Cooperative Learning Practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia

Muhammed Kedir Hiko

Department of Educational Planning and Management, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
Haramaya University, P. O. Box: 343, Dire Dawa, Ethiopia

Abstract: *The main purpose of this study is to assess the cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia. To achieve this purposes a descriptive survey research method was employed. By using quota sampling and purposive sampling a total of 154 respondents were selected. The data were collected from different primary and secondary sources of data by using questionnaire, interview and document analysis. Quantitative data were analyzed using percentages, mean, and Friedman Mean Rank. In addition to this, qualitative data was analyzed by narration and description in the way it supplement the quantitative analysis. The finding of the study revealed that cooperative learning is important to improve the academic achievement and social skills of students. However, cooperative learning practices is not effective in the study area. Lack of awareness, lack of motivation, shortage of instructional materials, resistant and lack of clear guidelines are some of the major challenges hampered cooperative learning practices. Based on the findings, it was recommended that College of Education and Behavioral Sciences should have to provide continuous and relevant trainings for both instructors and students. It was also forwarded that the techniques used in the approach should be diversified rather than using only group discussion and group assignment in and out-sides of the classroom. It was also suggested that the college should have to prepare detail and clear guidelines used for effective implementation of cooperative learning. It was also recommended that college, department and other stakeholder should have to fulfill necessary inputs and leaders should have to provide proper follow-up and support to effectively practice cooperative learning.*

Keywords: Cooperative, Learning, Cooperative Learning, Practices

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Education is the backbone of societal transformation in all aspects of life. The interdependence among different part of the society is very essential to share the limited resources as well as to achieve their common goal. In this support, as Ashley Montagu (1965) cited in (W.Johnson, 1994) stated that without the cooperation of its members society cannot survive, and the society of man has survived because the cooperativeness of its members made survival possible. In a similar manner, (F.Gamson, 1987) elaborated that:

'Learning is enhanced when it is more like a team effort than a solo race. Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated. Working with others often increases involvement in learning. Sharing one's own ideas and responding to others' reactions sharpens thinking and deepens understanding.'

Cooperative learning is one of the important strategies used to maximize students' learning through working together in small group. In this connection, (David W. Johnson, 2007) stated that cooperative learning promotes a situation in which students work together in small groups to maximize the learning of all members, sharing their resources, providing mutual support, and celebrating their joint success. Similarly, (Johnson, 2009) explained that extraordinary achievement comes from a cooperative group, not from the individualistic or competitive efforts of an isolated individual. Furthermore, (Cheong, 2010) elaborated that:

'Group-based learning creates an environment in which students can practice, gain, and improve soft skills such as leadership, communication, social and conflict resolution skills. However, simply placing students in groups and creating group-based assessment tasks will not necessarily result in students developing and practicing these skills. Instead, specific approaches, such as cooperative learning in this case, need to be followed to ensure students develop these skills.

Higher education massification in Ethiopia is contributing to the overwhelming challenges toward delivering quality education. By acknowledging this problem, implementing cooperative learning strategies throughout education system is one of the measures taken by universities to uplift students' learning opportunity. Even though the science of pedagogy promotes cooperative learning as one of the good strategies that maximize students' advancement in academic, social and personal development by working together, its practical implementation is accompanied with several challenges.

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences is one of the colleges in Haramaya University-the oldest and largest university in Eastern Ethiopia. The college accepted the responsibility for implementing cooperative learning strategies in order to improve students' learning opportunities. As the teaching staff members of the college, the researcher observation implies that cooperative learning implementation and its fruitfulness is not as expected.

Therefore, conducting a research on cooperative learning practices is essential and timely issue in order to identify its

Paper ID: SUB1433

3044

challenges and forward alternative solution for better practices as well as to improve its valuable contribution for students' learning in the higher education. This motivates the researcher to conduct a research on cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The challenge in education today is to effectively teach students of diverse ability and differing rates of learning (Iksan, 2007). Therefore, Universities are adapting different strategies to improve students' learning that will in turn contribute to the development of wider societies. Cooperative learning is one of those approaches that have been adopted long ago and still implementing in higher education since it has diversified advantages for students. Pertaining to its advantages (Nuntrakune, 2008) stated that cooperative learning strategies enhances students' cognitive development and social development such as knowledge building, meta-cognition, self-esteem and positive peer relationship.

Inversely, as Hannon and Ratliffe (2004) cited in (Nuntrakune, 2008) explained that in the traditional competition based classroom low achieving students may feel embarrassed and humiliated in their struggle to keep up. In addition to this, in some institutions cooperative learning is seen as cheating because the educational pedagogy recognizes and rewards individual effort and competition and discourages cooperation among students (Oregon University, 2013).

According to (Millis, 2002), higher education's most challenging goals include enhancing critical thinking, promoting deep learning, encouraging both self-esteem and the acceptance of others, and improving interpersonal effectiveness (with emphasis on team skills). Therefore, current emphases given for cooperative learning increases since it has multiple advantages for students. But, due to several challenges these advantages are not easily harvested in teaching-learning process. Several research findings like (A. Dionigi, 2013) pin-pointed that teachers' understanding about this strategy and students' behavior are some of the factors that affects the effectiveness of cooperative learning.

Moreover, as Latane, Williams, and Harkins (1979) cited in (E.Slavin, 1995) pointed out that in a group lacking individual accountability, one or two students may do the group's work, while others engage in "social Loafing". Similarly, (Bartsch, 2014) stated that mismatched personalities can cause unsatisfactory cooperative learning even when conflict or drama is present as students with dominant personalities might move into leadership roles whether or not they best suited to steer the project at hand. On the other side, as Rich (1990) cited in (Kohn, 1992) elaborated that despite the academic vague of cooperative learning and efforts at dissemination made by its proponents, it remains an instructional strategy seldom used in a systematic manner over the courses of school year or more.

"While there is a growing consensus among researchers about the positive effects of cooperative learning on student achievement as well as a rapidly growing number of educators using cooperative learning at all levels of schooling and in many subject areas, there is still a great deal of confusion and disagreement about why cooperative learning methods affect achievement and, even more importantly, under what conditions cooperative learning has these effects (Slavin, 1995).*"*

Furthermore, implementing cooperative learning in the classroom is more complex and demanding for the teacher, as well as the student (David Kaufman, 1997). In addition to this, as Paulsen and Faust (2008) cited in (Jones, 2008) note that there is still a resistance and hesitation in higher education to transform traditional college classes into cooperative learning environments. Similarly, the researcher also experienced that the cooperative learning strategies practical application in teaching learning process is not satisfactory. This implies as there is some gap between predetermined expectations and current practices. In order fill this gap, it is very important to conduct a research on cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University.

Therefore, this study is attempted to address the following basic questions:

- What is the current status of cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia?
- What are the major determinant factors affecting the practices of cooperative learning in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia?
- How cooperative learning practices will be improved for the future?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General objective
The main objective of this study is to assess the cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia.

1.3.2. Specific objective
The specific objectives of this study are:

- To identify the current status of cooperative learning practices in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia.
- To distinguish the major determinant factors affecting the practices of cooperative learning in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in Haramaya University, Ethiopia.
- To find alternative strategies used to improve the cooperative learning practices in higher education.

2. Research Design and Methodology

2.1 Description of Study Area

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences is one of the colleges in Haramaya University. It is found in the Main

Paper ID: SUB1433

3045

Campus, which is located at about 510 KM from the capital city of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa. The college has different undergraduate, masters and postgraduate diploma programs running under four varies departments such as Adult Education and Community Development, Educational Planning and Management, Psychology and Special Needs and Inclusive Education. In addition to this, it has Higher Diploma Training Center and English Language Improvement Center.

2.2. Research Methods

This study was employed in descriptive survey method. This method enable to investigate the current practice of cooperative learning in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences of Haramaya University through narration of events, comparison and drawing conclusion about the opinions, attitude and feelings based on the information secured from respondents.

2.3. Sources of Data

The primary sources of data are instructors and students. In order to supplement the data obtained from these primary sources, secondary sources of data such as guidelines, reports and other documents were utilized in this study.

2.4. Target population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

This study was conducted in College of Education and Behavioral Sciences of Haramaya University. The target population of this study includes college academic staffs (instructors) and regular undergraduate students. Regarding sample, all academic staff members was selected by using purposive sampling techniques since they have better insight about the cooperative learning practices in the college as well as manageable in size. There are about 248 undergraduate regular student populations in 2013/40 academic year in the college. Out of them about 50% percent were selected using quota sampling techniques since number of students in each department is not equal.

2.5 Data Collection Tools

The data collection tool of this study is questionnaire and observation.

2.6 Method of Data Analysis

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were utilized. The quantitative data collected from different respondents using questionnaire were organized, tabulated and analyzed by using frequency, percentage and mean as well as Friedman Mean Rank. In addition to this, qualitative data were analyzed by using narration in the way it supplement the quantitative analysis.

3. Results and Discussions

This part deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of quantitative and qualitative data collected from primary and secondary sources. A total of 154 questionnaires were distributed to the students and teachers. Out of these, about 150 of the questionnaires were returned after filled by respondents. This implies to the rate of return of the questioner was 94.4 percent.

It mainly focus on characteristics of respondents, the advantages of cooperative learning, Instructor's support in cooperative learning, problems in the practices of cooperative learning and alternative strategies used for improving the effectiveness of cooperative learning.

3.1. The characteristics of respondents

In this study there are two groups of respondents such as students and instructors. Regarding student respondents, 5 (five) personal information were collected through questionnaire which includes department, sex, age, level of study and average grade rank. Similarly, about four personal information of teacher respondent, such as department, sex, teaching experiences and academic rank were collected via questionnaire. This information presented as follows in the Table 1.

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

No	Characteristics	Respondents					
		Students (N=120)		Instructors (N=30)		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1	**Sex**						
	Male	61	50.8	27	90	88	58.7
	Female	59	49.2	3	10	62	41.3
2	**Age**						
	15-19	41	34.2	-	-	41	34.2
	20-24	74	61.7	-	-	74	61.7
	25 – 29	5	4.2	-	-	5	4.2
3	**Academic Rank**						
	Graduate Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Assist. Lecturer	-	-	5	16.7	5	16.7
	Lecturer	-	-	19	63.3	19	63.3
	Assist. Professor	-	-	6	20	6	20
	Associate Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	**Work Experiences**						
	1-5 Years	-	-	13	43.3	13	43.3
	6-10 Years	-	-	5	16.7	5	16.7
	11-15 Years	-	-	6	20	6	20
	Above 15 Years	-	-	6	20	6	20
5	**Level of study**						
	1st Year	71	59.2	-	-	71	59.2
	2nd Year	49	40.8	-	-	49	40.8
	3rd Year	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	**Department**						
	AECD	14	11.7	5	16.7	19	12.7
	EDPM	43	35.8	11	36.7	54	36
	Psychology	22	18.3	8	26.6	30	20
	SNIE	41	34.2	6	20	47	31.3
7	**Average Grade Point**						
	1.00-2.00	12	10.0			12	10.0
	2.00-3.00	68	56.7			68	56.7
	3.00-4.00	40	33.3			40	33.3
	Total	120	100	30	100	150	100

As item 1 of Table 1 indicates, the majority 88 (58.7%) of the respondents are male and the remaining 62 (41.3%) of

them are female. But, the number of females and male student respondents are almost the same with 50.8% and 49.2% respectively. This shows that there is a possibility of keeping gender balance while group formation to reduce dominance of male over female and the vice-versa.

As depicted in the item 2 of the same table, pertaining to student respondents' age, majority 74(61.7%) of them were found in between the age group of 20 to 24 and where as about 41(34.2%) of them were lies between age group of 15-19. The remaining 5(4.2%) of them were found between age group of 25-29. This implies that students were at a good age status to understand each other while they carry out their tasks by using cooperative learning.

As indicated in the item 3 of Table 1, regarding the instructors' academic rank, majority 19(63.3%) of them were Lecturer whereas the remaining 6(20%) and 5(16.7%) of them were Assistant Professors and Assistant Lecturer. This shows that the instructors were at a good academic status (rank) in order to provide several supports for their students in the implementation of cooperative learning in their courses.

As it can be seen from item 4 of Table 1, about 13(43.3%) of them have a work experience between 1-5 years where as 6(20%), 6(20%) and 3(16.7%) of them have a work experience above 15 years, between 11-15 years and between 6-10 years respectively. This implies that there are some instructors with less work experiences which may affect the effectiveness of cooperative learning in teaching-learning process.

As item 5 of Table 1 indicates, majority 71(59.2%) of the student respondents were 1st year and the remaining 49(40.8%) of them were second year students. This implies that the number of students in the first year is greater than the second year. However, the limited access and information about university environment influences the first year students in a properly working together in cooperative learning groups.

As shown in the item 6 of Table 1, respondents were asked about their departments. Accordingly, 54(36%) and 47(31.3%) of them are Educational Planning and Management and Special Needs and Inclusive Education Students where as 30(20%) and 19(12.7%) of them are Psychology and Adult Education and Community Development students. From researchers' observation point of views the number of students varies among departments due to number of intake as well as the last two programs were launched in 2012/13 academic year.

As indicated in the item 7 of Table 1, majority 68(56.7%) of the students respondents average grade point was found between 2.00 to 3.00. About 40(33.3%) of them were found at an average grade point of 3.00 to 4.00 where as 12(10%) of them were found at an average grade point of 1.00 to 2.00. This implies that the academic performances of most students were found at an average level which demands further emphasis on proper implementation of cooperative learning to improve the performance of students.

Therefore, from the above analysis, it could be safe to conclude that, even though there are limited experiences of students and instructors in university teaching-learning process, there are opportunities to learn from peers or colleagues. However, due to lack of proper interaction and experience sharing activities in the selected institutions the consciousness about cooperative learning is not as expected. This might be due to lack of attention and shortage of resources.

3.2 The Advantages of Cooperative Learning

Regarding the advantages of cooperative learning, about twelve variables were presented for the respondents to rate on the issues saying; strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). Moreover, in analyzing the results it was assumed that the mean values less than 1.5, equal and below 2.5, equal to or above 2.5 and below 3.5, equal or above 3.5 and below 4.5, and above 4.5 were respectively taken as strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree and strongly agree. Therefore based on the results in the mean value and average mean of each variables were computed and presented in Table 3 below, the analysis was presented following the table.

Table 2: Advantages of cooperative learning

No	Advantages of cooperative learning	Mean		
		Students (120)	Instructors (30)	Average
1.	It develop positive interdependence among students	3.53	3.80	3.7
2.	It enhances academic achievement of students	3.63	3.60	3.6
3.	It promote face-to-face interaction	3.89	3.67	3.8
4.	It improves communication skills	3.90	4.03	3.97
5.	It improves interpersonal skills	3.95	4.03	3.99
6.	It develop decision making skills	3.79	3.23	3.51
7.	It improves conflict management skills	3.54	3.73	3.64
8.	It develops team spirit and consensus building among students	3.57	3.73	3.65
9.	It develop the ability to work with diversified peoples	3.81	4.03	3.92
10.	It develops self-esteem of group members	3.70	3.40	3.55
11.	It gives equal opportunity for group members to succeed	3.58	3.23	3.41
12.	It develops critical thinking and reasoning skills	3.73	3.63	3.68
	Average Mean	3.72	3.68	3.70

As it is indicated in Table 2, the student respondents rate between 3.5 and 4.5 which pertain to 'agree' for all variables. In addition to this, instructor respondents rate between 3.5 and 4.5 for most items except item number 6, 10 and 11 with

mean value 3.23, 3.40 and 3.23 respectively which implies to 'undecided'. This implies that both student and instructor agree on the advantages of cooperative learning such as positive interdependence, enhance academic achievement, promote face-to-face interaction, improve communication skills, improve interpersonal skills, improve conflict management skills, develop team spirit, develop ability to work with diversified people and develop critical thinking and reasoning skills.

However, instructors response are 'undecided' with regard to whether cooperative learning develop decision making skills (mean-3.23), develop self esteem of group members (3.40) and gives equal opportunity for group members to succeed with mean value 3.23. This might be due to the limited experiences and lack of deep understanding that some instructor respondents have about the benefits of cooperative learning for students.

However, several research finding implies that cooperative learning as diversified benefits for students. For instance, cooperative learning is that it increases cognitive achievement, motivates students in their learning, increases academic performance and help social competence and skills that are required in the community and the world of work at large (Neo, 2005). In addition to this, working together to achieve common goal produces higher achievement and greater productivity than does working alone (Nebesniak, 2007).

3.3 Instructors' support in cooperative learning

Pertaining to the instructors' support in cooperative learning, about twelve variables were presented for the respondents to rate on the issues saying; strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). Moreover, in analyzing the results it was assumed that the mean values less than 1.5, equal and below 2.5, equal to or above 2.5 and below 3.5, equal or above 3.5 and below 4.5, and above 4.5 were respectively taken as strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree and strongly agree. Each variable were presented in Table 3 below, the analysis was presented following the table.

In the practices of cooperative learning the contribution of instructors are very important. Therefore, about nine expected support needs to provided by instructors were presented for both respondents. As indicated in Table 4, both respondents rated 'undecided' for almost all items except item number 1, 2 and 4.

Regarding item 1, student respondents rated 3.34 which imply 'undecided' where as instructors rated 3.53 that shows 'agree'. These may be implies that instructors are giving awareness about the values of cooperative learning but it is not sufficient. The second item stated about the group formation based on academic performance for which student respondents rated 3.58 i.e. agree and instructor respondents rated 2.9 i.e. undecided. This variation might be due to less attention instructors give for cooperative learning approach. The 4th item in the same table is about 'Instructors give challenging questions that leads to hot discussion and

debates' which is rated 3.09 by student respondents and 3.60 by instructors. This implies that, instructors are trying to give challenging questions for the groups so that they discuss and debate with each other for learning. But, there might not be consistencies among instructors.

Table 3: Instructors' support in cooperative learning

No.	Instructors' support in cooperative learning	Mean		
		Students (120)	Instructors (30)	Average Mean
1.	Instructors give awareness about the value of cooperative learning	3.34	3.53	3.41
2.	Instructors organize groups based on academic performance of students	3.58	2.93	3.25
3.	Instructors give clear responsibility for each group members	3.28	3.30	3.29
4.	Instructors give challenging questions that leads to hot discussion and debates	3.09	3.60	3.35
5.	Instructors frequently check the contribution of each group members	2.96	3.33	3.15
6.	Instructors give relevant feedback timely	3.16	3.20	3.18
7.	Instructors properly assess and give appropriate mark for each members	3.12	3.43	3.28
8.	Instructors give different responsibilities at different time in group work	3.30	3.47	3.39
9.	Instructors checked individual responsibility in group work	3.14	2.97	3.06
	Average Mean	3.22	3.31	3.26

Moreover, the average mean of these two groups of respondents implies that the contribution of instructors in the cooperative learning is not as expected. This may be due several problems of such as lack of knowledge and experiences on this approach, to lack of motivation, shortage of time, under-estimation of the values of cooperative learning and the etc.

However, several research findings imply that teachers play significant role for the success of cooperative learning. For instance, the study conducted by Johnson, (1987) as cited in (Wang T.-P., 2007) stated that successful cooperative learning contains two factors (a) the teacher first task is to induce students to produce active learning (b) teachers have to provide necessary proficient knowledge, and induce to work harder cooperatively; before the class the teacher should offer designs and arrangement of curriculum.

3.4 Problems in cooperative learning practices

The practices of cooperative learning may not be free of problems. Several research findings indicated that there are several challenges in cooperative learning practices. For instance, students developed in a very competitive environment as well as students who have poorly developed social and emotional skills consider cooperative learning activities as a treat or challenging (F. Ashman, 2003).

In this study, in order to indentify the problems and also to distinguish to what extent these problems are affecting cooperative learning practices, about eighteen variables were presented for the respondents to rate on the issues saying; strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5). Moreover, in analyzing the results it was assumed that the mean values less than 5, equal to or above 5 and below 10, equal to or above 10 were respectively taken as minor problem, medium problem and serious problems. Therefore, based on Friedman mean rank results each variable were presented in Table 4 below, the analysis was presented following the table.

Table 4: Problems in cooperative learning practices

No	Expected problems in cooperative learning practices	Friedman Mean Rank	
		Students (120)	Instructors (30)
1.	Lack of awareness about cooperative learning	9.02	11.72
2.	Lack of students motivation to work in group	10.01	11.72
3.	Unwillingness of instructors to practice cooperative learning	7.86	8.72
4.	Unequal sharing of work among group members	8.98	9.83
5.	Poor coordination of group member contributions	9.20	9.48
6.	Students do not want to be accountable for learning of their group members	9.41	9.92
7.	Shortage of reference materials	9.93	11.37
8.	Absence of clear procedure for monitoring group work	9.76	9.68
9.	Too large group size	8.71	8.75
10.	Lack of experiences in cooperative learning	9.97	9.47
11.	Poor English language abilities of students	10.62	10.78
12.	Some group members dominate over the other in group work	10.55	10.33
13.	Shortage of time	11.06	8.00
14.	Insufficient support and follow-up from instructors	9.58	10.12
15.	Over use or excessive usage of cooperative learning	8.25	6.38
16.	Uncomfortable seating arrangement	8.67	8.07
17.	Relevant feedback is not given on time	10.24	8.70
18.	Unfair assessment result for group work	9.17	7.97

As indicated in Table 4, from about eighteen expected problems in cooperative learning both students and instructors rated as 'serious problems' on item number 2, 11 and 12 with ranked mean value of 10.01, 10.62 and 10.53; 11.72, 10.78 and 10.35 respectively. This implies that lack of students' motivation to work in group, poor English language abilities of students and dominance of some group members over the other in group work are the major problems hindering the practices of cooperative learning.

Regarding impacts of students' motivation on learning, Rhem (1995) as cited in (J.Millis, 2009) stated that deep learning in cooperative learning depends on motivational context. Courses that remove these take away the sense of ownership and kill one of the strongest elements in lasting learning.

In addition to this, student responds also rated 'serious problem' for item number 13 and 17 with mean value 11.06 and 10.24. This implies that shortage of time and relevant feedback is not given on time are serious problems hindering students while they are trying to practice cooperative learning. On the other hand, lack of awareness about cooperative learning (mean-11.72), shortage of reference material (mean-11.37) and insufficient support and follow-up from instructors (mean-10.12) were also other serious problems for instructors.

As depicted in the same table, the remaining items such as 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 18 mean value is between equal or above 5 and below 10 which implies as 'medium problems. According to this, unwillingness of instructors to practice cooperative learning, unequal sharing of work among group members, poor coordination of group members contributions, students do not want to be accountable for learning of their group members, absence of clear procedure for monitoring group work, too large group size, lack of experiences in cooperative learning, overuse or excessive usage of cooperative learning, uncomfortable seating arrangement and unfair assessment result for group work are also problems even though it is not very serious.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

The knowledge, skills and experiences of the instructors and students matter for effectiveness of the practices of cooperative learning practices. However, it was found out that the current awareness of instructors and students are not up to the expectation. Therefore, it was suggested that College of Education and Behavioral Sciences in collaboration with other stakeholder should have to provide continuous and relevant training for all students and instructors.

The availability and accessibility of instructional materials are mandatory for the success of teaching learning process. Cooperative learning approach demands several materials such as reference books, laboratory facilities and equipments used in field practices. However, this study found out that there are shortages of instructional materials. Therefore, Ministry of Education, Haramaya University, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences and other stakeholders need to give attention for properly identifying and fulfilling necessary instructional materials and other facilities to

maximize learning opportunities for students through cooperative approach.

Students' motivation for learning and instructors motivation for teaching by using cooperative learning approach improves the success of learners and educators. However, this study was found out that especially students have less motivation for learning and also instructors' motivation is below the expected status. Therefore, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Departments, Instructors and student themselves need to develop and implement strategies through which the motivation of both groups will improved for the betterment of their performance.

The science of pedagogy promotes using several methods of teaching in order to address differences in content, student ability and interest, facilities and existing situation in and outside of the classroom. However, in this study it was found out that under cooperative learning: group discussion in the class-room and paper based group assignment are mostly practicing. This contributed for unwillingness of instructors and students to continue practicing this limited aspects of cooperative learning. Therefore, it was suggested that departments should have to empower instructors through training and experience sharing so that they can use multiple strategies included under cooperative learning.

Leaders' follow-up and support enable the implementation of cooperative learning more effective. However, this study was found out that leaders' follow-up and support for both students and instructors is not satisfactory. Therefore, leaders at University, College and Department Levels should have to give more attention as well as timely provide necessary support for instructors and students. In addition to this, they should have to make necessary follow-up from time to time to easily identify the gap and take remedial action for its improvement.

Reference

[1] Dionigi, A. H. (2013). Implementing Cooperative Learning in Australian primary Schools: Generalist teachers' perspectives. *Issues in Educational Research: Vol.23, No.1* , 52-68.

[2] Asefa, M. (2000). Community-based education: Concept and practice. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Development* , 4, 227-237.

[3] Atkins, C. J. (2000). Community Based Education. *School Community Journal* , 121-126.

[4] Cavanagh M. (2011). Students' Experience of Active Engagement through cooperative learning activities in lectures. *Active Learning in Higher Education. Vol. 2* , 23-33.

[5] Cheong, C. (2010). Fromoup-based Learning to Cooperative Learning: A Metacognitive Approach to Project-based Group Supervision. *International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline. Vol.13* , 73-86.

[6] Costley, C. (2000). Organizational and employee interests in programs of work based learning. *The learning Organization. Vol.8 No. 2; ABI/INFORM GLOBAL* , 58.

[7] David Kaufman, E. S. (1997). Three Approaches to Cooperative Learning in Higher Education. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education. Vol.XXVII, Nos. 2, 3* , 37-66.

[8] David W. Johnson, R. T. (2007). The State of Cooperative Learning in Postsecondary and Professional Settings. *Springer: Educational Psychology Review* , 15-29.

[9] Dionigi, A. H. (2013). Implementing Cooperative Learning in Australian Primary Schools: Generalist teachers' perspectives. *Issues in Education Research. Vol. 23 No. 1* , 52-68.

[10] E.Slavin, R. (1995). *Research on Cooperative Learning and Achivement: What we know, what we need to know.* -: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at risk: Johns Hopkins University.

[11] F. Ashman, R. M. (2003). *The Social and Intellectual outcomes of learning in groups.* London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer: Taylor and Francis Group.

[12] Gerhard Fischer, M. R. (2007). Community Based Learning:The core competency of residential, research-based. *International Journal on Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning* , -.

[13] Herman Miller. (2006). *Paradigm Shift: How Higher Education Is Improving Learning.* Herman Miller.

[14] J.Millis, B. (2009). *Becoming an Effective Teacher Using Cooperative Learning: A Personal Odyssey.* Texas-San Antonio: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

[15] Jon Yoder, M. W. (2007). *Community-based Education: Model Programs.* Oregon: Northwest Center for Sustainable Resources. Chemeketa Community College.

[16] Kohn, A. (1992). Resistance to Cooperative Learning: Making sense of its deletion and dilution. *Journal of Education. Volume 174, No. 2* , 38-56.

[17] Kristie, L. R. (2003). *The Influence of Cooperative Learning on Academic Performance and Students' Perception of the Educational Benefits of the Peer Collaboration in Sub-urban, Ninth Grade Global studies Course.* Michigan : Wayne State University-Unpublished Master's Project.

[18] Ledlow, S. (1999). *Cooperative Learning in Higher Education.* Arizona: Center for Learning and Teaching Excellence: Arizona State University.

[19] Li, M. &. (2013). *Cooperative Learning.* Hong Kong: The Hong Kong Institute of Education.

[20] Macpherson, A. (2007). *A cooperative Learning Group Activities for College Instructors: A Guide for Instructors.* -: Kwantlen University College.

[21] Millis, B. J. (2002). *Enhancing Learning and More Through Cooperative Learning.* Manhattan, Kansas: U.S.Air Force Academy: Idea Center .

[22] Mishra, S. (2006). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An Introduction.* Bangalore, India: NAAC & COL: National Printing Press.

[23] Mohi Eldin, M. H. (2000). A Taxonomy of Community Based Medical education. *Academic Medicine, Vol.75 No. 7 July/2000* , 699 - 707.

[24] Mpofu, R. &. (2006). The development of an instrument for assessing community-based education of undergraduate students of community and health sciences at the University of the Western Cape.

Education for Health (Abingdon, England) , 19(2), 166-178.

[25] Nebesniak, A. (2007). *Using Cooperative Learning to Promote a Problem-Solving Classroom.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

[26] Neo, M. (2005). Engaging Students in Group-based Cooperative Learning- A Malaysian Perspective. *Educational Technology and Society. Vol. 8 No. 4* , 220-232.

[27] Nuntrakune, T. (2008). *Cooperative Learning in Thailand: Professional Development to Enhance Primary Education.* Queesland, Australia: Center for Learning Innovation. Faculty of Education: Queesland University of Technology.

[28] OECD. (2008). *Learning Our Lesson: Review of Quality Teaching in Higher Education.* Unknown: Institutional Management in Higher Education.

[29] Oregon University . (2013, 05 16). *Teaching and Learning Center.* Retrieved April 19, 2014, from Teaching Effectiveness Program: http://tep.uoregon.edu/resources/librarylinks/articles/nou secooplearn.html

[30] Peterson, P. G. (1999). *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challege and National Response.* Annapolis Junction : Institute of International Education and Boston College Center for International Higher Education.

[31] Robinson, A. (1991). *Cooperative learning and the Academically Talented Students.* Little Rock, Arkansas: University of Arkansas at Little Rock: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

[32] Robyn M. Gillies, M. B. (2010). Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of Implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education. Vol. 26* , 933-940.

[33] Roseveare, F. H. (2012). *Fostering Quality Teaching in Higher Education: Policies and Practices.* OECD: IMHE.

[34] Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: What We Know, What We Need to Know.* Johns Hopkins University: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

[35] W.Johnson, R. T. (1994). An Overview of Cooperative Learning. In A. a. J.Thousands, *Creativity and Collaborative Learning* (pp. 1-21). Baltimore: Brookes Press.

[36] Wang, T. R. (1996). *Community-Based Learning: A Foundation for Meaningful Educational Reform. School Improvement Research Series.* -: Unpublished Research Report.

[37] Wang, T.-P. (2007). The Comparison of the Difficulties between Cooperative Learning and Traditional Teaching Methods in College English Teachers. *The Journal of Human* Resource *and Adult Learning. Volume 3, No.2* , 23-30.