

## The Effects of Employing Cooperative Learning Strategies on the Motivation of Iranian EFL learners

Zahra Seifi<sup>1</sup>, Dr.Ghasem Tayyebi<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English, Yasouj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Yasouj, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor of English, English department, Islamic Azad University, Kazeroon Branch, Kazeroon, Iran

*Received: March 26, 2015*

*Accepted: May 17, 2015*

---

### ABSTRACT

The present study aimed at investigating the effects of using cooperative learning (CL) on EFL students' motivation in an Iranian context. To this end, a quasi-experimental research design was used. Two private language institute classes (consisting of 26 participants each) took part in the study, the experimental group received cooperative learning and the control group received the whole language (WL) as the main way of teaching. The participants' level of proficiency in English was calculated by Oxford Placement Test (1992). In order to collect data, 6-point Likert Scale format of Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner, 1985) consisting of 104 items was used, both as a pretest and posttest. Independent samples t-tests were run both before and after the treatment to indicate whether there were any statistically significant differences between the motivation of these groups.

Based on the findings of the study, there was no significant difference between the motivation of experimental group and control group at the beginning of the program. The findings revealed that using CL as an instructional approach to teaching EFL had a more positive effect on the participants' motivation toward learning English. The findings also indicated that the control group had lost their motivation.

**KEYWORDS:** Cooperative learning, Motivation, Language Learning, whole language

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Factors contributing to the process of learning a foreign language are complicated. However, motivation plays an important role in such a process and to a large extent achievement in learning and mastering a second language is based on learners' motivation. Research indicates that apart from aptitude, motivation can influence language learning outcomes (Gardner, 1972; Wigfield & Wentzel, 2007). It seems very important to engage students to classroom activities, especially for those who learn a second language in a foreign language learning context because, as opposed to second language learning contexts, outside the classroom, it is very difficult to find opportunities to speak in the target language.

It has been supposed that there are two categories of students: motivated and unmotivated (Biehler & Snowman, 1997). However, others argued that the more students engage in their learning, the more their motivation will be (Johnson, Johnson, & Holubec, 1993). In order for students to be motivated, they need ample chances to interact with one another and to receive encouragement and support for their learning attempts. When students are placed into groups, by giving them tasks requiring working together and interdependence, all of the members of the group are responsible to achieve their joint objectives. Then students are motivated by the role they play in their group and by positive feedback they receive from their teammates regarding their contributions. Johnson and Johnson (1989) argued that idea exchanging among group members not only leads to increased interest but also promotes critical thinking.

As teachers we are supposed to provide our students with the tools to work effectively in a collaborative and cooperative environment. One of these tools could be cooperative learning (CL). CL is well-organized group work in which students work cooperatively to achieve their academic as well as social and affective objectives; that is, CL is a well-defined framework from which students would be able to learn from each other. When implemented properly, CL can provide an ideal way to develop supportive relationships between students. Students try to fulfil clearly stated academic and social goals. CL is a team approach in which the success of each group is based upon actively participating of the members of the group in the group activity. According to Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1991) CL is the "instructional use of small groups so that student's work together to maximize their own and each other's learning". According to Slavin's model of CL (1995) CL finally results in improvement in learning because the process of cooperation prompts motivation and consequential cognitive activities. Moreover, group learning can equip students with the necessary critical thinking skills that will prepare them to enter today's workforce. Two major categories of theories support this model: motivational theories and social cognitive theories, e.g., Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (1978).

---

\* **Corresponding Author:** Dr. Ghasem Tayyebi, Assistant Professor of English, English department, Islamic Azad University, Kazeroon Branch, Kazeroon, Iran. [ghasem\\_tayyebi@yahoo.com](mailto:ghasem_tayyebi@yahoo.com)

Contrary to competition that sometimes creates situations where learners try to achieve their goals based on the failure of others, CL seeks to create a situation prompting students to have high expectancy of each other. If a teacher puts CL method effectively into practice, both high achievers and low achievers could benefit from it, and it is expected that they may be respected by their peers. To be more specific, high achievers are valued because of the knowledge, willingness and ability they can share, and, on the other hand, low achievers are respected and accepted because of their willingness to improve their current knowledge. In CL classrooms, students can easily realize that their peers want them to learn, improve and be successful. They show great interest in helping and encouraging one another to learn (Slavin, 1995).

According to Salvin's (1995) CL model, a stage is created for cognitive development when students have motivation to learn and to help and encourage on another in the process of learning. Vygotsky (1978) argued that cooperation has a very crucial role in and develops learning, because it enables learners to operate within one another's "zone of proximal development" (p. 86). Working with peers is beneficial for learning in that students with the same level of proximal development are able to explain things in an understandable, easier way to each other than that explained by a person with high mental stage. Dewey (1963), in the same way, emphasized the importance of "active cooperation" in the process of constructing knowledge (p. 67).

CL has changed classroom trends from being teacher-centered, where the focus is on the teacher providing and imposing new material on the students, to being student-centered, where, on the other hand, the students are expected to take a more active role in their learning process. In cooperative classroom the students, while being responsible for their own learning and discoveries, can, simultaneously, become excited about and enjoy the learning process. Thus CL is different from traditional teaching approaches in that instead of competing with each other, they work together to achieve their goals. Accordingly, the success of CL students depends on two factors: the effort of individual students and, on the other end of the spectrum, the help, effort, skills and knowledge that other members of the group provide. It is also worth mentioning that no member of the group possesses all of the skills, resources and knowledge necessary to achieve the determined goal.

Slavin's (1995) CL model is also supported by cognitive elaboration theories. In the process of elaboration, students have a lot of opportunities to develop their ideas from imprecise, preliminary to concrete, sophisticated, which likely may not be the case in situations during which students only listen to a lecture and passively receive information. Moreover, elaboration leads to active information processing, cognitive restructuring, and reprocessing of ideas. These can lead to more practice, therefore, resulting in learning better and longer retention of materials than learning alone (Snowman & Biehler, 2005; Dansereau, 1988). Slavin's model of CL has been supported by motivational and cognitive theories as well as by a large number of experimental studies in different countries all over the world. Nevertheless, the use of CL in Iranian EFL classrooms is still under-researched. For the current study, the following hypothesis was formulated: there is no significant difference between Iranian EFL learners receiving cooperative learning and those receiving whole-class instructions in terms of motivation?

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Hancock (2004) Motivation may be defined as the force energizing; directing and maintaining behavior toward an object. Cook (2000) believes that language acquisition is not the same in learners. Moreover, it has been proposed and recommended that there are three main factors, which concern and influence the Second Language Acquisition; these three factors are age, personality, and motivation. He further claims that among the above three issues motivation is the most significant one in second language acquisition.

OLSEN and kagan (1992) argued that cooperative learning is group learning activity organized so that leaning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in group and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and motivated to increase the learning of others. Cooperative language learning, in accordance to Richards and Rogers (2003) is the continuation of communicative language teaching (CLT) sauignon (2007) noted that the spirit of CLT is to activate learners communicative interactions in the class and the goal CLT is to improve learners communicative competence. Beside, cooperative language learning is sometimes also known as collaborative learning (CL). CLL is a kind of learner-centered teaching method that elicits interactions among students.

Slavin (1984) has claimed that a possible factor responsible for the success of cooperative group instruction is the positive motivational impact of peer support for learning.

Johnson and Johnson (1979) scrutinized and indicated the correlation among all, academic achievement, and learner's attitude by comparing three groups of students, including cooperative learning group, competitive group, and individualistic group. There were sixty-six students (=66) in the fifth grade, twenty-two students in each group. Half of them were male half were female. The instructional time was an hour per day and for three days. On the first day, three groups of students tackled drill-review task. The second day, they had problem-solving task, and the third day; they engaged in specific-knowledge-acquisition and retention tasks. The result indicated that the CLL group achieved higher than either individualistic group or competitive group and

identically high with the individualistic group when tackling the drill-review task. Moreover, the CLL group also achieved higher than the individualistic group and equally as high as the competitive group in the specific-knowledge-acquisition task. Therefore, in this case, CLL could facilitate desirable academic result.

Aside from the desirable academic results, the study also found that cooperative learning produced more positive attitude than the other groups. Johnson and Johnson (1979) indicated that the CLL students felt most comfortable and relaxed while learning among the three groups. It is of cardinal importance for teachers to ascertain the effect of CLL upon their students. Therefore, there is a need to elucidate the relationship between cooperative language learning and motivation and to learn how and what CLL might bring forth in an EFL class.

Chen (1998) investigated English achievement of junior college students through cooperative learning techniques and the traditional whole class method. The results showed that students in small cooperative groups achieved significantly better results on the overall test. Chen states that the achievement gains under cooperative learning are attributed to the methods' reward structures and carefully structured interaction.

The studies by Chen (1998) and Liang (2002) conducted interviews. In the first study, students' voices from both high achieving and low achieving groups were heard through interviews conducted by the teacher as researcher. While a teacher-as-researcher research design gives a study a close-up observation, it might risk sample bias and objectivity in ways of participant

Jalilifar's (2010) used two techniques of Cooperative Learning including Student Team Achievement Divisions and Group Investigation in his investigation, examined students' reading comprehension achievement of English as a Foreign Language. The researcher found that Student Team Achievement Divisions technique is more effective in improving EFL reading comprehension achievement in spite of the fact that both techniques could no improve reading comprehension significantly.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

**3.1 Participants:** The participants in two intact groups were labeled the name of the two groups, that is, experimental and control. Each group consisted of 26 participants. They were female students at Nourabad Parseh Language School in Fars province, Iran. They ranged in age from 16 to 18. They were intermediate learners of English. The participants' level of proficiency in English was calculated by Oxford Placement Test (Allen, 1992). Although the instructor had the experience of teaching CL in her classes prior to the present study, she, however, had not experienced teaching it in isolation. It is worth noticing that the researcher indicated no preference for none of the methods used in the study, that is, CL and WL.

**3.2 Instrumentation:** An inventory entitled "attitude/motivation test battery by Gardner (1985) along with Oxford Placement Test (Allen, 1992) were used as instrument of this study. The participants' level of proficiency in English was calculated by Oxford Placement Test (Allen, 1992). In order to collect the data, the researcher made use of a questionnaire adopted from Gardner's AMTB (1985). The questionnaire consisted of 104 items. Integrative and Instrumental Orientation scales of the original 6-point Likert Scale format of Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner, 1985) were used, ranging from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. The AMTB is reported to have a reliability of .85 and high validity (Gardner, 1985). Since the level of the participants taking part in the present study was, as mentioned before, intermediate, and, as a result, they could read and understand the items of the questionnaire easily, it was presented in English, and the participants were asked to complete the questionnaire with close, careful attention. However, they were informed that if there were any questions regarding the comprehensibility of the questionnaire, they could ask the teacher, either in English or, for the sake of resolving any ambiguity, in their mother tongue. There was enough time for the participants to complete the questionnaire. The AMTB items were made of 12 scales which are as follows:

1. Interest in foreign languages
2. Parental encouragement
3. Motivational intensity
4. English class anxiety
5. English teacher evaluation
6. Attitudes towards learning English
7. Attitudes towards English-speaking people
8. Integrative orientation
9. Desire to learn English
10. English course evaluation
11. English use anxiety
12. Instrumental Orientation

However, since the main focus of the present study was on motivation, the results of some items, such as parental encouragement, English class anxiety, English teacher evaluation, attitudes toward English speaking

people. Integrative orientation, English course evaluation, English use anxiety and Instrumental Orientation are not reported here. (Gardner, 1985) Moreover, as the accumulation of answers given by the students were mostly on two ends of Likert scale, all the items were classified in two general scales of agree and disagree.

**3.3 Procedure:** Quasi experimental design was employed in this study to compare the cooperative learning group with the whole Class instruction group in terms of motivational outcomes.

The participants in the study were students at Nourabad Parseh language school. The researcher manipulated the types of instruction: One class was the control group receiving whole-class instruction; the other was the experimental group receiving cooperative learning pedagogy. The main teaching material for both the control and experimental groups was Topnotch 3 B. The treatment lasted 8 weeks. There were 2 students in each group. The performance of the experimental and the control group were measured twice: before and after the treatment. The pretests included a modified questionnaire adopted from Gardner's AMTB (1985) questionnaire; the posttests included the same questionnaire. The traditional techniques used with the control group mainly involved teacher-dominated WL instruction. However, since teacher talk took up most of the class sessions, peer interaction, language practice and communicative fluency were not emphasized. Discussion topics and learning tasks, which were carefully designed to suit students within the CL team, were also modified for use with the WL group mostly in the form of direct instruction or occasionally traditional group work. There are many ways cooperative learning can be executed. The specific cooperative learning method used in this study was Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) (Slavin, 1995). The STAD procedure for the experimental group was composed of five main steps: (1) instruction, (2) teamwork, (3) individual tests, (4) individual improvement scores, and (5) group average improvement points and team recognition. After the instructor presented her teaching, the groups were set to work. The students in the experimental group were sorted into 5 heterogeneous groups of four to 6 group members based on their performance on the Oxford Placement Test (Allen, 1992). The students went over the same exercise materials. But instead of working individually, they worked together with their teammates. They helped each other answer and understand the materials through elaborated explanations peer modeling, peer practice, and peer assessment and correction. It should be noted that based on the resource interdependence theory. When there were communicative activities, the activities were group-based, in contrast to the control group's whole-class or individual approach. In WL group, the number of students volunteering in group work was limited because only high achievers took the opportunity to speak; as a result, sometimes there was no opportunity for low achievers to speak. CL activities were aimed at increasing the production of peer interaction and meaningful negotiation among students, with emphasis on communicative fluency, while traditional teaching, that is, WL group, focused on accuracy of language forms through careful explanation of grammar, vocabulary, sentence structures and texts, as well as the use of a large number of repetitive drills. In the CL classroom, the teacher acted as a facilitator, guiding, monitoring and observing students' efforts in learning, while students played an active role in teamwork and provided each other with comprehensible input and output. In the WL class the teacher was class controller, language instructor and transmitter of knowledge, as well as the main provider of comprehensible input. Students mostly listened to the teacher and studied learning materials individually with little chance of meaningful communication with peers.

## 4. RESULTS

### 4.1 Pretest results from the AMTB questionnaire

**Table 1: The Frequencies for Pretest Items on Domain 1: Interest in Foreign Language**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
1. I wish I could speak many foreign languages perfectly.	22	23	4	3
12. Studying foreign languages is not enjoyable.	24	23	2	3
21. I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages.	22	23	4	3
32. I really have no interest in foreign languages.	24	24	2	2
42. I would really like to learn many foreign languages.	23	23	3	3
55. It is not important for us to learn foreign languages.	24	23	2	3
65. If I planned to stay in another country, I would try to learn their language.	25	25	1	1
76. Most foreign languages sound crude and harsh.	21	18	5	8
85. I enjoy meeting people who speak foreign languages.	24	25	2	1
95. I would rather see a TV program dubbed into our language than in its own language with subtitles.	19	18	7	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b> <b>(87.69%)</b>	<b>225</b> <b>(86.53%)</b>	<b>32</b> <b>(12.3%)</b>	<b>35</b> <b>(13.46%)</b>
	<b>Positive</b> <b>56.12%</b>	<b>Positive</b> <b>58.84%</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>43.88%</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>41.16%</b>

Items 12,32,55 and 76 were concerned with negative interest in foreign languages and therefore in order to calculate the positive interest in foreign languages had to be reversed, according to Table 2, we can conclude that 57.48% of the participants were highly interested in learning foreign languages, English in this case (control group: 56.12%; experimental group: 58.84%).

**Table 2: The Frequencies for Pretest Items on Domain 2: Motivational Intensity**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
3. I don't pay much attention to the feedback I receive in my English class.	5	5	21	21
13. I make a point of trying to understand all the English I see and hear.	22	22	4	4
23. I don't bother checking my assignments when I get them back from my English teacher.	17	18	9	8
33. I keep up to date with English by working on it almost every day.	22	21	4	5
44. I put off my English homework as much as possible.	13	13	13	13
56. When I have a problem understanding something in my English class, I always have my teacher for help.	17	18	9	8
67. I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don't understand my English teacher's explanation of something.	18	18	8	8
77. I really work hard to learn English.	21	21	5	5
87. I can't be bothered trying to understand the more complex aspects of English.	7	6	19	20
96. When I am studying English, I ignore distractions and pay attention to my task.	17	17	9	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>159</b> <b>(61.15%)</b>	<b>159</b> <b>(61.15%)</b>	<b>101</b> <b>(38.85%)</b>	<b>101</b> <b>(38.85%)</b>
	<b>Positive</b> <b>65%</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>35%</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>35%</b>	<b>Positive</b> <b>65%</b>

Table 2 showed that 65% of the participants agreed that they were highly motivated in learning English. Although it may seem that both groups had an equal agreement toward items listed in this table, with 61.15% superficial agreement, in reality items 3, 23, 44, 67 and 87 were related to negative motivational intensity toward learning English, therefore, they had to be reversed. Most of the participants had an agreement toward their tendency to make their best to understand every piece of English, whether written or spoken (item 13: 'I make a point of trying to understand all the English I see and hear' 84.61 % agreed). The second most popular item among the participants concerning motivational intensity was their willingness to be up to date with English by working on it almost every day (item 33: 'I keep up to date with English by working on it almost every day.' 82.69% agreed). The least percentage was allocated to their not feeling like trying to understand more complex aspects of English (item 87: 'I can't be bothered trying to understand the more complex aspects of English' with 25% agreement).

**Table 3: The Frequencies for Pretest Items on Domain 3: Attitudes Toward Learning English**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
6. Learning English is really great.	26	26	0	0
18. I hate English.	14	15	12	11
26. I really enjoy learning English.	25	25	1	1
38. I'd rather spend my time on subjects other than English.	18	18	8	8
47. English is a very important part of the school program.	24	25	2	1
62. Learning English is a waste of time.	16	16	10	10
70. I plan to learn as much English as possible	24	25	2	1
82. I think that learning English is dull.	16	16	10	10
90. I love learning English.	24	24	2	2
100. When I leave university, I will give up the study of English because I am not interested in it.	15	16	11	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>202</b> <b>(77.69%)</b>	<b>206</b> <b>(79.23%)</b>	<b>58</b> <b>(22.31%)</b>	<b>54</b> <b>(20.77%)</b>
	<b>Positive attitude</b> <b>66.92%</b>	<b>Positive attitude</b> <b>66.92%</b>	<b>Negative attitude</b> <b>33.08%</b>	<b>Negative attitude</b> <b>33.08%</b>

Regarding attitudes toward learning English, Table 3 indicated that 66.92 % of the participants had a positive attitude toward learning English, because items 18,38,62,82 and 100 were concerned with negative attitude toward learning English and therefore had to be reversed. All of the participants believed that learning English was really great (item 6: 'Learning English is really great' 100% agreed). Moreover, they really enjoy learning English (item 26: 'I really enjoy learning English' 96.15% agreed). The lowest percentage was allocated to hate learning English (item 18: 'I hate English' 55.76% agreed), to give up learning English when graduated from a university (item100: 'When I leave university, I will give up the study of English because I am not interested in it.' 59.61% agreed) and to consider learning English as a waste of time and dull (items 62: 'Learning English is a waste of time' and 82: 'I think that learning English is dull' 61.53% agreed) respectively. However, for negative attitudes toward learning English the reason maybe Iranian educational context in which there is no new advantages over learning English, and policy makers are quite interested in old-fashioned methods such as audio-lingual and grammar translation methods, in which there is almost no appealing factors to attract students attention and make them interested in learning English.

**Table 4: The Frequencies for Pretest Items on Domain4: Desire to Learn English**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
9. I have a strong desire to know all aspects of English.	25	25	1	1
17. Knowing English isn't really an important goal in my life.	7	6	19	20
29. If it were up to me, I would spend all of my time learning English.	20	20	6	6
37. I sometimes daydream about dropping English.	8	8	18	18
51. I want to learn English so well that it will become natural to me.	25	25	1	1
61. I'm losing any desire I ever had to know English.	9	8	17	18
73. I would like to learn as much English as possible.	24	25	2	1
81. To be honest, I really have no desire to learn English.	1	1	25	25
92. I wish I were fluent in English.	26	26	0	0
99. I haven't any great wish to learn more than the basics of English.	1	1	25	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>115</b>
	<b>(56.15%)</b>	<b>(55.76%)</b>	<b>(43.84%)</b>	<b>(44.23%)</b>
	<b>Positive desire</b>	<b>Positive desire</b>	<b>Negative desire</b>	<b>Negative desire</b>
	<b>86.15%</b>	<b>87.3%</b>	<b>13.85%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>

Table 4 indicates that the participants had a very strong desire to learn English (with a total of 86.73% positive desire: control group 86.15%; experimental group: 87.3%) because items 17,37,61,81 and 99 were concerned with negative desire and therefore had to be reversed in order for correct analyzing the data. All of them totally agreed that they wished they were fluent in English (item 92: 'I wish I were fluent in English' 100% agreed). They, however, had a strong desire to know all aspects of English (item 9: 'I have a strong desire to know all aspects of English.' 96.15% agreed) and also wanted to be so absorbed in English so that it would be a part of their daily life and become natural to them (item 51: 'I want to learn English so well that it will become natural to me' 96.15% agreed). The lowest percentage was for those items regarding having no desire to learn English (item 81: 'To be honest, I really have no desire to learn English' 3.84% agreed) or having a desire to just learn the basics of English (item 99: 'I haven't any great wish to learn more than the basics of English' 3.84% agreed). The participants disagreed with the idea of fearing of dropping English (item 37: 'I sometimes daydream about dropping English' 69.23% disagreed). They showed no tendency regarding their losing desire to learn English (item 61: 'I'm losing any desire I ever had to know English' 32.69% agreed).

#### 4.2 Posttest results from the AMTB questionnaire

However, in order to measure the effects of CL and WL on motivating the participants in learning English and improving their knowledge of English, the questionnaire was presented. The results are shown here:

**Table 5: The Frequencies for Posttest Items on Domain 1: Interest in Foreign Languages**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
1. I wish I could speak many foreign languages perfectly.	20	25	6	1
12. Studying foreign languages is not enjoyable.	25	15	1	10
21. I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages.	20	25	6	1
32. I really have no interest in foreign languages.	25	15	1	11
42. I would really like to learn many foreign languages.	18	25	8	1
55. It is not important for us to learn foreign languages.	25	20	1	6
65. If I planned to stay in another country, I would try to learn their language.	25	25	1	1
76. Most foreign languages sound crude and harsh.	24	15	2	11



<b>85. I enjoy meeting people who speak foreign languages.</b>	24	25	2	1
<b>95. I would rather see a TV program dubbed into our language than in its own language with subtitles.</b>	17	23	9	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>223</b> <b>(85.76%)</b>	<b>213</b> <b>(81.92%)</b>	<b>37</b> <b>(14.24%)</b>	<b>47</b> <b>(18.08%)</b>
	<b>Positive</b> <b>49.61%</b>	<b>Positive</b> <b>71.53%</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>50.39%</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>28.47%</b>

As Table 5 reveals, the control group participants had a negative interest toward foreign languages, by selecting items 12: ‘Studying foreign languages is not enjoyable.’ 32: ‘I really have no interest in foreign languages.’ and 55: ‘It is not important for us to learn foreign languages.’ each with 96.15% agreed. On the other hand, the experimental group showed great tendency toward foreign languages by selecting items 1: ‘I wish I could speak many foreign languages perfectly.’, 21: ‘I wish I could read newspapers and magazines in many foreign languages’, 42: ‘I would really like to learn many foreign languages.’, 65: ‘If I planned to stay in another country, I would try to learn their language.’ and 85: ‘I enjoy meeting people who speak foreign languages.’ each with 96.15% agreed.

It should be mentioned that in order to calculate the positive rate of interest in foreign languages, items 12, 32, 55 and 76 which were concerned with negative aspects of interest were reversed. Compared with the results of the pretested questionnaire shown in Table 2, there was a drastic positive change among the experimental group participants toward foreign languages (pretest: 58.84%; posttest: 71.53%). However, this change for the control group was vice versa, that is, there was a decline in their opinion toward foreign languages (pretest: 56.12%; posttest: 49.61%). As it can be easily seen, the effect of CL on changing the view of the participants in the experimental group caused them to have a positive tendency toward foreign languages. However, the decline in the control group can be the result of being exposed to WL instruction.

**Table 6: The Frequencies for Posttest Items on Domain 2: Motivational Intensity**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
<b>3. I don't pay much attention to the feedback I receive in my English class.</b>	10	3	16	23
<b>13. I make a point of trying to understand all the English I see and hear.</b>	18	24	8	2
<b>23. I don't bother checking my assignments when I get them back from my English teacher.</b>	20	15	6	11
<b>33. I keep up to date with English by working on it almost every day.</b>	18	24	8	2
<b>44. I put off my English homework as much as possible.</b>	18	10	8	16
<b>56. When I have a problem understanding something in my English class, I always have my teacher for help.</b>	17	22	9	4
<b>67. I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don't understand my English teacher's explanation of something.</b>	20	15	6	11
<b>77. I really work hard to learn English.</b>	17	25	9	1
<b>87. I can't be bothered trying to understand the more complex aspects of English.</b>	12	5	14	21
<b>96. When I am studying English, I ignore distractions and pay attention to my task.</b>	15	20	11	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>165</b> <b>(63.46%)</b>	<b>153</b> <b>(58.84%)</b>	<b>95</b> <b>(36.54%)</b>	<b>107</b> <b>(41.16%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>Positive</b> <b>(51.92%)</b>	<b>Positive</b> <b>(75.76%)</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>(48.08%)</b>	<b>Negative</b> <b>(24.24%)</b>

According to Table 6, the experimental group participants claimed that they tried hard to learn English (item 77: ‘I really work hard to learn English.’ 96.15% agreed). In addition, they made an effort to be up to date with English (item 33: ‘I keep up to date with English by working on it almost every day.’ 92.3% agreed), and to pay attention to each piece of it (item 13: ‘I make a point of trying to understand all the English I see and hear’ 92.3% agreed). However, they quite disagreed with the idea that they did not pay much attention to the feedback they received in the class (item 3: ‘I don't pay much attention to the feedback I receive in my English class.’ 88.46% disagreed). The participants in the control group confirmed that whenever they did not understand their teacher's explanation, they did not feel like paying attention to it (Item 67: ‘I tend to give up and not pay attention when I don't understand my English teacher's explanation of something’ 76.92% agreed) and that they did not try to check their assignment and their teacher's feedback given (item 23: ‘I don't bother checking my assignments when I get them back from my English teacher.’ 76.92% agreed).

According to Table 4, before the treatment, the participants in both groups showed 65% agreement toward being highly motivated in learning English. But this percentage improved to 75.76% for the experimental group

and declined to 51.92% for the control group. However, it is worth noticing that because items 3,23,44,67 and 87 were concerned with negative aspects of motivational intensity, in order to calculate the positive date, they were reversed. The result of the posttest questionnaire clearly demonstrated the positive effect of CL on motivating the participants in the experimental group versus negative effect of WL on the motivation of the control participants toward learning English.

**Table 7: The Frequencies for Posttest Items on Domain 3: Attitudes Toward Learning English**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
6. Learning English is really great.	21	26	5	0
18. I hate English.	19	11	7	15
26. I really enjoy learning English.	20	25	6	1
38. I'd rather spend my time on subjects other than English.	22	14	4	12
47. English is a very important part of the school program.	20	25	6	1
62. Learning English is a waste of time.	21	11	5	15
70. I plan to learn as much English as possible	20	25	6	1
82. I think that learning English is dull.	21	11	5	15
90. I love learning English.	20	25	6	1
100. When I leave university, I will give up the study of English because I am not interested in it.	20	11	6	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b> <b>(78.46%)</b>	<b>184</b> <b>(70.76%)</b>	<b>56</b> <b>(21.54%)</b>	<b>76</b> <b>(29.24%)</b>
	<b>Positive attitude</b> <b>49.23%</b>	<b>Positive attitude</b> <b>76.15%</b>	<b>Negative attitude</b> <b>50.77%</b>	<b>Negative attitude</b> <b>23.75%</b>

As it can be seen in Table7, the experimental group participants believed that learning English was great (item 6: 'Learning English is really great.' 100 agreed). They also loved and enjoyed learning English (item 26: 'I really enjoy learning English'; item 90: 'I love learning English.' 96.15% agreed) and considered English as an important part of each curriculum plan (item 47: 'English is a very important part of the school program.' 96.15% agreed) as well as showing willingness to learn English (item 70: 'I plan to learn as much English as possible, 96.15% agreed). However, the control group participants had a negative attitude toward learning English (item 38: 'I'd rather spend my time on subjects other than English.' 84.61% agreed) (item 62: 'Learning English is a waste of time.' 80.76% agreed; item82: 'I think that learning English is dull.' 80.76% agreed).

Based on the participants' responses, we can easily observe the positive effect of CL on motivating the participants in the experimental group and causing them to have a positive attitude toward learning English (pretest 66.92% versus posttest 76.15%). But for the control group there was decline in the positive attitude toward learning English (pretest 66.92% versus posttest 49.23%). It is however worth mentioning that items 18,38,62,82 and 100 were related to negative attitude toward learning English and therefore were reversed.

**Table 8: The Frequencies for Posttest Items on Domain 4: Desire to Learn English**

Item	Disagree		Agree	
	Control	Experimental	Control	Experimental
9. I have a strong desire to know all aspects of English.	20	25	6	1
17. Knowing English isn't really an important goal in my life.	10	4	16	22
29. If it were up to me, I would spend all of my time learning English.	16	24	10	2
37. I sometimes daydream about dropping English.	14	5	12	21
51. I want to learn English so well that it will become natural to me.	20	25	6	1
61. I'm losing any desire I ever had to know English.	15	4	11	22
73. I would like to learn as much English as possible.	19	25	7	1
81. To be honest, I really have no desire to learn English.	5	0	21	26
92. I wish I were fluent in English.	22	26	0	0
99. I haven't any great wish to learn more than the basics of English.	8	0	17	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b> <b>(57.3%)</b>	<b>138</b> <b>(53.07%)</b>	<b>111</b> <b>(42.7%)</b>	<b>122</b> <b>(46.92%)</b>
	<b>Positive desire</b> <b>70%</b>	<b>Positive desire</b> <b>93.07%</b>	<b>Negative desire</b> <b>30%</b>	<b>Negative desire</b> <b>12.7%</b>

According to Table 8, the experimental group participants showed great desire to learn English after being taught through CL (pretest 87.3% positive desire versus posttest 93.07% positive desire). It should be taken into account that items 17,37,61,81 and 99 were concerned with negative desire; therefore, in order to calculate



positive desire to learn English, they had to be reversed. The participants taught through CL totally agreed that they wished they were fluent in English (item 92: ‘I wish I were fluent in English.’ 100 agreed) and disagreed that they had no desire to learn English (item 81: ‘To be honest, I really have no desire to learn English.’ Item 99: ‘I haven’t any great wish to learn more than the basics of English.’ 100 disagreed). However, there was a decrease in the control group participants’ desire to learn English compared with that of their in the pretest (pretest 86.15% positive desire versus posttest 70% positive desire). They wished they were fluent in English (item 92: ‘I wish I were fluent in English.’ 84.61 agreed), but they stated that they were losing their desire to learn English (item 61: ‘I’m losing any desire I ever had to know English.’ 57.69% agreed) and that they sometimes had fear of failure (item 37: ‘I sometimes daydream about dropping English.’ 53.84% agreed).

In order to better understanding the data, the descriptive statistic was run to reveal the means of both groups in the present study, that is, the experimental and the control groups.

**Table 9. Pre-test Descriptive Statistics**

pretest	N	Mean
Control group	26	5.15
Experimental group	26	5.28

As Table 9 indicated, the mean for the control group in the pretest was 5.15 (M= 5.15), and that of the experimental group was 5.28 (M= 5.28).

**Table 10. Post-test Descriptive Statistics**

Post-test	N	Mean
Control group	26	4.87
Experimental Group	26	5.61

According to Table 10, on the post-test the control group mean was 4.78 (M= 4.78), and on the other hand, the experimental group mean was 5.61 (M= 5.61).

In order to compare students motivation in the control and experimental groups, in both pretest and posttest, independent sample t-tests were run. The reason for using independent sample t-tests was that the motivation of learners were compared in both pre-test and post-test separately. Table 11 shows the results of the t-test for the pretest of the control and experimental groups. This table indicates that the mean difference between the degree of motivation within the control and experimental groups was not statistically significant ( $t(50) = 343, p = .436$ ).

**Table 11. Pretest Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper
Control/experimental	Equal variances assumed	3.506	.062	.343	50	.436	.13	.522	-1.179	1.873	
	Equal variances not assumed			.343	48	.436	.13	.510	-1.156	1.850	

In the post-test, the mean of the degree of motivation within the experimental and control groups was statistically significant. The results of the post-test are shown in Table 12 ( $t(50) = .197, p = .005$ ).

**Table 12. Posttest Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper
Control/experimental	Equal variances assumed	3.506	.062	.197	50	.005	.76	.522	-1.179	1.873	
	Equal variances not assumed			.197	48	.005	.76	.510	-1.156	1.850	

## 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to see whether CL had an effect on the motivation of Iranian EFL students, in this case, in Nourabad, Fars province. To this end, the researcher utilized Gardner's AMTB (Gardner, 1985) to collect data. In order to better understanding the data the descriptive statistic was represented to reveal the mean of both groups in the present study. As Table 9 indicated, the mean for the control group in the pretest was 5.15 (M= 5.15), and that of the experimental group was 5.28 (M= 5.28)and, on the other hand, According to Table 10, on the posttest the control group mean was 4.78 (M= 4.78)and the experimental group mean was 5.61 (M= 5.61), showing that the CL group was more motivated toward learning English and control group lost the motivation. In order to compare students' motivation in the control and experimental groups, in both pretest and post-test, independent sample t-test was run. Table 11 shows the results of the independence sample t-test for the pretest of the control and experimental groups. This table indicates that the mean difference between the degree of motivation within the control and experimental groups was not statistically significant ( $t(50) = .343, p=.436$ ). The hypothesis of this study was not met because table 12 indicates that mean difference between the degree of motivation within the control and experimental groups in posttest was statistically significant ( $t(50) = .197, p=005$ ), showing that the CL group was more motivated toward learning English. All in all, the findings of the present study indicated that CL is more effective in promoting the motivation of learners to learn and to have a positive attitude toward foreign languages than WL instruction.

## REFERENCES

- Biehler, R., & Snowman, J. (1997). *Psychology Applied to Teaching*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Balfakih, M.A. N. (2003). The effectiveness of students-team achievement division (STAD) for teaching high school chemistry in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Science Education* 25(5), 605-624. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500690110078879>
- Chen, C. H. (1998). A comparison between cooperative learning and traditional, whole class learning- teaching English in a junior college. *Academic Journal of Kang- Ning*, 3, 69- 82.
- Cook, V. (2000). *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier Books.
- Dansereau, D. F. (1988). Cooperative learning strategies. In C. E. Weinstein, E. T. Goetz, & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Learning and study strategies: Issues in assessment, instruction, and evaluation* (pp. 103-120). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gardner, R. C. (1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. In Reynolds.
- Ghaith, M. G. (2003). The relationship between cooperative learning, perception of social support, and academic achievement. *System*, 30, 263-273.
- Hancock, D. (2004). Cooperative learning and peer orientation effects on motivation and achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97. (3), 159 - 166. Retrieved Jan. 24, 2007 from *Academic One File*. Thomson Gale. National Institute of Education. N G. (Ed.), *Bilingualism, Multiculturalism, and Second Language Learning* (pp. 43- 64).
- Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster Company. Jalilifar, A. (2010). The Effect of Cooperative Learning Techniques on College Students' Reading Comprehension. *International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 38(1), 96-108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.009>
- Johnson, & Johnson R. (1979). Type of task and student achievement and attitudes in interpersonal cooperation, competition, and individualization. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 108, 37-48.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. (1998). Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidences is there that it works? *Change*, 30, 26-35.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1998). *Cooperation in the classroom* (7th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

- Liang, T. (2002). *Implementing cooperative learning in EFL teaching: Process and effects*. Doctoral Dissertation, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Olsen, R.E., &Kagan, s. (1992). About cooperative learning. in. c. kessler (Ed.). *Cooperative language learning: a teacher resource book*. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice hall.
- Richards, J.C., &Rodgers, T.S. (2003). *Approaches and Methods in language teaching*. (2<sup>nd</sup>edRai, N., & Samsuddin, S. (2007). STAD Vs Traditional teaching, Redesigning Pedagogy –CRPP conference 2007. [Online] Available: <http://conference.nie.edu.sg/2007/paper/papers/STU349.pdf>).Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Needham
- Savignon, .J. (2007) Beyond communicative language teaching: what s ahead? *Journal of pragmatics*, 39, S1, 207-220.
- Snowman, J., &Biehler, R. (2005). *Psychology applied to teaching* (11thed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wigfield, A., &Wentzel, K. R. (2007). Introduction to Motivation at School: Interventions that Work. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(4), 191-196.