









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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 identify 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*. Queensland, Australia: Center for Learning Innovation. Faculty of Education: Queensland 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](http://tep.uoregon.edu/resources/librarylinks/articles/nou_secooplearn.html)
- [30] Peterson, P. G. (1999). *Higher Education in the 21st Century: Global Challenge 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.