationships, and (c) greater psychological health, social, competence, and self-esteem (Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Kagan, 1994; Slavin, 1985).

In this chapter, concepts like Cooperative learning, Achievement, Literature in English and English language acquisition and learning are first explained. This is followed by some discussions on the three major theories pertaining to second language acquisition (SLA) namely, the behaviourist, nativist and interactionist. Moreover, Communicative approach to language teaching and group work will be briefly discussed. Finally, some discussions on the previous research and studies on cooperative learning are also included.
2.2 Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is an important concept being dealt with in this research. According to Johnson & Johnson (1998), Cooperative learning is grouping students together to accomplish shared learning goals. Students work in small groups of three or four to get the most out of their own learning and each other’s learning. They encourage and support each other to learn and are responsible for their own as well as their teammates’ learning.

Johnson & Johnson (1998) also said that Cooperative learning is a student-centered approach that believes that active learning is more effective than passive one where the teacher becomes a facilitator rather than an instructor. Through cooperative learning, students have to exchange ideas, make plans and propose solutions to accomplish a collaborative goal. Therefore, it can enhance students’ social and personal developments.

Kagan (1990) introduced a Co-Op Co-Op Cooperative learning strategy. According to Kagan (1990), ‘Co-op Co-op is structured to maximize the opportunity for small groups of students to work together to produce a group product and then share this product with the whole class (14:2).’

This will provide opportunities for students to help each other among teams. It also provides students choices for the content they want to study. Co-Op Co-Op is designed to foster students’ self-direction and independence in learning (Daniel, Barbara, and Diane,1991).
2.3 Achievement

Achievement is another important concept being dealt with in this research. In this research, achievements can be categorized as achievement in academic performance and social development in acquiring English language by using cooperative learning approach.

(i) Achievement in Academic Performance

Achievement in academic performance refers to the positive effects of cooperative learning on academic achievement among the students. It also means that cooperative learning can promote higher academic achievement and greater motivation than individual learning. Students can achieve higher scores on academic examinations such as PMR and SPM. They also have higher proficiency in critical reasoning strategies and abilities.

(ii) Achievement in Social Development

Achievement in social development refers to the positive effects of Cooperative learning on social relationships among students in the same group. All students, regardless of their ability levels and social backgrounds have the opportunity to develop positive and productive relationships (Slavin, 1985). Positive and productive relationships promote communication and increase the participation of students. It is believed that through this cooperative learning, students can learn from each other and establish closer ties and become more confident.
2.4 Literature in English

Literature in English is also an important concept frequently referred to in this research. The English language curriculum in KBSM advocates the use of literature in the English language lesson. Since the implementation of the KBSM English Language Programme in Secondary Schools in Malaysia, the literature is taught through two channels which are, the incorporation of literary materials in school textbooks and the Class Reader Programme.

The literature in English component aims to enrich language learning, inculcate the reading habit among students, improve language proficiency as well as infuse an appreciation of literary works.

Beginning in 2001, the literature component has been included in the SPM English Language Paper. For Form 4 literature component, students have to study six poems and five short stories. For Form 5 literature component, students have to study at least one novel.

Hence, it is important for students to learn to comprehend and to answer correctly on the examination questions so that they can perform well in the literature component in the SPM English papers (Lim and Yong, 2005).
2.5 Acquisition Vs Learning

Since this research deals with the relationship between cooperative learning and achievement in language acquisition, the concept that surrounds acquisition and learning is very significant.

Learning and acquisition have always been compared by Krashen (1982), Fromkin and Rodman (1993), Lightbrown and Spada (1999). Krashen (1982) states that children have two distinct and independent ways of developing competence in a second language. Acquisition is referred to the process by which children unconsciously acquire in their native language while English language learning is referred to conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them.

Krashen (1982) in the monitor hypothesis further states that acquisition is the sole initiator of all second language utterances whereas learning can function only as “Monitor” for the output. He claims that anything the learner wants to say comes from acquired knowledge. However, learnt knowledge can monitor this speech production before or after actual output. The Monitor Hypothesis stresses that consciously ‘learnt’ knowledge is only available for monitoring rather than usable in other ways.

Krashen (1985) believes that ‘learnt’ knowledge can never be converted into ‘acquired’ knowledge. His theory is a “no interface” relationship between acquisition and learning (Krashen, 1985a: 38).

Fromkin and Rodman (1993) agree that children acquire their first language without explicit learning. A second language is usually learned but it may also be
acquired depending on the background and the input received by the second language learner.

According to Lightbrown and Spada (1999: 177), language learning refers to a learner’s developing knowledge of the target language. Other researchers also use the term ‘language acquisition’ to refer to the same process. In this study, the terms “acquisition” and “learning” will be interchangeably used irrespective of whether they involve conscious or subconscious processes.

According to Nesamalar et al (1997), both these processes are useful to second language learners as they support and complement each other. Conscious learning of language items should be supported by exposure to the use of the items in real-life situations to enable acquisition to take place. Acquisition can be encouraged through more emphasis on Cooperative learning strategy that focuses on group work and communicative activities which provide opportunities for the learners to make full use of the language.

However, Krashen’s theory of second language acquisition has been challenged in recent years. Munsell and Carr (1981) questioned the distinction between “learning” and “acquisition” and the notion of “conscious” and “unconscious” rules. They believe that it is much easier to learn a second language by starting with a conscious exposition of the rules and building one’s skill upon that foundation (pp.498-99). Munsell and Carr (1981) claim that Krashen should incorporate language learning theory into a wider context where the nature of human skills is explored.

Besides this, McLaughlin (1987) also comments on Monitor Theory. He claims that the acquisition learning distinction is not clearly defined. Various studies have shown
that the monitor theory does not work the way Krashen thought. McLaughlin believes that Krashen’s definition of “learning” has limited usefulness in explaining a learner’s conscious knowledge of grammar.

Although Krashen’s theory has been criticized by a number of scholars, it has a strong influence on thinking in the field over the past fifteen years. Many researchers agree with Krashen’s theory that there is a need to provide learners with “comprehensible input” (Hadley, 1993). Therefore, the role of input in second language theories of acquisition is very important in the implementation of cooperative learning method in an English literature classroom. For the next section, we will look into the role of input in second language theories of acquisition.

2.6 The Role of Input from the three different views – the Behaviourist, the Nativist, and the Interactionist

Krashen’s input Hypothesis model states that if we comprehend what the speaker says, then, language acquisition may occur. However, the input must contain meaningful speech and the learner must try to understand it (Cook, 1993). Input is seen as an important factor that enables the process of second language acquisition to occur. Besides input, there are other important factors in ensuring successful acquisition. Therefore, we shall be looking into the role of input and also other factors involved through the three major views of language acquisition theories which are the behaviourist, the nativist and the interactionist.
2.6.1 The Behaviourist View

The behaviourist theory of learning was first introduced in the early twentieth century. Psychologists such as Pavlov, Watson and Thorndike believe that by studying animal behaviour, it is possible to predict and explain the way humans learn. They also believe that like animals, it is possible to train humans to behave in a desired manner through the use of a learning model that consists of stimulus, response and reinforcement.

Another psychologist, Skinner “applies this stimulus-response and reinforcement theory to the way humans acquire language...(and) views language as a form of behaviour…and language learning as a process of habit formation” (Nesamalar et al 1997). The behaviorists believe that effective language behaviour is the production of correct responses to stimuli. If the response is reinforced, it will become habitual. Thus children produce linguistic responses that are reinforced. Small steps must be taken in order to ensure that correct behaviour is reinforced with rewards and mistakes are corrected immediately. “Traditional behaviourists believed that language learning is the result of imitation, practice, feedback on success, and habit formation” (Lightbrown and Spada, 1999:9).

Based on the behaviourist approach, audiolingualism was being introduced during the Second World War. The method originated in the attempts to provide training to army personnel. It was designed to develop oral fluency in L2 in nine months. The new approach concentrated on the techniques of mimicry and memorization (‘mim-mem’) designed to develop the ability for oral communication. As such, it was seen as appropriate for teaching young children as well as adults.
From the perspective of behavioural psychology, audio-lingual method (ALM) borrows the theory that constant repetition of behaviour leads to habit formation whereas for structural linguistics, it borrows the theory that language can be divided into small segments and studied in ‘chunks’. Advocates of ALM believe that language can be divided into segments and repeatedly instilled into the learner until its correct usage becomes a habit. Behaviourists view language learning as a mechanical process of forming the right habits and not a process that needs intellectual understanding.

2.6.2 The Nativist View

The linguist Noam Chomsky proposed his theory as a reaction to what he saw as the inadequacy of the behaviourist theory of learning based on imitation and habit formation. Chomsky in 1965 had discovered the existence of some kind of special language processing ability that children were born with, known as “language acquisition device (LAD)” (Hadley, 2001). The LAD in children is responsible for their success in language learning. Chomsky claims that children are biologically programmed to learn language and language develops in children in a similar way that other biological functions develop (Lightbrown and Spada, 1999).

Chomsky argued that this innate ability enables the children to create a linguistic system quickly, even with limited input. The children’s language experience with language input would probably have an effect on language learning but the language universals in the children’s mind are the product of their LAD. This belief results in Chomsky’s Universal Grammar Theory that acknowledges the existence of a set of basic grammatical elements, available in all human languages that helps children to organize the input in certain ways (Hadley, 2001).
The innatists’ view on language learning is also attributed to Stephen Krashen’s “Input Hypothesis”. Krashen proposed five hypotheses on second language acquisition: The Acquisition/Learning Hypothesis, The Natural Order Hypothesis, The Monitor Hypothesis, The Input Hypothesis and The Affective Filter Hypothesis.

The Acquisition/Learning Hypothesis suggested that there are two different ways to develop ability in a second language: acquisition refers to a subconscious process of acquiring the language which is said to be similar to the way we learn our native language; and learning refers to a conscious process of studying the language in formal situations where the learner’s focus is on form and rule learning.

The Natural Order Hypothesis states that grammatical structures are acquired and not learned in a natural and predictable order (Krashen, 1987:36). The Monitor Hypothesis claims that acquisition is the ‘backbone’ to success in second language performance and that conscious learning does not ensure better fluency. Conscious learning has only one function that is as a Monitor or an editor. It is used to make self-correction in the form of output in speaking or writing (Krashen, 1987:37).

In addition, the input hypothesis also plays an important role in language acquisition. Krashen stressed that one acquires language in only one way – by exposure to comprehensible input. If the input contains forms and structures just beyond the learner’s current level of competence in the language (‘i + 1’) then both comprehension and acquisition will occur. Lastly, Krashen suggested another hypothesis that is affective filter hypothesis. He stated that affective filter is an imaginary barrier which prevents learners from acquiring language from the available input. ‘Affect’ refers to motives, needs, attitudes, and emotional states. A learner who is tense, angry, anxious, or bored may ‘filter out’ input, making it unavailable for acquisition. Furthermore, the filter will
be ‘up’ (blocking input) when the learner is stressed, self-conscious, or unmotivated. It will be down when the learner is relaxed and motivated.

2.6.3 The Interactionist View

Interactionists’ theory of language learning emphasizes on the role of the linguistic environment in interaction with the child’s innate capacities in determining language development (Lightbrown and Spada, 1999: 22). To interactionists, language is the result of ‘interaction’ between the innate ability of the child and the linguistic environment.

Interactionists place a greater importance on the influence of the environment in language learning. They stress the importance of child-directed speech whereby the language adults with children is also modified to help their understanding. The topics of conversation could be limited to the child’s immediate environment or to experiences that the adult knows the child has (Lightbrown and Spada, 1999:24). The interactionists’ view of language learning resulted in Communicative Approach to language teaching (CALT), group work as well as cooperative learning.
2.7 Communicative approach to Language Teaching

Communicative approach to language teaching (CALT) is an important approach being dealt with in this research since the students need to carry out communicative activities in groups in order to acquire the language.

Littlewood (1981) states that the communicative approach to Language Teaching (CALT) aims to provide meaningful task practice, improve and maintain motivation, encourage natural learning process and create a context that supports learning.

In CALT, “classroom activities are often designed to focus on completing tasks that are mediated through language or involve in negotiation of information and information sharing” (Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 51). Much more spontaneity is present in communicative classroom: students are encouraged to deal with unrehearsed situations under the guidance, but not control of the teacher” (Brown, 2001:44).

The activities that are carried out should relate to learners’ background knowledge and real-life situation “involving learners in the experience of communication” (Savignon, 1981). Morrow (1979) emphasizes that communicative approach is not only giving students practice in the forms of the language, but also in the processes of using them. Morrow and Johnson (1979), stress that practicing “doing things” with language will be more fruitful than practicing language forms out of context. Students are encouraged to engage in group work when using the language forms that are previously learnt.

Larsen (1986), states three characteristics of the communicative approach that teachers should take into consideration as follows:
(i) Everything that is done in the communicative classroom has the objective of achieving communicative competence.

(ii) To provide real-life atmosphere.

(iii) Activities are often carried out in small groups.

This is in line with cooperative learning where students carry out real-life communicative activities in groups in order to practise the language that they have learnt as well as achieve communicative competence.

2.8 Group Work

Another important approach used in this research is group work. Group work may be defined as any activity that involves two or more learners without direct intervention by the instructor. It is learner-centered in design. The teacher serves as activity designer before class and facilitator during the execution of the activity (Davis, 2006). Group work has developed in complexity and variety to include activities like pair activities, small group activities, mingling activities and role-plays (Hadley, 1993).

According to Pica and Doughty (1985), group work made it possible for the teacher to devote more time to the students’ oral production. Less confident students get the chance to practise the new language in a non-threatening environment. Instead of being dependent on the teacher, students help each other to learn. Meanwhile, the teacher
just acts as a facilitator who monitors progress and gives help, advice and encouragement where and when needed.

Group work increases individual students’ participation in terms of conversational turns (Pica and Doughty, 1985). Group work is a useful component of classroom activities for simulating acts of true communication. It also contributes to a learner-focused classroom that allows for both student-student and student-teacher interactions.

Group work can reduce anxiety in certain types of classroom interactions. Koch’s study (1991) showed that paired interviews, small group work, and obtaining information by mingling were some activities that students rated highest in producing “comfort” in language learning.

As such, group work teaching method is in line with Cooperative learning approach in the way that the students carried out the communicative activities in groups in order to achieve a common goal. For the next section, we will look into some research and studies on Cooperative learning.

2.9 Research and Studies on Cooperative Learning

Johnson & Johnson, and Stanne (2000) reviewed that cooperative learning is one of the most widespread areas of theory, research and practice in education. An extensive
search found 164 studies investigating eight cooperative learning methods. The studies had yielded 194 independent effect sizes representing academic achievements.

Cooperative learning is one of the most remarkable areas of theory, research, and practice in education. It occurs when students work together to accomplish shared learning goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). A synthesis of research on cooperative learning strategies found out that these strategies improve the achievement of students and their interpersonal relationships. Researchers found out that among the 67 studies of the achievement effects of cooperative learning, 61% found greater achievement in cooperative than in traditionally taught control groups. Positive effects were found in all grade levels, in urban, rural, and suburban schools (Slavin, 1991). In a meta-analysis of 158 studies, Johnson & Johnson stated that current research findings prove that cooperative learning methods are likely to produce positive achievement results. The achievement levels are found to be higher when cooperative learning methods were used as compared to individualistic or competitive methods of learning (Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000).

Kagan (1994) pointed out that the grouping is essential for cooperative learning. The students are usually formed in heterogeneous groups, including a mix-ability of students a high, two middle, a low achieving student and having a mix gender that reflect the classroom population. The main reason for forming the heterogeneous group but not the homogeneous group is because it produces the greatest chances for peer tutoring and support as well as improving racial integration (Kagan, 1994).

Slavin (1995), stated that factors contributing to success of cooperative learning are group goals and individual accountability. Teachers provide students with incentive and motivation to help and encourage each other to work harder to increase their
performance in the group. There is strong evidence that group grades and team rewards are most successful for motivation (Slavin, 1995).

According to Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1993), students who are at the most fundamental level must be able to move into groups with a minimum of noise and fuss. They should be able to work with the group by using soft voices so that they would not disturb other students. These management skills also include group social skills such as encouraging everyone to work together, calling other group members by name and distributing of tasks equally. These are basic cooperative skills which students have to learn. Even adults still need to learn these skills. Furthermore, students also need the opportunity to be taught how to work in groups and how to be a productive group member. Each member has to play a role during cooperative tasks which allow students to practice behaviors that will both benefit the group and deeper understanding of content (Putnam, 1997).

Putnam (1997) compares cooperative learning with traditional learning group. Research indicates that this is a worthwhile effort. Putnam found that cooperative learning is not simply putting students in a group in order to accomplish a task, but a well-planned strategy designed to promote content learning, trust in others and social development. Table 2.1 shows the comparison between cooperative learning and traditional learning.
Table 2.1 Cooperative learning Vs Traditional learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative Learning Groups</th>
<th>Traditional Learning Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive interdependence</td>
<td>No positive interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual accountability</td>
<td>No individual accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative skill instruction</td>
<td>No cooperative skill instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for peer learning</td>
<td>Little concern for peer learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous groups</td>
<td>Homogeneous groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher selected groups</td>
<td>Student selected groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reflection and goal setting</td>
<td>Student selected groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher observation and feedback</td>
<td>No teacher observation and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunity for success</td>
<td>Uniform standard for success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from Putnam, Joyce (1997) cooperative learning in Diverse Classroom Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Merrill)

Many teachers use cooperative learning in many different ways. In assessing the effectiveness of specific cooperative learning strategies, however, there are a number of researchers who have developed cooperative learning procedures, conducted research and evaluation of their methods. According to Johnson, Johnson and Stanne (2000), there are ten modern methods of cooperative learning that received the most attention (refer to table 2.2).
Table 2.2 Modern Methods of Cooperative Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher-Developer</th>
<th>Year of research</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>Mid 1960s</td>
<td>Learning Together &amp; Alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vries &amp; Edwards</td>
<td>Early 1970s</td>
<td>Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon &amp; Sharon</td>
<td>Mid 1970s</td>
<td>Group Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>Mid 1970s</td>
<td>Constructive Controversy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aronson &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Jigsaw Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavin &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Jigsaw Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>Complex Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavin &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagan</td>
<td>Mid 1980s</td>
<td>Cooperative Learning Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Slavin &amp;</td>
<td>Late 1980s</td>
<td>Cooperative Integrated Reading &amp; Composition (CIRC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from Johnson, Johnson, and Stanne, 2000, *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta – Analysis*)

Johnson, Johnson and Stanne (2000) stated that this combination of theory, research, and practice makes cooperative learning a powerful learning procedure. But this does not mean that all practices of cooperative learning will be effective in maximizing achievement. Different types of cooperative learning methods are being used. Hence educators have very little guidance as to which specific cooperative learning methods will be more effective in different situation. As such, Johnson, Johnson, and Mary Stanne (2000) had examined four issues on their research. The first issue is how much research
has been conducted to validate specific cooperative learning procedures. The second issue investigated is how many different cooperative learning methods have been evaluated. The third issue investigated is how effective are the different cooperative methods in maximizing achievement. The fourth issue investigated is the characteristics of the more effective cooperative learning methods.

The research by Johnson, Johnson, and Stanne (2000) shows that cooperative learning is essential for maximizing learning and ensuring healthy cognitive and social development as well as many other important instructional outcomes. Hundreds of research studies demonstrate that cooperative learning result in higher individual achievement than competitive or individualistic learning. Cooperative learning is used throughout the world by educators. The combination of theory, research and practice had made cooperative learning one of the most outstanding of all instructional practices.

3.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has presented and discussed the related theories and readings pertaining to the research that will be carried out. In the coming chapter, discussions on the methodology of research will be presented.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview on the research framework. Descriptions on the population and sample, data collecting instruments, and the procedure of the data collection as well as methods of data analysis are explained.

3.2 Research Framework

This research is a case study. The purpose of this study is to find out the relationship between cooperative learning and achievement in the acquisition of English language among the students in Form 4 in one secondary school. The framework of the research is shown below:
Figure 3.1 The Framework of the Research
This study was qualitative but some data were quantified. The research framework was initially developed by Kagan (1990). This design was selected on the basis to maximize students’ academic achievement, social development and English language proficiency. Such design would also enable the researcher to find out the need for group discussion as well as the need to communicate with one another in order to achieve a common goal.

3.3 Population and Sample

The sample for the study was drawn from the Form Four Classes in one secondary school. The population profile of the Form 4 students is shown below in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 The profile of the Form 4 students by Gender and Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Male Population</th>
<th>Female Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Class 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Class 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Class 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Class 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Class 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Class 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Class 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were seven Form four classes in the chosen school. The total number of the population of form 4 students was 210. The sampling design was that of convenience. Class 1 was chosen as the experimental group and Class 2 was chosen as control group. Class 3 was chosen as the pilot study group for the improving of the instruments. The students were grouped as class 1 and class 2 based on English teacher’s perception, PMR results as well as monthly Test 1 results. The sample class profile is shown in Table 3.2 below.

**Table 3.2 Distribution of sample by Gender and perceived English Ability**

Class Name : Class 1 (Experimental Group)

Profile of Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>English Ability (As perceived by teacher and monthly Test 1 Results)</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Number of Males and females</th>
<th>Percentage of males and females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 shows the profile of all the samples for experimental group. As found in table 3.2, five students were considered as high level of English proficiency. Majority of them i.e. twenty of the students were considered as average level of English proficiency. However, seven of the students have low English proficiency level.
Table 3.3 Distribution of sample by Gender and perceived English Ability.

Class Name : Class 2 (control Group)

Profile of Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>English Ability ( As perceived by teacher and monthly Test 1 results)</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Number Of males And females</th>
<th>Percentage Of males And females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the control group, four students were considered as high level of English proficiency. Majority of them i.e. fifteen students were grouped as average level while ten students were categorized as low English proficiency level.

Both classes have more or less the same English proficiency level as well as family background. Most of their parents are farmers and only a few Government Servants. Most of the students have intermediate English proficiency level i.e. twenty students from Class 1 and 15 students from Class 2. Only a few students achieved high Proficiency level i.e. 5 students from Class 1 and 4 students from Class 2. Furthermore, 7 students from Class 1 and 10 students from class 2 were considered as having low
proficiency level. This had been proven by their English teacher’s perception, monthly Test 1 results as well as their PMR results.

3.4 Instrumentation

A total of four instruments were used to collect data in this study. There were pre and post tests, interview questions, list of factors observed and student evaluation form.

1 Pre-test and Post-test

A pre-test was given to the treatment and control groups. The questions were based on the lessons and exercises given to them on ‘The Lotus Eater’ by William Somerset Maugham. There were five objective questions and two subjective questions (Appendix A1).

A post-test was also given to the treatment and control groups. The post-test was used to measure the academic achievement of students using Cooperative learning in learning English. The questions were based on the lessons and exercises on ‘The Drover’s wife’ by Henry Lawson. There were five objective questions and two subjective questions (Appendix A2). All the test papers were checked for face validity by three English teachers.
The level of difficulty of pre-test and post-test was similar since all the objective questions were extracted from *Selected Poems and Short Stories Form 4* written by Lim and Yong (2003) and all the questions were based on the students’ understanding of the story. The subjective questions were taken from the *SPM English 1119 Past Year* questions which were quite standard and at the same level of difficulty.

2 Interview Questions

The researcher conducted interviews to a randomly selected sample of fifteen students as well as interviewed ten English teachers in the secondary school chosen. The format of the interviews can be found in Appendices D1 and D2. These interviews assisted the researcher to identify the problem on which to carry out case study as well as in guiding the teacher in planning the strategies and activities to be used in the three phases of the lessons.

3 List of Factors Observed

The researcher carried out three lesson observations (Phases I,II,III). During the lesson observations, the researcher used the Johnson and Johnson Observation form for gathering data on group interaction (Refer to Appendix E1). There were altogether eight factors. These factors were *contributes ideas, describes feelings, encourages participation, summarizes / integrate, checks for understanding, relates new to old learning, gives directions to work and individual work.*
4 Student Evaluations Form

After the three lessons, the researcher sought feedback from the students themselves. Each group completed one self-group evaluation form (Appendix E2). Each student also completed a lesson evaluation form (Appendix E3). The feedback from the students provided data on whether the students have enjoyed the lesson and if they have found group work productive and good.

3.5 Procedure of the Research

Before the treatment program started, a pilot study was conducted on a group of students from a Form 4 class. This was not the group chosen as sample. The main purpose was to try out the instruments and improve the instruments for the treatment lesson. The results were not so encouraging. Some questions from the pre-test and post-test were found to be not suitable. A few past years subjective questions had been added to make the tests valid and reliable. Besides, some questionnaires were found to be not relevant and suitable. The researcher had to change some questionnaires in order to answer the research questions.

A pre-test was given before the lessons and a post test was given after the lessons to both groups – experimental and control groups. The purpose of the tests was to find out whether there were any differences between the marks of pre-test and post-test for each student.
After the lessons, a group evaluation form was given to the experimental group to evaluate the effectiveness of using cooperative learning in learning English in a literature class.

An interview was carried out to the students and other English teachers to find out the effectiveness of using cooperative learning in learning English and the ways to improve the approach. The Framework of the three phases is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Co-Op Co-Op)</td>
<td>(Traditional Method)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 1**
- Reading the story and answering the questions in groups (
  - *(The Drover’s wife)*

**Phase 2**
- Understanding and analyzing the story in groups, brainstorming for presentation

**Phase 3**
- Team Presentation and Sharing with others, Group discussion for completing the exercises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre - Test</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reading the story and answering the questions in groups | Reading the story and answering the questions individually
| (The Drover’s wife) | (The Drover’s wife) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post – Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.2 Procedure of the three phases**
As shown in the figure above, the procedure consisted of three phases. These phases however were conducted differently in each group. The experimental group was conducted using Co-op Co-op method by the researcher but the control group was conducted using Traditional method by another English teacher. The lessons were divided into three phases. The time taken for each phase was 80 minutes. For further explanation, refer to the lesson plan for Cooperative learning in Appendix B1 and the lesson plan for traditional method in Appendix B2.

### 3.6 Method of Data Analysis

The data was coded and edited before being transferred to the computer for data analysis. The system used for data analysis was the SPSS version 9.0. The scores obtained from pre-test and post-test for experimental group were compared in terms of mean scores, standard deviation, margins of improvement and decline and paired samples T-test in order to find out whether there is any significant difference before and after the implementation of cooperative learning in the literature class.

Besides this, the scores obtained from pre-test and post-test for control group were also compared in terms of mean scores, standard deviation, margins of improvement and decline as well as paired samples T-test in order to find out whether there is any significant difference by using the traditional method in the teaching of literature in the classroom.
Moreover, the score differences between pre and post tests of the control and experimental groups were compared by using mean scores, standard deviation and independent samples T-test. The results were used to find out whether there are any significant differences between the results of the experimental and control groups.

The outcome of group evaluation form and lesson evaluation form were categorized and analyzed by using percentage. Scores from each item were designed based on a 4-option Likert scale. Respondents were asked to indicate their extent of agreement (Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly agree) by giving each item a score of 4 to 1 respectively. Respondents were also asked to answer a few questions on the effectiveness and usefulness of cooperative learning.

In addition, the percentages of group observation factors were also used to describe the different characteristics of cooperative learning in group activities. Finally, the answers from the interviews with teachers and students were analyzed and described on the effectiveness of cooperative learning.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the data collected from the research were analyzed and discussed. The data gathered were used to answer the research questions posed in chapter one.

4.2 Relationship between Cooperative learning approach in an English literature class and respondents’ achievement in acquiring English language

The first research question sought to find out whether there was any relationship between cooperative learning approach in an English literature class and
respondents’ achievement in acquiring English language. In order to show the relationship, the following have to be worked out:-

**The performance of the experimental group after being exposed to cooperative learning**

The performance of the experimental group after being exposed to cooperative learning strategies had to be analyzed using their pre test and post test results. The pre and post test results of the experimental group are shown in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1 Scores of Pre and Post Tests for Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>57.969</td>
<td>82.422</td>
<td>24.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>21.017</td>
<td>13.342</td>
<td>7.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.1, 93.8% of the subjects or 30 respondents showed positive score difference or improvement after they were exposed to cooperative learning method in the teaching of literature among the 32 subjects. Only 6.25% of the subjects or two respondents showed negative score after the treatment.

The table also clearly showed the mean and standard deviation scores after the treatment in the experimental group. The mean score for pre test among the treated samples was 57.97 compared to the mean score of 82.42 in the post test. The post test showed an increase of 24.44 in the mean score among the samples in the experimental group.

This finding was consistent with the finding of Janina (2003) that showed significant difference scores between the pre and post tests for experimental group. It showed that Cooperative learning resulted in higher achievement and greater productivity.

**Paired Sample T- Test Scores of Pre and Post tests for the Experimental Group**

Table 4.2 shows the paired sample T-test score of Pre and post tests for the experimental group.
Table 4.2 Paired Sample T-Test Score of Pre-test and Post-test for experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Based on the data in table 4.2, the paired samples t-test showed that t value is -7.353 which is smaller than 0.05. The output of the paired samples T-test indicated that there was significant difference in the score and achievement between the students’ performances in the pre and post test in the experimental group.

The result had proven that Cooperative learning was essential for maximizing learning and ensuring healthy cognitive development. This was in line with the finding of Johnson & Johnson and Mary Stanne (2000) who stated that Cooperative learning resulted in higher individual achievement.

Results of Pre and Post Tests of the Control Group

The results of pre and post tests of the control group are shown in Table 4.3
Table 4.3 Scores of Pre and Post Tests for Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>38.889</td>
<td>52.778</td>
<td>13.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>19.144</td>
<td>18.597</td>
<td>-0.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in table 4.3, 77.7% of the subjects or 21 respondents in the control group showed an increase in scores in the post test while 22.2% of the subjects or 6 respondents in the control group showed a decrease in scores in the post test. The mean for pretest is 38.89 while the post test recorded an increase of 13.89 in the post-test among the learners in the control group.

Both groups showed achievement despite the different methodologies used on them. Only a few subjects showed a decrease in scores. This may be due to the effect of the input given by the teacher despite the different learning strategies used.

This finding was similar with the theory of Chomsky (1965) who had discovered the existence of some kind of special language processing ability that children were born with, known as “LAD”. Hence, the LAD in the respondents was responsible for their success in language learning. This innate ability enables the respondents to create a linguistic system quickly, even with limited input.

**The Paired Samples T test of Pre and Post Tests for the Control Group**

Table 4.4 shows the paired samples T test of pre and post tests for the control group.
Table 4.4 Paired Samples T Test of Pre Test and Post Test for control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Using the data above, the paired samples t-test showed that t value is -3.143 which was smaller than 0.05. The output of the paired samples T-test indicated that there was significant difference in the score and achievement between the students’ performances in the pre and post test in the control group.

This study showed that there were some improvements in the control group. Compared with the improvements in the experimental group, this finding did not support the finding by Dotson (2003) which indicated that there were little improvements in the control group. In his study, all the respondents in the experimental group were scored higher than those in the control group.

Score Difference between Pre Test and Post Test

Table 4.5 shows the score differences between pre and post tests of the control and treatment groups.
Table 4.5 Score difference between Pre Test and Post Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean        | 13.889         | 24.453              |
| Standard Deviation | 22.958         | 18.872              |
As shown in Table 4.5, the mean of the score difference between pre and post tests of the control group was 13.889 while the experimental group was 24.453. The standard deviation of the control group was 22.958 while the experimental group was 18.872. This data showed that the experimental group had performed significantly better than the control group. For further explanation, we will look at Table 4.6 that showed the Independent Sample t-test score difference between experimental and control groups.

**Table 4.6 Independent Sample T-Test Score Difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.619</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-1.943</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.910</td>
<td>50.273</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-10.5642</td>
<td>5.5301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the data in Table 4.6, the Independent Sample t-test showed that Sig (p-value) is -1.943 which was smaller than 0.05. This means that there was significant difference in the score and achievement among the two groups. By comparing the p value and the mean difference, the experimental group had performed significantly better than the control group in the post test.

The finding was consistent with the finding of Dotson (2003) that showed significant difference between experimental and control groups. The results were also
consistent with those of earlier studies which compared other Cooperative learning methods against lecture or independent styles of instruction (Slavin, 1991; Johnson & Johnson, 2000). The respondents in the experimental group conducted by Slavin gained greater achievement than that of the control group. The finding also proved that Cooperative learning as well as group work could increase individual students’ participation in terms of conversational turns. They contributed to a learner-focused classroom that allow for both student-student and student-teacher interaction. Let us now move on to answer the second research question.

4.3 Positive or Negative relationship between Cooperative learning approach and students’ achievement in acquiring English language in an English literature class

The second research question was to find out whether the relationship between cooperative learning approach and students’ achievement in acquiring English Language was positive or negative. In order to show the positive relationship, the following have to be worked out:-

The Difference of Mean Scores between Pre Test and Post Test for Control Group and Experimental Group

Table 4.7 The difference of mean scores between pre test and post test for control group and experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>38.889</td>
<td>57.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>52.778</td>
<td>82.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>13.889</td>
<td>24.453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in the table above, Cooperative learning showed a positive relationship on the students’ academic achievement. The difference of the mean scores of experimental group was 24.453 which showed a significant improvement. Traditional method also showed a positive relationship on the students’ academic achievement. The difference of the mean scores of the control group was 13.889 which indicated that there were some improvements in the teaching of this method.

However, cooperative learning resulted in better performances than traditional method because the difference of the mean scores of experimental group was higher than the control group. This finding was consistent with the finding of Dotson (2003) that showed significant difference in cooperative learning strategy and traditional method, favoring the cooperative strategy.

As mentioned earlier, achievement was categorized into social development, academic performance and interest in language learning. The statements reflected on the key elements of cooperative learning aimed to find out what subjects really felt and perceived when they were given an opportunity to learn literature using cooperative learning methods and activities in ESL classroom. Questions 1 to 15 are positive statements while questions 16-18 are negative statements. The statements were analyzed based on the four scales used ranging from strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree. The summary of students’ response on Cooperative learning is shown in table 4.8.
## Table 4.8 The Summary of Students’ responses on Cooperative Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement/Frequency</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We can follow the directions.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We asked for help if we have problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We took turns to speak.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We listened to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We shared the idea and information with others.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other members had given me encouragement.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We worked together as a team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. We learn better when a classmate explains something</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I can do my best brainstorming with a team of other people.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I learn something better if I can talk to other people about it.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Working in groups helps me to complete my task.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Working in groups helps me to answer the questions in the exercise given.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Working in groups helps me to pass my examination</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Working in groups make things more fun and interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. We like learning literature with groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I like to do all the work myself for an assignment.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Group work is a problem because some people do not do their share of work.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel left out in group.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As found in table 4.8 above, the respondents generally were in agreement over eight statements in terms of social development which were adapted from Murray and Peterson (2005) in relation to their group activity:

1. We can follow the direction (97%).
2. We asked for help if we have problems (100%).
3. We listened to others (100%).
4. We shared the idea and information with others (97%).
5. We worked together as a team (100%).
6. We learn better when a classmate explains something (91%).
7. I can do my best brainstorming with a team of other people (97%).
8. I learn something better if I can talk to other people about it (94%).

This finding was consistent with the finding of Johnson & Johnson (1998). As stated by Johnson & Johnson, through Cooperative learning, students must enhance ideas, make plans and propose solutions to accomplish a common goal. Therefore, it could enhance students’ social and personal development.

Besides that, as shown in table 4.8, the finding showed positive relationship in terms of academic performance in acquiring English language. The respondents generally were in agreement over the following three statements.

1. Working in groups helps me to complete my task (97%).
2. Working in groups helps me to answer the questions in the exercise given (97%).
3. Working in groups helps me to pass my examination (87%).
This finding showed that Cooperative learning could enhance academic achievement in acquiring English language among the respondents. This learning helps them to pass their examination. This finding was consistent with the finding of Khairiyah and Mimi (2003), who discovered that active learning promotes better understanding of the respondents, yielding better results for the students.

Moreover, as shown in table 4.8, this finding also showed positive relationship in terms of student’s interest in acquiring English language.

1. Working in groups make things more fun and interesting (100%).
2. We like learning literature with group (100%).

The finding was consistent with the affective filter hypothesis by Krashen (1982) which stated that the filter will be ‘up’ (blocking input) when the learner was stressed, self-conscious or unmotivated. It will be “down” when the learner was relaxed and motivated. In the finding, the respondents enjoyed working in groups because the communicative activities are fun and interesting.
The Summary of Respondents’ Comments on Cooperative Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Circle the word which best represents your overall performance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Briefly state one thing which helped your group work well.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Briefly state one thing which would help your group to work better next time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from mistake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4. How did it feel working together on these activities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 the Summary of Students’ comments on Cooperative Learning
Based on the data provided in figure 4.1, about 88% of the students were highly satisfied with their group performance in the group activities. About 55% of the students said that their groups were able to work well through group discussion. About 20% of the students like to share their idea in group activities. About 12.5% of the students could work well when they understand each other. They suggested that they need determination in order to do the best in their group work. Cooperation and sharing of idea also play an important part in helping their group to work better next time.

The finding shows that majority of them are happy, excited, and enjoyed themselves when they were carrying out group work. This finding is similar with the finding of Koch (1991) who stated that group activities can reduce anxiety in certain types of classroom interactions and produce “comfort” in language learning.

**The Summary of Lesson Evaluation by Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. The best part of the lesson is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Presentation  42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz ( Numbered Heads Together) 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Discussion  17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work  11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mind Mapping  4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Suggestions for making the lesson better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Play the event  43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More quizzes  17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music  13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interesting activities  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More freedom  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the work together  7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Other Comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like the activities very much 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to do these types of activities again 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good experience 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.2 Summary of Lesson Evaluation by students**
Figure 4.2 showed that the students preferred group activities like team presentation (42%), quiz (26%), group discussion (17%) and group work (11%). They have made suggestions for making the lesson better next time. They would like to carry out interesting activities in the literature class like role playing (43%), quiz (17%) and listening to music (13%). About 10% of the students said that they wanted more freedom. This is because they wanted to choose their own topic and talk freely without limitation of time.

In short, it can be concluded that they rated their group learning support and cooperative learning strategy implemented as very good. They also indicated in their responses that they would like to have more of such lessons. The next section is an attempt to provide answers to the third research question.

4.4 Aspects that affect students’ learning of the English language

The third research question was to find out in what aspects do students possess positive or negative relationship in the learning of the English language. The findings in this section are divided into two sections. The first section deals with the positive aspects respondents improved and the second section deals with the negative aspects respondents did not improve. In order to find out the aspects respondents improved, the following data have to be presented.
Aspects respondents improved

It was found that the respondents improved in a lot of aspects. They are summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Observed (in %)</th>
<th>G 1</th>
<th>G 2</th>
<th>G 3</th>
<th>G 4</th>
<th>G 5</th>
<th>G 6</th>
<th>G 7</th>
<th>G 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributes Ideas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes Feelings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Participation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizes, Integrates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks for Understanding</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates New to Old Learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives Directions to work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on table 4.9 above, it was exciting to note that the groups in general displayed all the characteristics expected for conducting cooperative learning strategy.

In the first phase, the cooperative learning structure that the teacher used was Quiz (Numbered Heads Together) (Appendix E). Some of the groups were still practicing individual work. This, probably, was a direct consequence of the students’ unfamiliarity with the Cooperative learning structure.

However, in the second and third phases, the students showed a lot of improvements. The cooperative learning structures that had been used in these phases were Spend-a-Buck, Brainstorming, Team Discussion and Team Presentation (Appendix E). As seen in table 4.14 above, the students in each group had displayed all the characteristics of Cooperative learning strategy such as contributing ideas (ranged from 20% to 30%), encouraging participation (ranged from 15% to 25%), checking for understanding (ranged from 5% to 25%), describing feelings (ranged from 5% to 10%), Summarizing and integrating (10%), Relating new to old learning (ranged from 5% to 10%), giving directions to work (ranged from 5% to 10%) except individual work which they seldom used. It was interesting to note that majority of the group members could contribute their ideas and encourage participation when they carried out group activities.

Overall, it can be concluded from the observations that the classroom participation level was increased when a cooperative learning strategy was implemented. Cooperative learning structures enabled students to acquire English language as well as create more caring, supportive, and committed relationships which were also found by Johnson & Johnson (1998), Kagan (1994), and Slavin (1985) in their previous studies.
Besides, respondents were also interviewed to find out the aspects they improved. Interviews were conducted with the respondents after the third phase. All the respondents (100%) agreed that they liked working in groups during the literature lessons. Below are some of the positive comments given by the respondents.

**Respondents’ Positive Comments**

| (1) | I can gain a lot of knowledge. |
| (2) | I learn new things in groups during the lessons. |
| (3) | I like to do the work together with my friends. |
| (4) | We can share our ideas and problems together. |
| (5) | Cooperative learning can improve my social skill. |
| (6) | It is more fun and much easier to learn by using cooperative learning in the literature class. |
| (7) | It releases my tension and stress. |

**Figure 4.3 Positive Comments given by respondents on Cooperative Learning**

First and second positive comments from learners in the experimental group supplied extra input to this study. Group work helped learners to learn new knowledge...
and new experiences in the language classroom. Few heads when put together could enrich the input of the lesson.

As seen in third, forth and fifth positive comments in figure 4.3, some learners in the group felt learning in groups helped them to understand the story better especially when they faced problems in comprehending the story. They could help each other to solve their problems. This finding was consistent with the study by Slavin (1991). He found out that cooperative learning improved the achievement of students and their interpersonal relationships. Cooperative structures gave students the chance to develop positive, productive relationships among themselves.

The sixth, seventh positive comments in figure 4.3 referred to one of the benefits of cooperative learning. It was consistent with Krashen’s affective filter hypothesis. He stated that affective filter was an imaginary barrier which prevented learners from acquiring language from the available input. According to the hypothesis, the filter will be ‘up’ when the learner was stressed, or unmotivated. It will be “down” when the learner was relaxed and motivated.

**Interviews with English Teachers**

Interviews were also conducted with the other English teachers in the school. Most of the teachers agreed that cooperative learning can enhance the students’ achievement in English language acquisition but it depended on the language ability of the students. It may work well on good students but not on weak students.
Some of the positive comments given by these teachers who had adopted this method are stated below:

- Cooperative Learning gives the students chances to explore the subject on their own.
- It varies the teaching strategy.
- It makes the class lively.
- The students do not get bored easily.
- The students have the opportunity to express their ideas and show their talents.
- The activities emphasize on students’ active participation.
- Students learn better when they learn from their peers.
- It is more effective and all the students can have their turns.

Based on the statements given by the English teachers, it was obvious that cooperative learning promotes communication and increases the participation of students. It provides better quality work. The statements are similar to the finding of Robert Slavin (1985), who shows that cooperative learning provides positive effects on academic achievement as well as social relationship among all students. All students, regardless of their ability level, benefit from the cooperative experiences.

Aspects respondents did not improve

The second part of the third research question was to find out in what aspects students did not improve. The instruments used to gather data on the research question were Group Evaluation Form, Observation Form, and interview questions for teachers and students. The positive aspects had been reported earlier and this reports the negative aspects.
About 6% (2) of the respondents from the experimental group showed a decrease in their scores in the post test. These two respondents still could not get used to the new strategy. They were the type of respondents who prefer to always work alone and who could not keep up.

Based on the data given in table 4.7, some respondents still had a negative attitude on Cooperative learning. About 16% of the respondents liked to do all works by themselves for an assignment. About 34% of the respondents felt that group work was a problem because some people did not do their share of work. About 19% of the respondents felt left out in group work. For this type of respondents, they might not want to involve actively in their group and they just became inactive ’passenger’ in the group activities. They seemed to be more comfortable with the traditional lecture which emphasizes more on habit formation and drilling.

Another negative aspect that was observed on cooperative learning was the high noise level. The respondents tend to make a lot of noise when they carried out group discussion. This problem occurred almost every time at all levels. Even the teacher who taught next to the class complained about the high noise level in the classroom. The respondents did not know how to control the noise level. The researcher had to spend time and energy trying to get the classroom quiet and trying to get the attention of all the respondents.

Below are some of the negative comments given by respondents;

- Other members in the group do not take part.
• Some students are not serious with their work.

• They do not want to share their ideas.

• We have conflict among the members because we have different ideas to do the work.

Cooperative learning could be implemented to all different types of students. However, different students might need different strategies. There were students who could not get along, the students who preferred to always work alone, and the students who could not keep up. The teacher should let these students knew that they were to focus on improving their social skills (Debra Richman, 1997).

For the English teachers (interviewees) who implemented cooperative learning in their classroom, they found out that cooperative learning had some negative aspects. Based on their experience, they thought that it will take up longer time than the traditional way of teaching. Due to the time constraint, the cooperative learning might not be able to carry out in a short period of time. Other teachers thought that students were too passive to move around. The students preferred to sit around waiting to be spoon-fed. They were passive, reluctant and lazy. The above findings were consistent with the findings of Khairiyah and Mimi (2003), who discovered that there were students who found it difficult to contribute because there was one dominating person. There were also those who would happily let someone else do the work. These types of students still preferred traditional method which emphasized more on imitation, practice, feedback on success, and habit formation (Lightbrown and Spada, 1999).

Some teachers were worried that one child will do the assigned work, but that every student in the group will get the same mark. Besides that, some teachers thought that students might not have team work skill to work in groups. These were all valid
reasons why cooperative learning might not work and might bring negative effects on some students. But if we trace back the percentage, such students were only a minority. Moreover, practitioners should realize that a failure in cooperative learning strategy is not caused by the approach. More failures in cooperative learning has to do with the learning styles of the students. Introvert students do not like to cooperate with others. Thus it is not the fault of the approach.

4.5 Conclusion

As the students progressed in their group activities, there was progress in the learning and understanding of the story. The post-test results showed that students had grasped a better understanding of the story after being exposed to the various cooperative learning activities. The positive comments given by English teachers and students confirm that the cooperative learning approach in the teaching of literature component creates opportunity for students to be involved directly in the learning process and in English Language acquisition.

In short, majority of the students (94%) found that cooperative learning experiences promote higher achievement and greater motivation than individual learning. Some students had developed better social skills after the learning as also observed by Slavin (1985).
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section presents the conclusions based on the specific objective and the research questions of the research. This is followed by recommendations for practice. Finally, suggestions for further research are also given.

5.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings from the pre-test and post-test, classroom observations, the students’ feedback through questionnaires and interviews with teachers and students, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The respondents enjoyed working in groups.
The respondents liked to share their ideas and information with others.

The respondents learned better when a classmate explains something to them.

Working in groups helps the respondents to complete their task faster.

Working in groups helps the respondents to pass their examination.

The respondents like to learn literature in groups.

The respondents can gain a lot of knowledge and new experiences in cooperative learning.

Cooperative learning releases students’ tension and stress.

The respondents do not get bored easily when learning English literature using cooperative learning.

By using Cooperative learning, a teacher can vary his or her teaching strategy.

Working in groups make things more fun and interesting.

The respondents can carry out brainstorming in their group in order to accomplish a task.

The respondents were happy, excited, and enjoyed themselves when carrying out group works.

The classroom participation level was increased when a Cooperative learning strategy was implemented.

Cooperative learning activities enabled students to acquire English language.

Cooperative learning creates more caring, supportive, and committed relationships.

If Cooperative learning is not welcome by any students, it is not the fault of the approach but it has to do with the students’ personalities or learning styles.

The findings of this study supported the study conducted by Kagan (1994), who stated that Cooperative learning strategy can increase students’ achievement. This is also consistent with the findings of Slavin (1985) who mentioned that cooperative learning can bring positive effects on academic achievement as well as positive aspects on social relationship among all students. He added that when compared with traditional method,
cooperative learning also promotes higher achievement and greater motivation than individual learning.

Besides this, the findings supported the study conducted by Johnson & Johnson (1987), who stated that cooperative learning promotes positive attitudes towards instructional experiences and the subject areas.

From the findings, we can conclude that cooperative learning might not be beneficial for every student. However, majority of the students would benefit both socially and academically if cooperative learning is implemented in the classroom. It can enhance achievement in English language acquisition in a class. Cooperative learning activities can help maximize the performance of the students in acquiring the English language as well as interpersonal skills needed for success in school and society.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

From the results and findings, the following recommendations are made for teachers who would like to implement cooperative learning strategy in their teaching.

Firstly, teachers need to start by teaching social skills because some students cannot get used to the new strategy. Based on the findings, there were types of students who prefer to work alone. Because of this, teachers need to teach the students how to ask for help, how to listen to others and how to give opinion (Johnson & Johnson, 1996). According to Johnson & Johnson (1994), in order to achieve goals in the group, students
must get to know and trust each other, communicate accurately and unambiguously, accept and support each other and resolve conflict constructively.

Besides teaching social skills, teachers need to teach students ‘Quiet Signal’ which was introduced by Kagan (1992) because from the findings, students tend to get over-excited and thus create a very noisy atmosphere. Hence, the quiet signal is an appropriate signal for students to stop talking and to give their full attention to the teacher. It works well in a classroom. When the teacher raises his/her hand, the students do the same action to give full attention to the teacher (Kagan, 1992).

Moreover, cooperative learning could be implemented for different types of students. Students with special needs might need different strategies to keep them on track. In this research, there were students who preferred to work alone. For this type of students, teachers could give them positive reinforcement for completing a given task. For students who cannot get along, teachers can keep cooperative group activities brief and simple while they are working in groups. They are led to focus on improving their social skills (Ellis & Whalen, 35-37, 1992).

Furthermore, the cooperative learning strategy should be continued as a teaching method to enhance the social communication among the students in the group. It offers the secondary school students the chance to develop positive, productive relationships among themselves. Cooperative teams may offer some students the academic support that will help them to excel in their studies.
5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

As mentioned earlier, the limitation of this study was the small size of sample. Additional research should be conducted to examine whether these results are positive in a large sample in all forms, all disciplines, in urban, in rural, in suburban schools, and for high, average, and low achievers.

Besides this, it may be interesting to do further research into whether cooperative learning promotes better retention of knowledge gained after the teaching. For better results, the teacher could give a post test one month after the implementation of cooperative learning strategy.

Last but not least, comparative studies could be done to identify the difference between the cooperative learning strategy and other learning strategies such as problem based learning or content based learning. Further research is recommended to verify the findings of the current study in order to strengthen this contribution towards the development of a sound research data, based on cooperative learning strategy.
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Appendix A 1

Pre – Test

½ hour

Name: ____________________ Class: ___________

The Lotus Eater by William Somerset Maugham (Form 4 Selected Poems and Short Stories)

Section A : Objective Questions (10%)
Choose the correct answer.

1. The narrator sees Wilson for the first time
   A  in the Bay of Naples
   B  on Mount Vesuvius
   C  in a beautiful garden
   D  on a hillside

2. Which of the following statements is true about Wilson’s life on the island of Capri?
   A  He often entertains friends in his cottage
   B  He supports himself by giving piano lessons.
   C  He lives a quiet life all by himself
   D  He lives in the cottage with Assunta and her husband.

3. Wilson said he bought an annuity for twenty-five years. How did he get the money to do this?
   A  He won a cash prize
   B  He inherited money from his family.
   C  He made a very profitable business deal.
   D  He had saving and he sold his house.

4. When Wilson’s money first ran out
   A  Assunta asked Wilson to leave
   B  Assunta found Wilson a job as a boatman
   C  Assunta continued to clean and cook for Wilson
D Assunta sometimes asked the narrator’s friend for some money for Wilson.

5. Why does the narrator’s friend say that Wilson’s mind was damaged by the smoke?
A Because Wilson would not leave the hospital
B Because Wilson did not recognize the narrator’s friend
C Because Wilson borrowed small sums of money
D Because Wilson would not pay the rent

(Extracted from Selected Poems and Short Stories Form 4, written by Lim Chee Seng and Margaret Yong)

Section B : Subjective Questions (10 %)
Read the extracts from the short story The Lotus Eater and then answer the questions that follow.

Extract 1

“After my first visit here, I went back to work in London,” Wilson replied. “I was a bank manager and I had worked in the same bank since I was seventeen. I did not want to do the same work for the rest of my life. I wanted to go back and live on Capri for the rest of my life.”

“But I did not decide in a hurry,” Wilson went on. “I had to be sure that I was not making a terrible mistake. So I went on working in the bank for a whole year. That’s the one thing I regret now.”

1. (a) Where did Wilson decide to spend the rest of his life?

_______________________________________________________________________

(1 mark)

(b) Why was Wilson bored with his job?

_______________________________________________________________________

(1 mark)
(c) “That’s the one thing I regret now.” What was his regret?

(1 mark)

(d) Do you think Wilson was happy in the end? Give a reason.

(2 mark)

( Extract 2

“ That night, he tried to kill himself. He shut all the windows and lit a charcoal fire in his bedroom. The next morning, Assunta came to make his breakfast. She found him lying on the bed. He was very ill, but he was still alive.”

“ They took him to hospital and he slowly got better. But he was not the same. I went to visit him in hospital. He didn’t know who I was. Perhaps his mind was damaged by the smoke.”

“ So, what happened to him then?”

2. (a) Briefly describe what happened to Thomas Wilson after his failed suicide attempt. How did he spend the rest of his life till his death at the age of 67?

(2 marks)

(b) What led to Thomas Wilson’s attempted suicide?

(1 mark)

(c) Why was Wilson not the same after the attempted suicide?

(1 mark)
(d) Why did the writer say that Wilson’s mind was damaged by the smoke?

____________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________ (1 mark)

Appendix A 2
Post Test
½ hour

Name: __________________ Class: ______________

The Drover’s Wife by Henry Lawson (Form 4 Selected Poems and Short Stories)

Section A: Objective Questions (10 %)

Choose the best answer.

1. When Tommy first sees the snake, what does he want to do?
   A. He wants to hit the snake with a stick.
   B. He wants to throw the stick at the dog.
   C. He wants to throw his stick at the snake.
   D. He wants to throw the snake into the wood-heap.

2. The drover’s wife makes the children sleep on the table because
   A. that is the cleanest place in the house.
   B. that is the way they always sleep.
   C. that is the only place with a candle.
   D. that is the safest place in the house.

3. What does the brother-in-law do when he visits the drover’s wife once a month?
   A. He brings groceries for the family.
   B. He takes the sheep to the market.
   C. He catches the snakes in the house.
   D. He takes the cow to the market.

4. Which statement best describe Alligator?
   A. He loves to welcome the relatives when they visit.
   B. He will probably be sold in the market one day.
   C. He will probably be killed by a snake one day.
D  He is a black and white dog.

5. What is the husband doing?
A  He has gone to visit his brother.
B  He is selling his sheep in a nearby town.
C  He is driving sheep for another farmer.
D  He has gone to search for a lost sheep.

(extracted from Selected Poems and Short Stories Form 4 by Lim and Yong, 2003)

Section B : Subjective Questions (10%)

Read the extracts from the short story *The Drover’s Wife* and then answer the questions that follow.

Extract 1

Alligator still watches the wall from time to time. Suddenly, he becomes greatly interested; he draws himself a few inches nearer the partition and a thrill runs through his body. The hair on the back of his neck begins to bristle, and the battle-light is in his yellow eyes. She knows what this means and lays her hand on the stick.

1. (a) Why does Alligator suddenly become interested?

(b) Give two pieces of evidence from this extract that suggest that danger is approaching.

(i) ______________________________________________________ (1 mark)

(ii) _____________________________________________________ (1 mark)
Extract 2

“Tommy, come here, or you’ll be bitten. Come here at once when I tell you!”

The youngster comes reluctantly, carrying a stick bigger than himself. Then he yells triumphantly, “There it goes – under the house!” and darts away with club uplifted. At the same time, the big, black, yellow-eyed dog-of-all-breeds, who has shown the wildest interest in the proceedings, breaks his chain and his nose reaches the crack in the slabs just as the end of its tail disappears. Almost at the same moment, the boy’s club comes down and skins the aforesaid nose. Alligator takes small notice of this and proceeds to undermine the building; but he is subdued, after a struggle and chained up. They cannot afford to lose him.

The drover’s wife makes the children stand together near the dog-house while she watches for the snake. She gets two small dishes of milk and sets them down near the wall to tempt it to come out; but an hour goes by, and it does not show itself.

(2) (a) Why is the boy carrying a stick?

(b) What character of the boy is seen here?

(c) The word it in the second paragraph refers to

---

(c) In your own words, explain the meaning of the last sentence.

______________________________________________________________ (2 marks)

(Question 49, Paper 1, SPM E1119, 2003)
(d) In your opinion, why does the drover’s wife put milk near the wall?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________( 2 marks)

Answers for Pre-Test

Section A

Section B
1. (a) In Capri.
   (b) He had worked in the same bank since he was seventeen.
   (c) He went on working in the bank for a whole year.
   (d) No. He ran out of money and he killed himself but failed to do so. He became insane and live a miserable life for another seven years before he died.

2. (a) He became insane. He worked for Assunta as a Shepherd by looking after the goats in her farm. He lived a miserable life without proper shelter and food.
   (b) He ran out of money and Assunta asked him to leave the house.
   (c) Because he did not recognize people and probably his mind was damaged by the smoke.
   (d) Because Wilson seemed strange and alienated himself from the rest of society as well as being incoherent in the way he spoke and his mannerisms.
Answers for Post-Test

Section A


Section B

1. (a) Alligator could sense the presence of the snake.
   
   (b) (i) Alligator draws himself a few inches nearer to the partition.
       (ii) The hair on the back of Alligator’s neck begins to bristle.
   
   (c) She knows from the dog’s reactions that the snake is near them, and she gets ready to attack it.

2. (a) He wanted to use it to hit the snake.
   
   (b) Brave and Protective.

   (c) The snake

   (d) To tempt the snake to come out.
Appendix B 1

Lesson Plan

Experimental Group (Co-Op Co-Op)

Phase 1

Class : 4 A
No. Of Students : 36
Level of Proficiency : Intermediate
Previous Knowledge : Students had learnt Literature components since Form 1
Time : 7.00-8.20 ( 80 minutes)
Subject : English
Theme : Social Issues
Topic : The Drover’s Wife
Learning Outcomes : 3.0 Language For Aesthetic Use
                   3.1 Listen to, read, view and respond to literary works by :
                      a. understanding and telling in one’s own words the story and
                         poem heard and read, and giving one’s own opinion of the text.
Specifications : ii. Finding out the meaning of unfamiliar words by using
                 contextual clues and the dictionary.
                 iii. Retelling the story or poem in one’s own words.
Objectives of the : At the end of the lesson, the students should be able to :
lesson 1. describe about the writer’s background
          2. read and understand the short story ( The Drover’s Wife).
          3. answer ten questions based on the story.
Educational emphasis : Contextual and Multiple intelligences
Moral Values : Life must be endured
               We must be brave
               Children should care about their parents
### Teaching Aids
- Selected poems and short stories worksheets

### References

### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Set Induction</strong>&lt;br&gt;(10 mins)</td>
<td>1. The teacher introduces the title of the story (The Drover’s wife).&lt;br&gt;2. Then the teacher asks the students to use the <strong>Roundrobin</strong> structure to share words they associate with the words ‘The Drover’s wife’.&lt;br&gt;3. Have one member of each team share the team’s responses with a neighboring team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Development and practice</strong>&lt;br&gt;(40 mins)</td>
<td>1. The teacher introduces the writer’s background, synopsis as well as new vocabulary Items.&lt;br&gt;2. Students read the short story silently.&lt;br&gt;3. The teacher asks teams to use <strong>Numbered Heads Together</strong> to answer the questions given by teachers.&lt;br&gt;4. Teacher asks questions based on the short story to evaluate the understanding of the students in the short story.&lt;br&gt;5. Then one student is called upon to answer.&lt;br&gt;6. Teacher gives away the prize to the team who can answer the questions correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Consolidation & Reinforcement (20 mins)
   The students complete the exercises given by teacher.

4. Conclusion (10 mins)
   Teacher reads aloud a poem for the students to ponder on.

Reflection:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Experimental Group (Co-Op Co-Op)

Phase 2
Activities

1. Set Induction (15 mins)
   1. The teacher introduces the game ‘Find Someone who..’
   2. Teacher distributes worksheets to each student and explains that they are going to get up and walk around the room.
   3. They should ask their classmates questions in order to find someone to fit with each of the descriptions. Students can write down their results in complete sentences.
   4. After the students have completed the sheets, check the answers by asking publicly to a response to each task.
2. Development and practice  
(40 mins)  

1. The teacher lists out all the literature components on the blackboard. (eg. Synopsis, plot, setting, characters, themes, moral values, point of view, language and style)  
2. Students use **Spend-a-Buck** to select the sub-topic of each literature component. Team representatives use **Spend-a-Buck** to vote on the sub-topics on the blackboard. Each team votes for one sub-topic.  
3. After consensus is reached on each sub-topic, each team does mini-topic research on the short story. The teacher reminds students to use mind-mapping and diagrams to do their projects.  
4. After completing their research, the students in each team prepare oral presentations of their sub-topics. Teacher distributes papers and marker pens for the students.

3. Consolidation & Reinforcement  
(15 mins)  

1. Students use **group processing** to discuss how well they worked as a team in completing and presenting the sub-topics.  
2. Individuals pass up their sub-topics reports to the teacher for review and evaluation. The students may submit mind-mapping or lists of reading materials.

4. Conclusion  
(10 mins)  

The students complete the exercises given by teacher.

Reflection:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
## Experimental Group (Co-Op Co-Op)

### Phase 3

**Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Set Induction</strong> (15 mins)</td>
<td>1. The representative from each group is ready for the presentation. Individual students should take responsibility for each part of the presentation. The <strong>team presentation</strong> should be a synthesis of what members have learnt from their own work and from each other, with each team member having a unique role. The students may be given the option to use visual aids, power point, demonstrations, or drama techniques for presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Development and practice</strong> (40 mins)</td>
<td>1. Teacher should encourage teams to involve members of the class in a question and answer session for part of the presentation. Teacher also should encourage members of the class to use effective listening and participation skills to help the partner teams. Following each presentation, class members give positive feedback on how the partner teams helped the class improve its understanding of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Consolidation &amp; Reinforcement</strong> (15 mins)</td>
<td>1. After the presentation, teacher distributes worksheets to the students. The students in their groups use <strong>brainstorming</strong> to answer the questions. Teacher discusses the answers with the students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Conclusion (10 mins) | The students need to complete group evaluation form and lesson evaluation form on cooperative learning. Teacher interviews a few students about cooperative learning.

Reflection:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix B2

Lesson Plan

Traditional Method of Learning

Control Group

Phase 1

Class : 4 B
No. Of Students : 36
Level of Proficiency : Intermediate
Previous Knowledge : Students had learnt Literature components since Form 1
Time : 7.00-8.20 (80 minutes)
Subject : English
Theme : Social Issues
Topic : The Drover’s Wife
Learning Outcomes : 3.0 Language for Aesthetic Use

3.1 Listen to, read, view and respond to literary works by :
   a. understanding and telling in one’s own words the story and
      poem heard and read, and giving one’s own opinion of the text.
Specifications : ii. Finding out the meaning of unfamiliar words by using
   contextual clues and the dictionary.
   iii. Retelling the story or poem in one’s own words.
Objectives of the lesson : At the end of the lesson, the students should be able to :

1. Describe about the writer’s background
2. Read and understand the short story (The Drover’s Wife).
3. Answer ten questions based on the story.

Educational emphasis : Contextual and Multiple intelligences

Moral Values : Life must be endured
   We must be brave
   Children should care about their parents

Teaching Aids : Selected poems and short stories
## Worksheets

### References

### Activities

| 1. Set Induction (10 mins) | 1. The teacher introduces the title of the story (The Drover’s wife).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. Then the teacher introduces the writer’s background, synopsis and new vocabulary items.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                           | 2. Students read aloud the short story individually.
|                           | 3. Teacher tells the story in simple words.
|                           | 4. Teacher asks questions based on the short story to evaluate the understanding of the students in the short story.
|                           | 5. Then one student is called upon to answer.
|                           | 6. Teacher corrects the answers together with the students. |
| 3. Consolidation & Reinforcement (20 mins) | The students complete the exercises given by teacher. |
| 4. Conclusion (10 mins) | Teacher reads aloud a poem for the students to ponder on. |
Reflection:

Control Group (Traditional Method of Learning)

**Phase 2**

**Activities**

| 1. Set Induction (15 mins) | 1. The teacher asks students questions based on the story.  
2. Students answer. |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. Development and practice (40 mins) | 1. The teacher distributes notes on literature components. (e.g. Synopsis, plot, setting, characters, themes)  
2. Teacher explains the notes.  
3. Students listen. If they have any doubts, they can ask questions. |
| 3. Consolidation & Reinforcement (15 mins) | 1. A ‘Quiz’ is given. Teacher asks questions based on literature component.  
2. Students who can answer the questions get two marks for each question. The winner is the one who score the highest marks. |
4. Conclusion
(10 mins)
The students complete the exercises given by teacher.

Reflection:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Control Group (Traditional Method of Learning)
Phase 3
Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Set Induction (15 mins)</td>
<td>1. Teacher revises the lesson together with the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teacher asks questions based on the story given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development and practice (40 mins)</td>
<td>1. Teacher distributes notes on the remanding literature components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eg. moral values, point of view, Language and style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Teacher explains the meaning of the notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Students listen and ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consolidation &amp; Reinforcement (15 mins)</td>
<td>1. The students complete the exercises given by teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conclusion (10 mins)</td>
<td>Teacher discusses the answers together with the students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflection:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C

Cooperative Learning Strategies

Cooperative Learning structures are methods of organizing the interaction of students in the classroom. Step-by-step procedures are used to conduct the lessons. Some steps involve group work and others involve the whole class. The following examples illustrate a few of these methods used in the three phases of English Literature lessons. Sample lesson plans for selected structures are included in Appendix C.

1. RoundRobin

RoundRobin is a simple structure that encourages equal participation when students are responding to a question or prompt. Often students are given a specific amount of time to respond, such as 30 seconds or a minute. RoundRobin is not a discussion, however, students focus on actively listening to their peers, rather than debating or discussing their responses.

Steps:
   i. Students number off 1-4 within teams.
   ii. Teacher announces topic or question.
   iii. Students take turns sharing their responses in numerical order.

2. Numbered Heads Together

Numbered Heads Together is an excellent structure for answering questions. After a number is called, designated students may respond by writing on individual slates, giving oral answers, or holding up prepared response cards. To ensure individual accountability, students may not receive help from their teammates after a response number is chosen.
Steps
i. Students in teams number off 1-4.
ii. Teacher poses a question or problem.
iii. Students put heads together to discuss responses.
iv. Teacher randomly calls a number.
v. Team members with that number respond.

3. **Spend-a-Buck**

Each student is given four quarters to spend any way he or she wishes on the items to be decided. The team tallies the results to determine its decision.

4. **Group Processing**

Students evaluate their ability to work together as a group and each member’s participation, with an aim to improving how the group works together.

5. **Brainstorming**

Students encourage each other to generate ideas regarding a particular topic or problem and build upon each other’s ideas.

6. **Team Discussion**

Team Discussion is a less structured than RoundRobin since students may respond in any order and for any amount of time. When using this structure, monitor student participation closely. If students are not participating equally, consider breaking students into pairs for a pair Discussion. Team Discussions are often followed by brief Class Discussions in order to clarify some concepts.

Steps
i. Teacher announces question or discussion prompt.
ii. Students in teams talk over their responses.

7. Team Presentation

Team Presentation should be a synthesis of what members have learnt from their own work and from each other, with each team member having a unique role. The students may be given the option to use visual aids, power point, demonstrations, or drama techniques for presentations.

(All the above Cooperative Learning structures are extracted and adapted from Kagan Cooperative Learning (1990))

8. Steps of Co-Op

1. A whole-class discussion dealing with students’ interests and needs relative to the lesson topic;
2. The formation of heterogeneous teams;
3. Teambuilding and cooperative skill development;
4. The selection of each team’s topic;
5. The selection of mini-topics by individual team members;
6. Mini-topic research and preparation of mini-topic presentations to fellow team members;
7. The presentation of mini-topics;
8. The preparation of team presentations to the whole class;
9. Team presentations to the whole class; and
10. Feedback to teams and individual team members.

(Taken from Kagan, 1990:14:2)
Appendix D 1

List of Interview questions for students

Questions
1. What is your name?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. How old are you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. What is your favourite subject in school?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. What do you think about English? (Easy or difficult)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. What is your problem in learning English?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6. Which part do you find it difficult? (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Literature Component, Grammar)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
7. Do you like to learn English Literature? (Poems, Short stories, Novel) Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. What is your problem in learning English Literature?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. Do you enjoy working in groups? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. What was good about working in groups?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

11. What was bad about working in groups?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D2

List of Interview questions for Teachers

Questions

(1) Which subject did you enjoy doing the most when you were a student?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(2) Do you have fun when you are teaching English in your class? Why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(3) What are your main problems when teaching English?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(4) Why do you think students have difficulty in understanding English especially English Literature Components?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(5) What are your teaching strategies in the English classroom?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(6) How often do you attend in-service training courses related to Education?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
(7) What was the last in-service course you attended?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(8) Have you heard of Cooperative Learning Strategies?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(9) Have you implemented any of the Cooperative learning strategies in English class?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(10) Does cooperative learning work better than the traditional lecture? Why?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(11) Do you like to use cooperative learning strategy to teach your students? Why?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(12) What are the problems you encounter when you carry out the learning?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(13) How will you improve to make it work better?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Extracted and Adapted from ‘The Classroom Teacher ; Special Issue on Action Research, Pusat Serantau Pendidikan Sains Matematic SEAMEO)
## Appendix E 1

Group Observations and Comparisons Using Johnson & Johnson’s observation form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Observation (in %)</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributes Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes Feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizes, Integrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks for Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates New to Old Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives Directions to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Evaluation Form

Group: _______________

Section A

Dear students,

Please give your responses for each of these items by circling the given scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We can follow the directions. 1 2 3 4
2. We asked for help if we have problems. 1 2 3 4
3. We took turns to speak. 1 2 3 4
4. We listened to others. 1 2 3 4
5. We shared the idea and information with others. 1 2 3 4
6. Other members had given me encouragement. 1 2 3 4
7. We worked together as a team. 1 2 3 4
8. We learn better when a classmate explains something. 1 2 3 4
9. Working in groups make things more fun and interesting. 1 2 3 4
10. Working in groups helps me to complete my Task. 1 2 3 4
11. I can do my best brainstorming with a team of other people. 1 2 3 4
12. I learn something better if I can talk to other people about it. 1 2 3 4
13. We like learning literature with groups. 1 2 3 4
14. Working in groups helps me to answer the questions in the exercise given.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
15. Working in groups helps me to pass my examination.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
16. I like to do all the work myself for an assignment.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
17. Group work is a problem because some people do not do their share of work.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
18. I feel left out in group work.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4

(Adapted from ‘My Group Work Inventory’ by Chris Murray and Dr. Ken Peterson. 2005)

Section B

Answer all the questions below.

(1) Circle the word which best represents your overall performance?

Excellent                Pretty Good                Need to do better

(2) Briefly state one thing which helped your group work well.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(3) Briefly state one thing which would help your group to work better next time.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
(4) How did it feel working together on these activities?


(Extracted and Adapted from ‘The Classroom Teacher ; Special Issue on Action Research, Pusat Serantau Pendidikan Sains Matematic SEAMEO.2001)
Appendix E 3

Lesson Evaluation Form

Name : ___________________  Date:__________________

1. The best part of the lesson is

________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. Suggestions for making the lesson better

________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. Other comments.

________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

(Extracted and Adapted from ‘The Classroom Teacher ; Special Issue on Action Research, Pusat Serantau Pendidikan Sains Matematic SEAMEO)
Appendix F 1

Short story – The Drover’s Wife by Henry Lawson

The two-roomed house is built of round timber, slabs, and string-bark, and floored with split slabs. A big, bark kitchen standing at one end is larger than the house itself, verandah included.

Bush all round – bush with no horizon, for the country is flat. No ranges in the distance. The bush consists of stunted, rotten, native apple-trees. No undergrowth. Nothing to relieve the eye save the darker green of a few sheoaks which are sighing above the narrow, almost waterless, creek. Nineteen miles to the nearest house.

The drover, an ex-squatter, is away with sheep. His wife and children are left here alone.

Four ragged, dried-up-looking children are playing about the house. Suddenly, one of them yells, “Snake! Mother, here’s a snake!”

The gaunt, sun-browned bush woman dashes from the kitchen, snatches her baby from the ground, holds it on her left hip and reaches for a stick.

“Where is it?”

“Here! Gone into the wood-heap!” yells the eldest boy-a sharp-faced, excited urchin of eleven. “Stop there, mother! I’ll have him. Stand back! I’ll have him!”

“Tommy, come here, or you’ll be bitten. Come here at once when I tell you!”
The youngster comes reluctantly, carrying a stick bigger than him. Then he yells triumphantly, “There it goes – under the house!” and darts away with club uplifted. At the same time, the big, black, yellow-eyed dog-of-all-breeds, who has shown the wildest interest in the proceedings, breaks his chin and his nose reaches the crack in the slabs just as the end of its tail disappears. Almost at the same moment, the boy’s club comes down and skins the aforesaid nose. Alligator takes small notice of this and proceeds to undermine the building; but he is subdued, after a struggle and chained up. They cannot afford to lose him.

The drover’s wife makes the children stand together near the dog-house while she watches for the snake. She gets two small dishes of milk and sets them down near the wall to tempt it to come out; but an hour goes by, and it does not show itself.

It is near sunset, and a thunderstorm is coming. The children must be brought inside. She will not take them into the house, for she knows the snake is there and may, at any moment, come up through the cracks in the rough, slab floor; so she carries several armfuls of firewood into the kitchen, and then takes the children there. The kitchen has no floor, or, rather, an earthen one-called a “ground floor” in the centre of the place. She brings the children in and makes them get on this table. They are two boys and two girls—mere babies. She gives them some supper and then, before it get dark, she goes into the house and snatches up some pillows and bed-clothes-expecting to see or lay her hand on the snake at any minute. She makes a bed on the kitchen table for the children, and sits down beside it to watch all night.

She has an eye on the corner and a green sapling club laid in readiness on the dresser by her side; also her sewing basket and a copy of The Young Ladies’Journal. She has brought the dog into the room.

Tommy turns in under protest, but says he’ll lie awake all night and smash that snake; he has his club with him under the bed-clothes.
Near midnight. The children are all asleep and she sits there still, sewing and reading by turns. From time to time she glances round the floor and wall-plate and whenever she hears a noise, she reaches for the stick. The thunderstorm comes on and the wind, rushing through the cracks in the slab wall, threatens to blow out her candle. She places it on a sheltered part of the dresser and fixes up a newspaper to protect it. At every flash of lightning, the cracks between the slabs gleam like polished silver. The thunder rolls and the rain comes down in torrents.

Alligator lies a full length on the floor, with his eyes turned towards the partition. She knows, by this, that the snake is there. There are large cracks in that wall, opening under the floor of the dwelling-house.

She is not a coward, but recent events have shattered her nerves. A little son of her brother-in-law was lately bitten by a snake and died. Besides, she has not heard from her husband for six months and is anxious about him.

He was a drover and started squatting here when they were married. The drought ruined him. He had to sacrifice the remnant of his flock and go droving again. He intends to move his family into the nearest town when he comes back; and in the meantime his brother, who lives along the main road, comes over about once a month with provisions. The wife has still a couple of cows, one horse and a few sheep. The brother-in-law kills one of the latter occasionally, gives her what she needs of it and takes the rest in return for other provisions.

It must be near one or two o’clock. The fire is burning low. Alligator lies with his head resting on his paws and watches the wall. He is not a very beautiful dog to look at and the light shows numerous old wounds where the hair will not grow. He is afraid of nothing on the face of the earth or under it. He hates all other dogs-except kangaroo-dogs- and has a marked dislike to friends or relations of the family. They seldom call, however. He sometimes makes friends with strangers. He hates snakes and has killed many, but he will be bitten some day and die; most snake-dogs end that way.
Now and then the bush woman lays down her work and watches and listens and thinks. She has few pleasures to think of as she sits here alone by fire, on guard against a snake. All days are much the same to her; but on Sunday afternoons, she dresses herself, tides the children, smartens-up baby and goes for a lonely walk along the bush track, pushing an old perambulator in front of her. She does this every Sunday. She takes as much care to make herself and the children look smart as she would if she were going to “do the block” in the city. There is nothing to see, however, and not a soul to meet. You might walk for twenty miles along this track without being able to fix a point in your mind, unless you are a bushman.

It must be near daylight now. The room is very close and hot because of the fire. Alligator still watches the wall from time to time. Suddenly, he becomes greatly interested; he draws himself a few inches nearer the partition and a thrill runs through his body. The hair on the back of his neck begins to bristle, and the battle-light is in his yellow eyes. She knows what this means and lays her hand on the stick. The lower end of one of the partition slabs has a large crack on both sides. An evil pair of small, bright, bead-like eyes glistens at one of these holes. The snake – a black one – comes slowly out, about a foot and moves its head up and down. The dog lies still and the woman sits as one fascinated.

The snake comes out a foot farther. She lifts her stick and the reptile, as though suddenly aware of danger, sticks his head in through the crack on the other side of the slab and hurries to get his tail round after him. Alligator springs and his jaws come together with a snap. He misses this time, for his nose is large and the snake’s body closes down in the angle formed by the slabs and the floor. He snaps again as the tail comes round. He has the snake now and tugs it out eighteen inches. Thud, thud, comes the woman’s club on the ground. Alligator pulls again. Thud, thud. Alligator pulls some more. He has the snake out now- a black brute, five feet long. The head rises to dart about, but the dog has the enemy close to the neck. He is a big, heavy dog, but quick as a terrier. The eldest boy wakes up, seizes his stick and tries to get out of bed; but his mother forces
him back with a grip of iron. Thud, thud – the snake’s back is broken in several places. Thud, thud – its head is crushed and Alligator’s nose skinned again.

She lifts the mangled reptile on the point of her stick, carries it to the fire and throws it in; then piles on the wood and watches the snake burn. The boy and the dog watch too. She lays her hand on the dog’s head and all the fierce, angry light dies out of his yellow eyes. The younger children are quieted and presently go to sleep. The boy stands for a moment in his shirt, watching the fire. Presently he looks up to her, see the tears in her eyes and, throwing his arms round her neck exclaims: “Mother, I’ll never go droving.”

And she hugs him to her breast and kisses him; and they sit thus together while the sickly daylight breaks over the bush.

(Taken from Selected Poems and Short Stories Form 4, Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia and Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 2000)
Appendix F 2

Notes for “The Drover’s Wife” by Henry Lawson

Overview

Henry Lawson was a nineteenth-century Australian writer. He wrote many short stories. His stories realistically describe the life of the Australian bush. To him, the typical Australian farmer was tough and independent, and he describes them in sympathetic terms.

Synopsis

The drover’s wife is alone at home with four children. Her husband is taking sheep to the market. Tommy, the oldest boy, spots a snake. The drover’s wife picks up her baby and puts her children near the dog house where it is safer. Tommy and the dog go after the snake. Tommy tries to beat the snake but hits the dog’s nose instead.

That night, the drover’s wife makes the children sleep on the kitchen table while she keeps watch. As she waits, she thinks of her little nephew who recently died from a snake bite. She is anxious because her husband has been away for six months.

When the snake reappears, Alligator (the dog) bites the snake’s tail while the drover’s wife hits it till dies. After that, as morning comes, the drover’s wife weeps. Her son comforts her. He says he will never go droving.
Plot

The plot shows how the drover’s wife deals with the snake that has come into her home. All the action after that is about the killing of the snake. After the snake is killed, the son suddenly tells the mother that he will not become a drover. This is a surprising yet touching ending.

Setting

The ‘bush’ in this story is the outback or underdeveloped countryside of Australia. Farms in the bush are very isolated. Often, the land is not suited to farming and water is scarce. In this story, the creek is almost dry. The farmer has been ruined by drought and he has returned to the life of a drover. Conditions are harsh and the family faces many dangers—droughts, fires, floods and poisonous snakes.

Characters

The main character is the drover’s wife/the mother. The minor characters are Tommy (her son), Alligator (her dog) and the drover (her husband).

The Mother

The main character is the wife of the drover. She lives in a poor, isolated wooden house in the bush as a bush woman. She has four young children, the youngest a baby and the eldest, eleven years old. She looks rough and rugged, as her life is very hard. She finds the life difficult but does not complain. Her only contact with the outside world is through her brother-in-law and a magazine called The Young Ladies’ Journal.
Tommy

Tommy is eleven years old, the oldest child in the family. He is lean and sun-tanned. He is not afraid of the snake but his mother will not let him hunt for it. At the end of the story, he sees his mother crying. He understands her sadness and loneliness, and he tells his mother he will never be a drover.

Alligator

Alligator is their pet – a mongrel, a ‘dog-of-all-breeds’. He is big and black, with yellow eyes. He is not a beautiful dog as he has many scars from previous fights with snakes. He is very quick at catching dangerous snakes.

The Drover

The drover is the husband of the woman and the father of the four children. He used to be richer when he started farming, but the drought killed most of his animals. So he has become a drover, that is, he helps another farmer taking the farm animals through the bush to the market.

Themes

The main theme of the story is the harshness of bush life. Lawson describes the details of bush life for a lonely drover’s wife. There are many dangers (the drought, the snake and the storm), but in general, the life of the drover’s wife is very dull because every day is the same. This theme shows that bush life is lonely and dangerous.
The sub-theme is the courage of the bush family. The father (who has to work far away), the mother, the children and even the dog all show great courage and endurance when faced with the hard conditions of their lives.

**Moral Values**

The main moral values and lessons in this story are:

- Life must be endured.
- We must be brave to cope with the challenges of life.
- Children should care about their parents.

**Life Must Be Endured**

The drover’s wife leads a hard life. Her husband is away for long periods of time. She copes with all the problems alone. However, she does not complain.

**We Must Be Brave to Cope with the Challenges of Life**

Tommy learns early that he must be brave in facing the challenges of life. The black snake is the symbol of these challenges. Tommy bravely picks up a big stick to attack the snake in spite of the great danger.

**Children Should Care About Their Parents**

Tommy is very sensitive to the feelings of his mother. He comforts her in her sadness and loneliness. He knows that his mother misses his father. He tells her that he will never go droving (he will never leave her to face the hardships alone).

**Point of View**

Lawson uses the third person point of view to tell the story. The characters do not speak much. So we do not really know what they think. Lawson only reveals them
through their actions and behaviors. However at the end of the story, we get an understanding of how the woman feels. What the son says to his mother too, shows his feelings. We know that he understands his mother.

**Language and Style**

The language used is plain. Sometimes there are incomplete sentences. This plain style of writing reflects the plain life of the drover’s wife. Some literary devices such as symbolism and personification are used.

**Symbolism**

There are strong animal symbols in this story. The snake is a symbol of the harshness of life in the bush. It represents danger and fear. The dog is a symbol of courage, loyalty and toughness. These are the same qualities the drover’s wife needs to survive in the bush.

**Personification**

Personification is used, for example, the snake is ‘evil’ and the sunrise feels ‘sickly’. The sickly light of the daybreak reflects the feelings of the drover’s wife.

**Tone and Mood**

The mood is bleak and sad. The drover’s wife is very lonely. The appearance of the snake reminds her of her nephew who died after being bitten by a snake. Dealing with the snake reminds her of how lonely she is without her husband at home.

(Extracted from Selected Poems and Short Stories Form 4 by Lim Chee Seng and Margaret Yong)
Exercises

A. Choose the best answer.

1. When Tommy first sees the snake, what does he want to do?
   A. He wants to hit the snake with a stick.
   B. He wants to throw the stick at the dog.
   C. He wants to throw his stick at the snake.
   D. He wants to throw the snake into the wood-heap.

2. The drover’s wife makes the children sleep on the table because
   A. that is the cleanest place in the house.
   B. that is the way they always sleep
   C. that is the only place with a candle
   D. that is the safest place in the house

3. What does the brother-in-law do when he visits the drover’s wife once a month?
   A. He brings groceries for the family.
   B. He takes the sheep to the market.
   C. He catches the snakes in the house.
   D. He takes the cow to the market.
4. Which statement best describe Alligator?
A  He loves to welcome the relatives when they visit.
B  He will probably be sold in the market one day.
C  He will probably be killed by a snake one day.
D  He is a black and white dog.

5. What is the husband doing?
A  He has gone to visit his brother.
B  He is selling his sheep in a nearby town.
C  He is driving sheep for another farmer.
D  He has gone to search for a lost sheep.

6. Which statement best describes Tommy?
A  He wants to be a drover like his father.
B  He is brave and wants to kill the snake.
C  He likes dogs that kill snakes.
D  He is very afraid of the snake.

B  Write short answers to the following questions.

1. Why does the drover’s wife set out two dishes of milk?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. What does the drover’s wife do when the thunderstorm comes?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
3. What does the drover’s wife do every Sunday?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. Why did the husband stop being a farmer?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. Briefly describe the drover’s house.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

6. Briefly describe Tommy’s character.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

7. Why does the drover’s wife cry at the end of the story?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Extracted from Selected Poems and Short Stories Form 4 by Lim Chee Seng and Margaret Yong. 2003)
Answers for exercises

Exercise A
1  A      2  D      3  A      4  C      5  C      6  B

Exercise B
1. The drover’s wife sets out two dishes of milk to tempt the snake to come out of hiding.

2. When the thunderstorm comes, the drover’s wife puts the candle on a sheltered part of the dresser and protects it from the storm.

3. Every Sunday, the drover’s wife goes for a walk with her four children. She dresses up and makes sure the children look smart even though they are only walking through the bush.

4. The husband was ruined by the drought, which killed most of his cows and sheep.

5. It is a small, rough wooden house. It has a large kitchen and verandah.

6. He is very brave. He is not afraid of the poisonous snake. He loves his mother very much.

7. The drover’s wife cries at the end of the story because she is feeling lonely, tired and perhaps afraid too.