



Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review (ISSN: 2315-5132) Vol. 8(2) pp. 013-024, November, 2019
Available online <http://garj.org/garjerr/index.htm>
Copyright © 2019 Global Advanced Research Journals

Full Length Research Paper

The Impact of Implementing the Cooperative Learning Method on Improving the Writing Skill as Perceived by EFL Learners at the Arab American University Palestine

Mujahed Hossien Tahir Zayed

Arab American University Palestine
Email: Mujahed_aauj@yahoo.com and mujaheed.zayed@aaup.edu

Accepted 29 November, 2019

This study aimed at identifying the attitudes of EFL learners at the Arab American University Palestine (AAUP) towards implementing Cooperative learning method in writing classes. To this end, the author surveyed the opinions of 179 students (68 females, 111 males) using a questionnaire developed according to a 5-point Likert Scale. Cronbach Alpha formula was used to determine the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS. A descriptive analysis was made to measure the target students' attitudes (and thus the percentages, means and standard deviations of the gathered data). Gender differences were also considered via an independent T- test. In addition, the One Way ANOVA test was carried out to identify whether there were statistically significant differences among EFL learners' attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method due to their year of study. The study found that EFL learners at (AAUP) have positive attitudes towards implementing Cooperative learning method in writing classes, with no gender differences and there were statistically significant differences among the first year and second year students for the second year students.

Keywords: EFL, cooperative learning, learning method, writing skills, EFL learners.

INTRODUCTION

In learning a foreign language, writing is a skill of language that has always been considered problematic among the other language skills (i.e. reading, speaking and listening). It is not only to the learners who learn it, but also to the teachers who teach it (Kustati & Yuhardi, 2014). EFL learners have problems in fulfilling the requirements of writing due to low proficiency of the language, lack of knowledge regarding English vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and punctuation as well as they sometimes lack of interest in writing as a subject (Karim, 2012). English teachers at usually the problem of choosing suitable teaching methods to overcome writing concerns in their students, especially in Palestine where English is treated as a foreign language.

Many educators have provided definitions for cooperative learning (CL). Firestone (2018) highlights cooperative learning is held in a mixed-ability class where classmates are divided into groups and rewarded according to the group efforts rather than individual member's success.

Cooperative learning has emerged over the past ten years as one of the learner-centered methods of language teaching. According to Millis (2010), many experts agree that cooperative learning has many components that distinguish it from other small group learning including collaborative learning. Olsen (2018) mentions many benefits for using cooperative learning strategies such as funny, interactive and developing

critical thinking. Harmer (2004: 3-4) states that "being able to write is a vital skill for "speakers" of a foreign language as much as for everyone using their own first language. Training students write thus demands the care and attention of language teachers".

Statement of the Problem

Students have been noticed to be facing various difficulties in foreign language learning, especially in writing classes. An overloaded lecture room might not allow a student to get enough opportunities to interact using the target language for communicating his/her ideas and maintain peers' comments and participations. As a matter of fact, the strong students might write accurately whereas the weak students are hesitant, do not try or even lack knowledge needed to carry out writing tasks. Furthermore, some students showed limited social relationships with other classmates, which might make them feel lonely. As a rule of thumb, such conditions are in crucial need for the cooperative learning method in learning writing. Thus, in a way or another, learners will be brought all to work together.

Purpose of the Study

The study at hand aims at investigating the effectiveness of the cooperative learning method in enhancing students' writing skill in EFL writing classes at the Arab American University Palestine, as well as exploring the attitudes of the learners towards using cooperative learning during the writing lectures.

Significance of the Study

This present study is meant to provide an insight for a writing learning method for students, give some contribution to English as Foreign Language teachers in the field of teaching and research to solve certain problems related to teaching and learning methods and to be a basis for the next researchers to conduct further research.

Research Questions

This study is conducted to answer the following questions:

1. What is the overall attitude of EFL learners at the Arab American University of Palestine (AAUP) towards the use of the Cooperative Learning method to enhance their writing skills?
2. Are there any statistically significant gender differences among EFL learners at the Arab American

University of Palestine (AAUP) towards the use of the Cooperative Learning method to enhance their writing skills?

3. Are there any statistically significant differences among EFL learners at the Arab American University of Palestine (AAUP) due to year of study towards using the Cooperative Learning method to enhance their writing skills?

Hypotheses of the Study

- There are no significant differences at the $\alpha = .05$ in the mean scores of AAUP EFL learners' attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill as demonstrated in their Positive Interaction, individual and group accountability, face to face interaction, interpersonal and small group skills and group processing aspects.
- There are no significant gender differences at the $\alpha = .05$ in the mean scores of AAUP EFL learners' attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill.
- There are no significant differences in the mean scores of AAUP EFL learners' attitudes due to year of study towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill.

Definitions of Terms

- **EFL:** English as a Foreign Language.
- **cooperative learning:** a method where students work in small groups and are given rewards and recognition based on their groups' performance (Slavin, 1980).

Limitations of the Study

The scope of the study at hand is restricted to students of Intermediate English at AAUP for the fall semester 2019/2020.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of implementing the Cooperative learning method in writing classes is becoming important in the entire world, especially Palestine and the Arab countries. Hence, researchers started to show great interest in this field. In the studies conducted so far, the effects of Cooperative Learning (CL) on EFL learners have been found to be positive in different areas and in various

subjects, such as writing and reading comprehension. As for learners, they have also shown positive attitudes towards CL method.

Keiko Hirose (2008) conducted a study on cooperative learning in English writing instruction through feedback. His study aimed to explore how Japanese university students with no prior peer feedback experience interacted with each other using peer feedback in a semester-long English writing course. The participants of his study were 15 Japanese university students (1 male and 14 female) in an intact English writing class taught by the author himself. They were fourth-year students (age=22) whose major was not English, it was French, Spanish, German, or Chinese, in the Faculty of Foreign Studies. A pre-course questionnaire ensured that no students had previously experienced peer feedback activities as implemented in the course. This researcher found out that through cooperative learning students were able to interact with each other in such a dynamic way. Not only that, they also engaged in various positive interactions during the teaching and learning process. These findings of this study were clearly reflected on students' written and spoken feedback data. The students' feedback covered multiple functions such as asking questions, giving additional related information, making suggestions, and reacting to numerous aspects of their peers' compositions. The results also suggest that peer feedback is a promising activity for students to work cooperatively, benefit from each other, and improve their writing, or more broadly, communication skills in English.

Yusuf Q., Josoh Z. and Yusuf Y. (2019) also conducted a research paper on Cooperative Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learners. Their research paper investigated the effects of CL to improve the writing skill of ninth grade students in a middle school in Kuala Lumpur. It used the quasi experimental design, with pre-test and posttest of the narrative essays as the instruments. The data collected were further analyzed by employing descriptive and inferential statistics. The students' writings were scored on the five writing components; they are vocabulary, organization, grammatical accuracy and mechanics. The results of this study showed that the students had increased in their writing scores from the pre-test to the post test after the application of CL in the class. Eventually, the results indicate positive effects of CL in improving the writing skill of students at the school, and they are also discussed in the paper.

Mahmoud M. (2014) studied Cooperative language learning (CLL) approach to encourage second-year university students at the college of languages and translation, at Al-Imam University to learn from their peers so that they could enhance their writing skills. The samples for his study included one group of EFL second-year students (20 students) from Al-Imam University, College of Languages and Translation. The author of this study mentions that It was unavailable for him to select

other sections as he was responsible for teaching only one section. Students in CLL-based groups were trained to be more responsible for their learning through developing their personal interaction as well as their linguistic competence in a more relaxed social context. This treatment included second year students enrolled in EN 211 course in the second semester of 2013 academic year. The researcher used two instruments in this study; a pre-post writing test, and an attitude questionnaire. The pre- and post- scores from the test were calculated for descriptive statistics and compared using a Wilcoxon Test. The process of evaluating students' writings focused mainly on analyzing their mistakes with regard to spelling, using of vocabulary, grammar, punctuation as well as coherence. The findings of this study revealed that the students' scores in writing were higher for the post-test than the pre-test at the significance level of 0.01 after being subject to this kind of treatment. However, the author stated that the degree of improvement was not extremely high as students made some mistake regarding the previously mentioned points. As for the attitude scale, the obtained results of this study proved that the students developed positive attitudes towards using the cooperative learning approach to develop language skills in general and to develop their writing skills in particular.

Another study conducted by Ali W. (2017) focused on assessing whether or not there were significant differences between male and female students' attitudes towards cooperative learning (CL) in learning writing skills based on English for Ethiopia Grade Seven Pupil's Book. This study involved ninety students who were attending their lessons at the same school. The data for this study were gathered through questionnaires. In order to see the actual happening and to triangulate the findings of the questionnaires, interviews were conducted and classrooms were observed. The results of the study showed that the students who were administered questionnaires and interviewed understood the benefits of using CL during writing though the number of students in each class was large, and the students had poor background knowledge of English language. The classroom observations proved that the number of students in each class was large; the teachers could not follow up and monitor their learners appropriately while the students were working on the writing tasks in groups; the students frequently used their mother tongues rather than English during group discussions; the teachers did not set a time limit for the discussions, and there was no practice of evaluating the writing group activities after CL. Moreover, the mean results of this study indicated that female students had better attitudes towards CL in learning writing skills. However, their difference is not statistically significant. The summary of the findings indicated that the writing lessons in the students' English textbook should be taught through CL though there were some problems that have been mentioned above to

practice them in the classrooms.

As for Stain P. (2011), he did a research paper on improving Writing Ability through cooperative learning strategy. The objective of this study was to improve the students' writing ability in writing English class using Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) model of Cooperative learning strategy. This study employed Classroom Action Research (CAR) design. The subjects of the study were the fifth semester students of the English Department of Malang Muhammadiyah University. The numbers of the subjects were 5 students. This study was conducted in two cycles with 4 steps of classroom action research procedure: planning, implementing, observing and reflection. Each cycle had two meetings. The result of the study showed that Cooperative learning strategy with Cooperative Integrated reading and Composition (CIRC) model was effective to improve the students' writing ability that could be seen from the improvement of the students' writing achievement.

Mohammad H. (2018) has conducted another study to investigate Kordofan University (in Sudan) EFL students' views on learning writing skills through cooperative strategies. This research adopted both descriptive and analytical methods and a questionnaire was employed for data collection. A random sample of (41) EFL learners out of (55), in the Faculty of Education, responded to the questionnaire. Frequencies and percentage values were utilized for data analysis. The study has found that the majority of the participants were in favor of cooperative writing learning strategies via positive interactions, individual accountability and group processing.

In her thesis, Ait L. (2017/2018), conducted a study which examined the effect of cooperative learning strategies on 3rd year students' writing skill. The population of the study involved EFL students of 3rd year at the University of A-Mira Bejaia, Faculty of Arts and Languages, Department of English. In fact, all groups which represented the whole population were asked to answer the pre-post questionnaire. The population encompassed 6 groups of 31 students. The sample of this study consisted of one group. The group was composed of 31 students, but only 28 attended their writing classes regularly. The aim of this study was to show whether the implementation of cooperative learning strategies enhances students' writing skill or not and what were the students' perceptions toward collaborative writing at the University of A-Mira, department of English. The research adopted questionnaires (pre-post) and students' essays throughout the experiment. Accordingly, the results demonstrate that the students after the experiment made a progress in their writing. Moreover, CL strategies motivated students to write better. So, the results confirmed the hypothesis that the students write better in collaboration after the experiment in which these strategies created a comfortable atmosphere for both the skilled and the unskilled students.

In their study, Fujiwara Y. and Sato E. (2014), aimed to incorporate cooperative learning into a writing activity to promote student fluency and gain their confidence toward writing. A total of 57 participants who took a course on Science English as ESP answered pre- and post-task questionnaires related to a short video-clip description task with their peers. The results from the questionnaires indicated that cooperative learning had a positive influence on their attitude toward writing ability/activity.

Ahangari S. and Samadian Z. (2014) investigated the impact of cooperative learning through Learning Together Model, proposed by Johnson and Johnson in 1987, on the writing skills of Iranian EFL learners. Thirty learners who were selected based on their English proficiency scores participated in this study. The students were divided into two groups of experimental and control that took a pre-test and post-test in writing. The results of comparing their pre-test with their post-test scores indicated statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups on the dependent variable and lent empirical support to the language teachers using cooperative learning as their teaching system. Some pedagogical implications can be offered as the results of the study. Language teachers, by using cooperative learning techniques, can create an enjoyable class of maximized participation and outcome. EFL learners, in a cooperative learning environment, can also explore the language knowledge that they want to master.

For the sake of constructing a writing class using the Cooperative Learning method, Johnson and Johnson (2009) outline five fundamental elements of Cooperative Learning as described below:

1. Positive Interdependence: team members depend on each other to accomplish the group's task. Every student has to contribute with his or her own ideas, and share responsibility of doing good work.

2. Individual and Group Accountability: each member of the team shall be responsible for contributing his or her own part of the work and understand all the details to be learnt for the success of the group. The work of each and every individual must be evaluated and the result is given back to the group.

3. Face to Face Promoting Interaction: this focusses on small group interaction. Despite the fact that some tasks are completed individually, group members at the same time play a vital role by providing each other with regular feedback, challenging reasoning and conclusions, supporting and encouraging one another to achieve the goal of the group.

4. Interpersonal and Small Group Skills: these are, in fact, the basic skills in group-work. Group members have to learn interpersonal skill such as active learning, staying on task, raising questions, encouraging each other, helping other members in order to simplify teamwork, create confidence and improve communication.

Table 1 Distribution of the population of the study

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	475	43
Female	629	57
Total	1104	100

Table 2 Distribution of the sample of the study

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	68	38
Female	111	62
Total	179	100

5. Group Processing: this reflects on a group session to say whether actions of a member were really helpful or unhelpful and make decisions about what actions to continue with or change. It also helps to improve self-esteem and positive attitudes towards the learning process.

Research Methodology

This section focuses on the procedures adopted in the study to present students' attitudes towards using cooperative learning method in writing lectures. In other words, it outlines the sample, tools of data collection and the statistical measurements for data analysis.

Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised (1104) students studying the Intermediate English Course at AAUP for the Fall Semester 2019/2020. The distribution of population of the study is shown in Table (1) above.

A simple random sample, selected by drawing numbers, comprised 173 (58 females and 115 males) law students as shown in Table (2) above.

Instrument of the Study

In order to determine EFL students' attitudes about implementing Cooperative Learning in writing classes and its impact on developing their writing skill, a questionnaire was administered to them. It contained 26 statements. This tool maintained validity and reliability. That is to say, all the questionnaire items are greatly focused and covered the five essential elements of Cooperative Learning. In addition, a common scale to measure person's reaction to something is the Likert scale which is graded as 1. Strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. Neutral 4. agree and 5. Strongly agree. Therefore, the questionnaire employed both content and construction validity. It is important to say that the researcher used

tables and percentage values to display, analyze and interpret the gathered information.

The means were transferred into percentages. The researcher adopted reliable formula to interpret the results of this study taking the following scale (Azzam F. 2018):

- (80 % and above) very high
- (70 - 79.9 %) high
- (60 - 69.9 %) fair
- (50 - 59.9 %) low
- (less than 50 %) very low

Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of the study was tested by using the Alpha Cronbach formula which yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.85, which is significant and acceptable for the purpose of the study.

Validity of the Instrument

In order to investigate the validity of the instrument, the questionnaire was given to two TEFL experts from the Arab American University Palestine. They suggested some amendments and the questionnaire was modified accordingly. To ensure its validity, the questionnaire was piloted prior to carrying out the main study. Responding to the outcome from the pilot study, some of the terms were amended to make them more comprehensible for Intermediate English level students.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the sake of answering the first question of the study, the researcher examined the null hypothesis: "There are no significant differences at the $\alpha = .05$ in the mean scores of AAUP EFL learners' attitudes towards the impact of implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill as demonstrated in their Positive Interaction, individual and group accountability,

Table 3 Students' Attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill

No	Elements of Cooperative Learning	Std. Deviation	Mean	Percentage
1	Face to Face Promoting Interaction	.44183	4.4972	89.94
2	Group Processing	.46544	4.3128	86.26
3	Positive Interaction	.66812	4.2142	84.28
4	Interpersonal and Small Group Skills	.50064	4.0095	80.19
5	Individual and Group Accountability	.46948	3.8793	77.59
	Overall Attitudes	0.509102	4.1826	83.652

Table 4 The participants' responses to the "positive interaction" element

No.	Item of the questionnaire	Std. Deviation	Mean	Percentage
2	I prefer to write in a group with my classmates.	.80789	4.2570	85.14
1	In cooperative writing activities, I feel much more relaxed than writing individually.	.85519	4.2570	85.14
3	I prefer to discuss my writing mistakes with my classmates.	.93028	4.1285	82.57
Total Degree		0.864453	4.21	84.28333

face to face interaction, interpersonal and small group skills and group processing aspects." The authors analyzed the data using means, standard deviations and percentages.

Students' Attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill

The result of this descriptive analysis shows that the overall mean score of EFL learners' attitudes at AAUP towards the impact of implementing cooperative learning method on developing their writing skill in the five elements of cooperative learning is 4.182 (SD 0.509). This mean score is equivalent to 83.65 %, which is a very high according to the scale adopted by the researcher to interpret the results of this study. The details are shown in Table (3).

This result reveals that the participants have positive attitudes towards the impact of implementing cooperative learning method on developing their writing skill. These results are in line with most of the previous studies mentioned in the literature review which confirmed that the cooperative learning method has a positive effect on improving the students' writing skill.

The positive interaction element towards implementing cooperative learning method on developing the writing skill

The positive interaction element represents a high mean score (4.21, with a standard deviation of 0.668), this

mean score is equivalent to (84.28 %) which indicates that the participants have very high positive attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method on developing their writing skill as shown in Table 4.

The items with the same highest mean were "I prefer to write in a group with my classmates" and "In cooperative writing activities, I feel much more relaxed than writing individually" (4.25). The lowest item was "I prefer to discuss my writing mistakes with my classmates" (4.12). This shows that EFL learners at AAUP prefer and feel much more relaxed in learning writing cooperatively.

The "individual and group accountability" element towards implementing cooperative learning method on developing the writing skill

The individual and group accountability" element represents the lowest mean score of attitudes of EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the cooperative learning method in writing classes (M=3.879, SD =.469). This mean score is equivalent to (77.59 %) which is high according to the scale adopted for the interpretation of the results of this study. The majority of the respondents showed positive attitude in individual and group accountability as shown in Table (5).

The results suggest that EFL learners at AAUP are highly motivated to cooperate in order to achieve the writing tasks assigned to the group together and each group member is fully willing to achieve the task assigned to him / her while having various roles each time they do writing activities cooperatively. Some students highly emphasized the idea of having defined part of the writing task and fairly the success of the group's work is an

Table 5 The participants' responses to the "individual and group accountability" element

No.	Items of the questionnaire	Std. Deviation	Mean	Percentage
4	My classmates and I help each other to achieve the writing task assigned to the group.	.58366	4.4749	89.50
8	I, as a member of a group, produce my own writing task in cooperative writing activities.	.92099	4.1061	82.12
7	I, as a member of a group, do various roles in the group such as writing drafts, leading the group or coordination among the members.	.84377	4.0391	80.78
6	In cooperative writing activities, I have a defined part of the writing task.	.86184	3.6592	73.18
5	My writing's success depends on the success of the writing of all the group members.	1.15762	3.1173	62.35
Total degree		0.873576	3.87932	77.586

Table 6 The participants' responses to the "Face to Face Promoted Interaction" element

No.	Items of the questionnaire	Std. Deviation	Mean	Percent age
9	I respect and listen to the members' writing participations.	.58880	4.6983	93.97
10	I communicate better with other students and benefit from their writing ideas because of Direct interaction.	.66467	4.4749	89.50
11	My classmates and I make the writing exercises easier to each other Cooperative writing activities.	.69042	4.3184	86.37
Total Degree		0.647963	4.4972	89.94667

Table 7 The participants' responses to the "Interpersonal and Small Group Skills" element

No.	Items of the questionnaire	Std. Deviation	Mean	Percentage
12	I find writing cooperatively motivating.	.72371	4.4078	88.16
14	I feel much more encouraged to use English when other group members use it in writing activities.	.77246	4.3408	86.82
15	I get much more accurate ideas than mine when I write in a group.	.80126	4.1788	83.58
20	In cooperative learning, I get chances to evaluate other members and they also evaluate me.	.77189	4.0726	81.45
13	In cooperation, I get more chances to use English language.	.93556	3.9665	79.33
21	I feel comfortable to express my ideas in cooperative writing activities.	1.01724	3.8994	77.99
18	In cooperative work, I am much more capable of organizing my ideas in writing.	.93851	3.8659	77.32
19	Cooperative learning helps me develop the self-evaluation skill.	1.01179	3.8547	77.09
16	Cooperative learning enhances my spelling.	1.01964	3.7765	75.53
17	Cooperative learning helps me correct my punctuation mistakes.	1.00316	3.7318	74.64
Total Degree		0.899522	4.00948	80.191

Table 8 The participants' responses to the "Group Processing" element

No.	Items of the questionnaire	Std. Deviation	Mean	Percentage
24	The strong students help the weak students to write in group learning.	.72028	4.4525	89.05
25	In group work, I support the others and benefit from them in writing and they do the same.	.61869	4.4413	88.83
26	In Cooperative writing activities, I get more chances to ask other members questions about writing.	.72402	4.2961	85.92
22	It is easier for us to solve writing difficulties in cooperative writing activities.	.81277	4.2737	85.47
23	I simplify understanding the writing activities to my classmates and they do the same.	.66277	4.1006	82.01
Total Degree		0.707706	4.31284	86.256

Table 9 Results

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
positive interaction	Male	68	4.2500	.67991	.08245
	Female	111	4.1922	.66294	.06292
individual and group accountability	Male	68	3.9382	.44822	.05436
	Female	111	3.8432	.48046	.04560
face to face promoting interaction	Male	68	4.4363	.48955	.05937
	Female	111	4.5345	.40770	.03870
interpersonal and small group skills	Male	68	3.9603	.48841	.05923
	Female	111	4.0396	.50781	.04820
group processing	Male	68	4.2235	.46812	.05677
	Female	111	4.3676	.45730	.04340
M total	Male	68	4.1617	.35777	.04339
	Female	111	4.1954	.37974	.03604

indication for the success of each member of the group. That is, the mean score of items 4, 8, 5, 6 and 7 (which represent the individual and group accountability) is (3.879) (SD .873) knowing that the mean scores of items (4, 8 and 7) were very high, the mean score of item (6) was high and the mean score of item (5) was fair according to the scale adopted in this study. This indicates the positive attitudes of EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the cooperative learning method in writing classes. More specifically, the differences in the mean scores of the five items underline the importance of cooperative learning method in writing activities. According to EFL learners at AAUP, the cooperative learning method is a source for the sense of individual responsibility, source of group solidarity and building cooperation.

The "Face to Face Promoted Interaction" element towards implementing cooperative learning method on developing the writing skill

The overwhelming majority of the respondents emphasize that face to face interaction helps them to interact and communicate with each other.

Moreover, all statements (9, 10 and 11) were confirmed by the participants, i.e., the learners stated that they listen and respect the opinions of each other with mean score of (4.69) for item (9), participants stated that direct interaction helps them benefit from each other with a mean score of (4.47) for item (10) and they believe that every student makes the writing task easier to other member of the group with a mean score of (4.31) for item (11), which in turn indicates that group work facilitates the

Table 10 Independent Samples Test Results

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
positive interaction	Equal variances assumed	.006	.938	.561	177	.576	.05781	.10309	-.14563-	.26125	
	Equal variances not assumed			.557	139.044	.578	.05781	.10372	-.14726-	.26288	
individual and group accountability	Equal variances assumed	.853	.357	1.317	177	.190	.09499	.07215	-.04739-	.23738	
	Equal variances not assumed			1.339	149.424	.183	.09499	.07095	-.04521-	.23519	
face to face promoting interaction	Equal variances assumed	2.603	.108	-1.449-	177	.149	-.09826-	.06783	-.23212-	.03560	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.387-	122.555	.168	-.09826-	.07087	-.23854-	.04202	
interpersonal and small group skills	Equal variances assumed	.008	.927	-1.029-	177	.305	-.07935-	.07708	-.23147-	.07278	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.039-	146.097	.300	-.07935-	.07636	-.23026-	.07157	
group processing	Equal variances assumed	.054	.817	-2.027-	177	.044	-.14404-	.07106	-.28427-	-.00381-	
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.016-	139.248	.046	-.14404-	.07146	-.28533-	-.00275-	
M total	Equal variances assumed	.047	.828	-.590-	177	.556	-.03377-	.05722	-.14669-	.07915	
	Equal variances not assumed			-.599-	148.354	.550	-.03377-	.05640	-.14523-	.07769	

Table 11 One Way ANOVA Test Results

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
positive interaction	first year	145	4.1540	.65147	.05410	4.0471	4.2610	2.00	5.00
	second year	31	4.4624	.70804	.12717	4.2027	4.7221	2.00	5.00
	third year	3	4.5556	.50918	.29397	3.2907	5.8204	4.00	5.00
	Total	179	4.2142	.66812	.04994	4.1156	4.3127	2.00	5.00
individual and group accountability	first year	145	3.8290	.47491	.03944	3.7510	3.9069	2.40	5.00
	second year	31	4.1161	.37157	.06674	3.9798	4.2524	3.40	4.80
	third year	3	3.8667	.50332	.29059	2.6163	5.1170	3.40	4.40
	Total	179	3.8793	.46948	.03509	3.8101	3.9486	2.40	5.00
face to face promoting interaction	first year	145	4.4644	.43443	.03608	4.3931	4.5357	3.00	5.00
	second year	31	4.6452	.45490	.08170	4.4783	4.8120	3.33	5.00
	third year	3	4.5556	.50918	.29397	3.2907	5.8204	4.00	5.00
	Total	179	4.4972	.44183	.03302	4.4320	4.5624	3.00	5.00
interpersonal and small group skills	first year	145	3.9717	.47518	.03946	3.8937	4.0497	2.20	5.00
	second year	31	4.1806	.60245	.10820	3.9597	4.4016	2.70	5.00
	third year	3	4.0667	.20817	.12019	3.5496	4.5838	3.90	4.30
	Total	179	4.0095	.50064	.03742	3.9357	4.0833	2.20	5.00
group processing	first year	145	4.2883	.48297	.04011	4.2090	4.3676	2.60	5.00
	second year	31	4.4258	.38555	.06925	4.2844	4.5672	3.60	5.00
	third year	3	4.3333	.11547	.06667	4.0465	4.6202	4.20	4.40
	Total	179	4.3128	.46544	.03479	4.2442	4.3815	2.60	5.00
M total	first year	145	4.1415	.35827	.02975	4.0827	4.2003	3.09	4.96
	second year	31	4.3660	.39178	.07037	4.2223	4.5097	3.19	4.92
	third year	3	4.2756	.20443	.11803	3.7677	4.7834	4.10	4.50
	Total	179	4.1826	.37089	.02772	4.1279	4.2373	3.09	4.96

writing tasks. These findings are acceptable and adequate for positive support of the “face to face

promoted interaction” as a characteristic of Cooperative Learning.

Table 12 ANOVA Results

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
positive interaction	Between Groups	2.784	2	1.392	3.195	.043
	Within Groups	76.674	176	.436		
	Total	79.457	178			
individual and group accountability	Between Groups	2.107	2	1.053	4.993	.008
	Within Groups	37.127	176	.211		
	Total	39.234	178			
face to face promoting interaction	Between Groups	.845	2	.423	2.194	.115
	Within Groups	33.903	176	.193		
	Total	34.749	178			
interpersonal and small group skills	Between Groups	1.125	2	.562	2.276	.106
	Within Groups	43.489	176	.247		
	Total	44.614	178			
group processing	Between Groups	.484	2	.242	1.119	.329
	Within Groups	38.076	176	.216		
	Total	38.560	178			
M total	Between Groups	1.314	2	.657	4.991	.008
	Within Groups	23.172	176	.132		
	Total	24.486	178			

The “Interpersonal and Small Group Skills” element towards implementing cooperative learning method on developing the writing skill

The statistical analysis shows that the participants are highly in favor of the idea that in cooperation they get much more chances to use English language, express their ideas freely, and gave them the ability to evaluate each other with very high mean scores for items (12) mean score 4.40, (14) mean score 4.34, item (15) mean score 4.17, and item (20) mean score 4.07. moreover, the subjects agreed that cooperation helps them as well to develop their spelling, correct their writing mistakes, solve language problems and group members help each other understand language items with high mean scores; item (13) got a mean score of 3.96, item (21) mean score 3.89, item (18) mean score 3.86, item (19) mean score 3.85, item (16) mean score 3.77, item (17) mean score 3.73. Overall, the mean scores of the entire items of this element indicate positive attitudes towards interpersonal and small group skills.

The “Group Processing” element towards implementing cooperative learning method on developing the writing skill

The mean scores taken from table (8) show that most of participants believe that high achiever students help the weaker group members in cooperative learning with

mean score (4.45) for item (24), other subjects confirm that all the group members support each other in cooperative activities with mean score (4.44) for item (25). The participants showed high positive attitudes towards asking each other questions in group work with mean score (4.29) for item (26), and solving writing difficulties together with mean score (4.27) for item (22). The last item was also confirmed by the participants i.e. they showed positive attitudes towards simplifying the writing activities to each other in cooperative learning activities with a mean score of (4.1) for item (23). All in all, most of the answers were in favor of Cooperative Learning.

Implementing cooperative learning method and Participants' Gender

To answer the second question of this study, the researcher examined the following null hypothesis: “There are no significant gender differences at the $\alpha = .05$ in the mean scores of AAUP EFL learners' attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill.” To examine this hypothesis, the independent sample T- test was carried out as shown in Table (9) and table (10) above.

The total significance level (.828). This means that the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there are no statistically significant differences due to gender among EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the

Table 13 Post Hoc Tests Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable	(I) Year of Study	(J) Year of Study	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
positive interaction	first year	second year	-.30834 [*]	.13060	.019	-.5661-	-.0506-
		third year	-.40153 [*]	.38499	.298	-1.1613-	.3583
	second year	first year	.30834 [*]	.13060	.019	.0506	.5661
		third year	-.09319-	.39908	.816	-.8808-	.6944
	third year	first year	.40153 [*]	.38499	.298	-.3583-	1.1613
		second year	.09319	.39908	.816	-.6944-	.8808
individual and group accountability	first year	second year	-.28716 [*]	.09088	.002	-.4665-	-.1078-
		third year	-.03770-	.26790	.888	-.5664-	.4910
	second year	first year	.28716 [*]	.09088	.002	.1078	.4665
		third year	.24946	.27771	.370	-.2986-	.7975
	third year	first year	.03770	.26790	.888	-.4910-	.5664
		second year	-.24946-	.27771	.370	-.7975-	.2986
face to face promoting interaction	first year	second year	-.18079 [*]	.08685	.039	-.3522-	-.0094-
		third year	-.09119-	.25601	.722	-.5964-	.4141
	second year	first year	.18079 [*]	.08685	.039	.0094	.3522
		third year	.08961	.26538	.736	-.4341-	.6133
	third year	first year	.09119	.25601	.722	-.4141-	.5964
		second year	-.08961-	.26538	.736	-.6133-	.4341
interpersonal and small group skills	first year	second year	-.20892 [*]	.09836	.035	-.4030-	-.0148-
		third year	-.09494-	.28995	.744	-.6672-	.4773
	second year	first year	.20892 [*]	.09836	.035	.0148	.4030
		third year	.11398	.30056	.705	-.4792-	.7071
	third year	first year	.09494	.28995	.744	-.4773-	.6672
		second year	-.11398-	.30056	.705	-.7071-	.4792
group processing	first year	second year	-.13753-	.09204	.137	-.3192-	.0441
		third year	-.04506-	.27130	.868	-.5805-	.4904
	second year	first year	.13753	.09204	.137	-.0441-	.3192
		third year	.09247	.28123	.743	-.4626-	.6475
	third year	first year	.04506	.27130	.868	-.4904-	.5805
		second year	-.09247-	.28123	.743	-.6475-	.4626
M total	first year	second year	-.22455 [*]	.07180	.002	-.3662-	-.0829-
		third year	-.13408-	.21165	.527	-.5518-	.2836
	second year	first year	.22455 [*]	.07180	.002	.0829	.3662
		third year	.09047	.21939	.681	-.3425-	.5234
	third year	first year	.13408	.21165	.527	-.2836-	.5518
		second year	-.09047-	.21939	.681	-.5234-	.3425

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill in the positive interaction, individual and group accountability, face to face promoting interaction and interpersonal and small group skills elements. However, there are statistically significant gender differences among EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill in the group processing element for the female. The researcher suggests that these statistically significant differences for the females are due to the fact that female students are much more willing to meet outside classes and discuss the writing issues at times male students prefer to socialize outside classrooms. Moreover, female students are often highly concerned about providing the best writing pieces. Overall, the attitudes of EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the cooperative learning

method to enhance their writing skill are not affected by their gender.

Implementing Cooperative Learning Method and Participants' Year of Study

To answer the third question of this study, the researcher examined the following hypothesis: "There are no significant differences in the mean scores of AAUP EFL learners' attitudes towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill due to their year of study." To examine this hypothesis, the One Way ANOVA was carried out as shown in Table (11) and (12) above:

The results indicate that there are no statistically

significant differences among EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill in the face to face promoting interaction element with total mean score of (4.4972), interpersonal and small group skills element with total mean score of (4.0095) and group processing element with total mean score of (4.3128). However, the results showed that there are statistically significant differences among EFL learners at AAUP towards implementing the cooperative learning method to enhance their writing skill in the positive interaction element with significance score of (.043) and individual and group accountability element with significance score of (.008). The researcher carried out the Post Hoc Tests in order to identify for whom the differences are as shown in table (13) above:

The results of the Post Hoc Tests reveal that the attitudes differences are in the positive interaction element with mean difference of (.30834) and individual and group accountability element with mean difference of (.28716) among the first year students and the second year students for the second year students. The researcher suggests that the differences were for the second year students because they are often more adapted to university systems and group discussions, whereas first year students are still new to adapt with the university atmosphere and to meet new friends and classmates to work with them as members of a group from the university.

CONCLUSION

The present study aimed at investigating the impact of implementing the cooperative learning method on improving the writing skill as perceived by EFL learners at the Arab American University Palestine. In order to achieve the study goals, a questionnaire was administered to the EFL undergraduate students. The sample was randomly selected from the Fall semester learners who studied the Intermediate English level courses. Based upon, the participants of the study are supposed to have good opinions about the effective methods of learning the writing skills. The findings of this study have shown that the majority of the subjects confirmed positive attitudes towards cooperative learning activities in learning writing. The supportive results of the entire questionnaire items were above 70% which is considered as high agreement and that could be acknowledged as significant and satisfactory in tackling modern English Language Teaching issues. However, few respondents stated inadequacy of cooperative writing learning methods. Therefore, more explanations are still desired to those structural elements since Cooperative Learning is an effective modern application of the

communicative language learning. Overall, the investigation carried out through this research paper supports the positive findings of the previous studies for using Cooperative Learning strategies in mastering the writing skill.

REFERENCES

- Ahangari S and Samadian Z (2014). The Effect of Cooperative Learning Activities on Writing Skills of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature Studies*. 2(4): 121-130, 2014. DOI: 10.13189/lls.2014.020403
- Ait L (2017/2018). Enhancing EFL Students' Writing Skill through Cooperative Learning Strategies, Master thesis. University Abderrahmane Mira –Bejaia.
- Ali W (2017). Students' Attitudes Towards Cooperative Learning (CL) in EFL Writing Class. *Arabic Language, Literature & Culture*. 2(3): 60-68.
- Azzam F (2018). The Reality of Applying Electronic Gate Project at public schools of Jenin Governorate. Unpublished Master Thesis, An Najah National University – Nablus – Palestine.
- Firestone M (2018) – Definition of Cooperative Learning – <https://study.com/academy>.
- Fujiwara Y and Sato E (2014). Effects of Cooperative Learning on Writing Activity of English for Special Purposes in Japanese University Students. *Journal of Academic Society for Quality of Life*, 1(1): 32-39, 2015.
- Hanan M (2018). EFL Learners' Attitudes towards Cooperative Learning in the Writing Skill. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 5, No. 4, December 2018.
- Harmer J (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hirose Keiko (2008). *Cooperative Learning in English Writing Instruction through Peer Feedback*. Aichi: Aichi Prefectural University.
- Johnson DW and Johnson RT (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5): 365–379.
- Karim AA (2012). *Cooperative Learning Strategies in Enhancing Students' Writing Proficiency: The Case of Second Year LMD Students at Mohamed Khidher University (Master's thesis)*. University of Mohamed Khidher Biskra, Biskra.
- Kustati M and Yuhardi (2014). The Effect of the Peer-Review Technique on Students' Writing Ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 1(2): 71-81, 2014.
- Millis BJ (2010). "Why Faculty Should Adopt Cooperative Learning Approaches". In B. J. Millis (Ed.). *Cooperative Learning in Higher Education: Across the Disciplines, Across the Academy* (New Pedagogies and Practices for Teaching in Higher Education) (pp1-10). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Montasser M (2014). The Effectiveness of Using the Cooperative Language Learning Approach to Enhance EFL Writing Skills among Saudi University Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3): 616-625, May 2014.
- Olsen P (Internet access March 2018) – What Is Cooperative Learning in the Classroom? Strategies, Benefits & Definition – <https://study.com/academy/lesson>
- Saint P (2011). Improving Writing Ability through cooperative learning strategy. *Journal of English as A Foreign Language*. Volume 1, Number 1, 2011.
- Slavin RE (1980). Cooperative learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(2), 315-342.
- Yusuf Q, Josoh Z and Yusuf Y (2018). Cooperative Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 2019, p-ISSN: 1694-609X, 12(1): 1399-1412.

