

Chapter Four

Findings and Discussion

This chapter consisted of findings and discussion. Pseudonym was used to call the participants, they were Afi (first participant), Alex (second participant), Anggi (third participant), and Anto (fourth participant). The finding presented the data from interview of four participants. In the discussion, the researcher related the findings to experts' argument. The findings and discussion were created to answer the research questions about students' perception on the implementation techniques, advantages, and disadvantages of cooperative learning method at English Education Department Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta batch 2014.

The Implementation of Cooperative Learning Method at English Education Department.

The implementation. The implementation of cooperative learning was not only how to apply but also it was including the sequences of activities, types of activities, team formation, role of teacher, language used, and what feedback usually used at English Education Department batch 2014 Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta to implement cooperative learning method.

Positive Interdependences. One of cooperative learning elements was positive interdependences. It means that all of members of the groups should get benefit from the learning. Positive interdependences also have been practiced in

group work activities at EED of UMY. It was indicated by the lecturer who have implemented goal structured, reward structured, role structured, material structured, and rule structured.

Goal structured. Only one participant who stated that the lecturer delivered the aim of the activities. He was the fourth participant, Anto. He stated that the aim of the activities was presentation. Anto expressed “.... then the lecturer told that the result will be presented” (Ant.6). Olsen and Kagan (1992) stated goal structured was giving the aim of the learning, what is the result from the discussion. For example, the teacher tells the student that after the discussion is finished, they will present the product of discussion.

Reward structured. The researcher also found that reward structured has been implemented at EED of UMY. All of participants stated that the usually reward was a score from the lecturer. Alex said “as the promise, the active students got extra score” (Al.18). Anggi stated that “the lecturer appreciated students by giving score or compliment” (Ang.12). Anto also said “the students got score from the lecturer” (Ant.14). Those opinions were in line with Olsen and Kagan (1992), who stated reward structured was giving appreciation for students’ work such as give score. Giving score can be taken by average from each member, sum of individual score. Scoring can increase students’ motivation to gain their abilities in order to get better rewards.

Role structured. Each member has a role. It can be seen from the data reported by the participants. Afi stated “...there were students who write the

conclusion and also there were students who presented it” (Af.33). Afi expressed “...for example we were seven students, two students were looking for the definition, two students discussed the function of the materials, two others were guided again” (Al.33). Anto said “.... in the group, there were students who searched for the resources, there were students who write the conclusion, or might be looking for from books” (Ant.25). Olsen and Kagan (1992) argued role structured involves assigning different roles to each student within a group such as explainer or checker. In the higher education it could be more specific roles such as gatekeeper (monitor), cheerleader (encourager), taskmaster (supervisor), secretary (recorder/reporter), checker (explainer), and quiet captain. They had specific roles and responsibilities in their own job.

Material structured. Materials in cooperative learning should be designed carefully. The materials will be learned should be explained clearly. It was found by the researcher based on the data from the participants. Afi said “...the lecturer explained the points of materials then the students were told about what will be discussed” (Af.16). Alex stated “the lecturer explained the chapter, for example we will learn about A that completely new, then we search any information about A” (Al.5). Anggi mentioned “...the lecturer told the detail of materials...” (Ang.4). Anto told “The lecturer gave the recent topic to discuss” (Ant.17). Olsen and Kagan (1992) stated material structured included limiting sources and material used by students. Such as each student only allowed to use one pencil and one paper. From the limited sources and materials, students were expected to

use it responsibly. Material structured also involved designing information and the activities.

Rule structured. Rules of the discussion were very important to keep students work in plan. Rule structured has been implemented at EED of UMY. Afi stated that “usually the lecturer gave time to discuss the material, it was usually 20 minutes...” (Af.18). Anggi said “the process of discussion was limited around 15 minutes.... when the lecturer said stop then we stop the discussion” (Ang.17). Anto expressed “the lecturer gave the rule of discussion...the lecturer gave limitation time for discuss, it was around 15-25 minutes” (Ant.5). Those arguments were coherent with Olsen and Kagan (1992), who stated that rule structured means that students could not continue to the new learning before all of them finish the assignment. Therefore, students would focus on the current assignment until it has completed.

Sequences/process. Actually there were three sequences found by the researcher on the implementation of cooperative learning method at EED of UMY, they were pre-activities, whilst-activities, and post-activities.

Pre-Activities. In the beginning of learning, usually the students got explanation about the material from the lecturer. Afi reported that “the usual activities were reviewing the material in past meeting.... there were also quiz to check our understanding” (Af.3). Alex said “we usually began with explanation from the lecturer and made a group then gave opinion” (Al.1). Anggi told “.... there were illustrations about the material would be learned and also there was ice

breaking activities” (Ang.6). The fourth participant, Anto said “usually began with checking the students’ attendances, material explanation from the lecturer, then dividing the group, after that we were given different material in each group” (Ant.4)

Whilst-Activities. In the whilst-activities, the most often activities done were discussion and shared idea with other members of the groups. Afi stated that the students usually conduct discussion, it was proved by the lecturer who look around group activities. as she reported “...the lecturer looked around to see the activities of each group...” (Af.9). Alex expressed “After made a group, we shared ideas with other group members....” (Al.2). Anggi also implicitly told that in the whilst activities, the students conduct discussion. As she reported “the lecturer asked about the problems then they helped us” (Ang.7). Anto mentioned “the lecturer monitor group discussion conducted by students to make sure the discussion work in plan” (Ant.8)

Post-Activities. In the end of learning there were some activities such as assessment and presentation. Afi, the first participant said “in the end of discussion, the lecturer explained more material or gave an assessment and also told the next assessment...” (Af.14). Alex mentioned “.... in the end of discussion, we conclude the result of discussion” (Al.2), Alex also add more information, as he reported “.... we presented what we have been done to other groups” (Al.15). Anggi also stated there were presentation in the end of discussion, as she reported “one students were asked to present the result”

(Ang.11). Anto said “students were asked to present the result of discussion”

(Ant.11)

Types of activity. Actually, there were many ways to implement cooperative learning in teaching and learning process. Unfortunately, there just three ways that usually used at English Education Department batch 2014. They were think-pair-share, student team achievement division, and team accelerated instruction.

Think-Pair-Share. After conducting interview, the researcher found that all of participants had experiences in think-pair-share activities. It could be seen from the data has been collected. Afi said “to begin the discussion, lecturer only instructed to make pair with friends besides us.... we discussed in pair then we conclude our opinions about the task” (Af.25). “The first thing was given topic by lecturer, usually we were asked to give opinion agree or disagree toward a statement. Next, I communicated with my partner to share my opinion...” (Al.20), he also mentioned “if we have already agree, then each group shared their opinion” (Al.21). Anggi reported that “the most important process was we should be able to answer question in pair” (Ang.16). Anto was same “after given materials by lecturer, we shared task with the partner, one looked for the resources and the other one wrote the conclusion” (Ant.16). those were supported by Olsen and Kagan (1992) who stated in Think-Pair-Share, teacher usually used low consensus question (known or knowable), then students started to think individually, then they move to their pairs to discuss the answer. The last, teacher asked student to report the result of their discussion.

Student Team Achievement Division (STAD). Besides, students were also experienced on STAD activities. Afi stated that “After the discussion was finished, usually there was presentation” (Af.1), Anggi, the third participant stated that “the process was about 15 minutes, if there were questions from the lecturer, then we shared opinion each other” (Ang.17). Anto also has experiences as he said “for example, the lecturer gave materials about recent topic, every member shared their opinion in the discussion, then the result was written by the writer” (Ant.17), then he continued “usually at the end of discussion, lecturer gave question randomly” (Ant.19). Their opinions were in line with Olsen and Kagan (1992), they stated that STAD activities started by making groups of four then teacher explained the materials for the day. Then students in the groups discussed to master the material. After the discussion was finished, then the teacher made quiz.

Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI). The last ways of implementation of cooperative learning found was Team Accelerated Instruction. Afi, Anggi, and Anto have already experienced it. First was reported by Afi, she said “usually if we already found the materials, then each member gave opinion, after all of members gave their opinion then we conclude together” (Af.28). Second, Anggi answered “for example, the lecturer told to one student to open a folder which was contained materials, then the students discussed it outside of the class. Next, we would discuss again in the next meeting” (Ang.20). The last, Anto experienced that “.... usually lecturer gave material or topic then we search the resources and discussed it in group” (Ant.18). That was coherent with Olsen and Kagan (1992),

they stated that team accelerated instruction is a combination of individualized instruction and team learning. In this technic, students learn material individually then teach each other without material explanation from the teacher.

Team formation. In this section, the researcher explained the finding about team formation which was consist of types of groups and grouping techniques.

Types of groups. The researcher found that there were some types of groups based on the amount of the members. Those were pair and small groups.

Pairs. All of four participants have experiences in pairs activities. It was proved by the data from the interview. Afi said “.....but I also ever work in pairs (Af.20). “There were two up to three students” (Al.19). “the fewest groups were pair” (Ang.14). “in one discussion, I ever work in pair...” (Ant.15)

Small groups. Besides, all of four participants have experienced work in pairs, they also have experienced work in small group discussions. As Afi said “It was around three up to five students” (Af.20). “the amount of the groups was five up to seven” (Al.19). “at least there were four up to five from all of total students” (Ang.14). “the most often I ever conduct were four up to six students” (Ant.15).

Olsen and Kagan (1992) supported those perceptions, they stated that cooperative learning included of work in pairs up to six members per team. They also stated that since it was small groups, it gave more chances to the informer to give more explanation and the students get more information.

Grouping techniques. The researcher found three techniques that frequently used to make the groups, those were counting, list of attendances, and self-decision.

Counting. The researcher asked about how to make the groups. All of participants argued that the most often ways to make groups was by counting. Afi said, “usually, we used count technique to make a group, it was adjusted with the amount of the class, for example we would like to make group of three or four or five...” (Af.21). Then Alex also stated “usually it was counting from 1,2,3,4,5,6” (Al.29). Anggi answered “usually the lecturer counted amount of whole class, then students counted one up to five” (Ang.25). Anto also was not different with them, he answered “the most often ways used by lecturer to decide the group was counting, began from student who sat at front until student who sat at back, then we gathered based on the number we got” (Ant.22).

Those opinions same with Olsen and Kagan (1992), they stated that random grouping could be created by giving symbols, colored papers, counting, or playing cards. Then, students who get similar symbols, color, number, or card become a team.

List of attendances. Besides, the groups also could be decided based on list of attendances. Afi stated that sometimes lecturer used list of attendances to make the groups. As she reported “sometimes, if the lecturer wants a simply ways, they used list of attendances” (Af.22). Alex was not different, he said, “sometimes, lecturer used list of attendances to make the groups” (Al.30). Then Anggi’s

opinion was “the other ways were using odd or even numbers of list of attendance” (Ang.26). Those opinions were not different with Olsen and Kagan (1992), they stated that heterogeneous groups maximized peer tutoring, improving students’ awareness toward other ethnic, and increasing students’ understanding toward students’ ability.

Self-decision. Besides using counting and list of attendances, there were also other ways to make the groups. All participants who said that students could decide their own members reported it. Afi stated that sometimes lecturer asked students to choose their own teammates. As she said, “lecturer asked us to decide our own groups” (Af.23). Alex also stated that the students could decide their own members. As he mentioned, “so, if we chose our own groups, we had option to choose our own members” (Al.31). Anggi also said, “besides, we could choose by ourselves” (Ang.27). Then Anto said, “we decided it for ourselves, so we chose friends who may could cooperate with us” (Ant.23). Olsen and Kagan (1992) supported those that they argued that interest group was determined by students’ characteristic. The students chose teammates they like.

Teacher role. Different with traditional role in teacher centered that teacher’s role as explainer, there were various roles of teacher in cooperative learning such as teacher as inquirer, teacher as creator, teacher as observer, teacher as facilitator, and teacher as change agent. The researcher found that there are only three roles that often met by students.

As creator. It was indicated by all of participants' responses that teacher gave instructions before conducting discussion. It was reported by Afi and Anggi when they were asked about what teachers did before activities were conducted, Afi said that "They gave instructions before conducting activities" (Af.4), "Before conducting discussion, the lecturer gave directions on what should we do" (Af.7). Then, Anggi answered "it was surely giving direction, for example what students should do" (Ang.2).

Besides, role of teacher as creator was also seen from all participants who answered that lecturer explained and reviewed material before discussion began. Afi reported that "what lecturer do before discussion began was reviewing material in the past meeting" (Af.3) then she continued "before conducting discussion, lecturer only explained all of points in the material that would be learned" (Af.6). Then Alex said "lecturer explained the materials, then there was discussion about the sub chapters (Al.5), besides explaining materials, lecturer discussed what has been learned in the past meeting" (Al.7). Anggi also said "lecturer gave directions then they gave details of materials" (Ang.4). Anto answered "before conducting discussion, usually lecturer checked student attendance then gave materials explanation" (Ant.3). Olsen and Kagan (1992) stated that The roles of teacher as creator were creating social environment, structuring and planning learning tasks, setting goals of the learning, arranging classroom, assigning roles and students into groups, and picking material and time.

As observer. Roles of lecturer as observer also found at English Education Department of UMY. It was appeared from all of participants' answers. Afi said "lecturer look around to check what was discussed by students in each group...lecturer supervised students who were active" (Af.9). Alex stated that "..... there was lecturer who walked around to watch our discussion" (Al.13). "lecturer supervised by watching students' activities to know their speaking abilities, there was also teacher who watched from front of class" (Ang.9), Anto also answered "what usually lecturer done was monitoring, so they walked around to supervise their students or asked one students about the progress of discussion..." (Ant.7). Those opinions were in line with Olsen and Kagan (1992) they stated that watching and listening to students' activities is important. By watching and listening, teacher knew the problem faced by students, know the strength, needs, and interest.

As facilitator. It was seen on three participants' opinion. Afi, the first participant stated "There was lecturer who emphasized students to talk using English" (Af.10) "...what I knew so far that lecturer warned students who talked using Bahasa" (Af.11) "...so, if there were students who did not understand, then lecturer explained it to all of groups" (Af.12). Alex, the second participant said "For example, if we had any questions, we could call the lecturer and they came to the groups..." (Al.9), then he continued "for example, word "settlement", we did not know the meaning or for example we did not know about some theories, then we asked and lecturer gave short explanation" (Al.14). "usually if there were students who asked or confused, they gave direction directly in front of students"

(Ant.9). Olsen and Kagan (1992) mentioned teacher as facilitator meant that teacher gave the students meaningful role. Teacher assisted students in problem solve process. Also, teacher supported and encouraged students to have more desire to learn.

As feedback giver. The last teacher role found by the researcher was teacher as feedback giver. At the end of the learning, EED of UMY lecturers usually gave feedback to the students both in verbal or in note form. It was seen from all of four participants who expressed that the lecturers gave a feedback at the end of the activities. Afi stated that "...the feedback was more tend to give more explanation...gave feedback in a circle form to show the error" (Af.17), Alex the second participant said "... feedback in form of unique words.... applause or excellent" (Al.17). Then the third participant expressed "the appreciation given was score or compliment" (Ang.12), the last participant, Anto mentioned "feedback that usually given was direct feedback or verbally" (Ant.13).

Looking at those opinions, the researcher conclude that feedback was very important. Feedback helped the learner meet their goals of learning. Besides, feedback also could raise students' motivation. It is supported by Petchprasert (2012), who stated that feedback supports both the lecturers and learners reach the objectives of teaching and learning. Moreover, he mentioned that feedback is considered as a technique to encourage learners' learning especially in second language learning.

Language used. The finding about the language used also found by the researcher. Bahasa and English were used in the cooperative learning activities at EED of UMY. Those were stated by two participants who reported there were rule to use English in the discussion but also if there were misunderstanding the students were allowed to use Bahasa. First was expressed by Afi, the first participant, he said “there were lecturers who allowed their student to use Bahasa but there were also lecturers who obligated to use English...” (Af.10). Second was told by Anggi, she said “the lecturer asked the students to use English in the presentation but if there were problems we can use Bahasa to help” (Ang.11)

Accountability. It can be seen there were allotments in the group discussion activities. Each member has their own role. It can be seen from the data reported by the participants. Afi stated “...there were students who write the conclusion and also there were students who presented it” (Af.33). Afi expressed “...for example we were seven students, two students were looking for the definition, two students discussed the function of the materials, two others were guided again” (Af.33). Anto said “.... in the group, there were students who searched for the resources, there were students who write the conclusion, or might be looking for from books” (Ant.25). Olsen and Kagan (1992) also stated that all of group members have their own responsible. Each student has their job to be finished in order to make group work keep running.

Social skill. Cooperative also emphasized on the importance of skill to weave with other people. The researcher found that this element has been practiced at EED of UMY. All of participants have those experiences. Afi said “.... we know how to deliver our opinion to others without hurting their emotion or we could deliver our opinion politely” (Af.39). Alex stated “.... we learned types of people in delivering their opinions.... I think my opinion was not completely true, so I listen to others too...” (Al.37). Anggi mentioned “we learned to develop our critical thinking and trained to work together with friends” (Ang.31). Anto, the last participant said “we could make harmony among friends...for example, we have not understood yet about the material then we listened to other member who could explained more detail...” (Ant.33). Those opinions were in line with Olsen and Kagan (1992) who stated that social skills include ways students interact with each other to achieve activities or task objectives (e.g., asking and explaining) and ways student interact as teammates (e.g., praising and recognizing).

Advantages of Cooperative Learning based on Perception of English Education Department Students batch 2014. All of participants had their own experiences on the advantages of cooperative learning. There were four advantages found by the researcher based on the data from the participants. Those advantages were cooperative learning could increase students’ motivation to learn, cooperative learning could develop students’ thinking, cooperative learning made students could feel the group situation, cooperative learning reduced students’ anxiety.

Cooperative learning can increase students' motivation to learn. The first advantages found by the researcher was cooperative learning increase students' motivation to learn. All of participants stated that they were motivated by their friends in the group. Afi said "sometimes, motivation came from our friends, then they transmit it to us" (Af.35). Alex felt that clever students could motivated him, as he reported, "I saw in a group not all off students were clever, so if there were clever students in a group, I felt motivated" (Al.36). Then Anggi was motivated to speak well when she was in the group, as she said "most of people were anxious to talk, so in the discussion, we were motivated to try speak well" (Ang.32). Anto was not different, in which he was motivated to be like his friends. He said "when we explained the materials had been determined by lecturer, in fact there were our friends who understood better than us. So, we felt that why my friends could do that and I could not" (Ant.36). Those opinions were in line with Wichadee and Orawiwatnakul (2012), They stated that students understood that without him or her, the groups did not work. Because of that, students always try to participate in the group work.

Cooperative learning can develop students' creative thinking. The second advantages of cooperative learning were it developed students' thinking. Afi said that "in the discussion, there were clever students and were not, there were students who have already understood well, then we were thinking together to teach each other" (Af.34). She also mentioned that group discussion made her thought became more organized. As she said "we knew how to complete the assignment by group discussion... and the way we thought became more

organized” (Af.36). Alex got new knowledge from his friends in the group. As he reported “I got new knowledge from my friends” (Al.35). Anggi, the third participant thought that her critical thinking was developed during group discussion. She said that “we were confidence to talk and share opinion also develop our critical thinking” (Ang.30). She also felt that group work has an effect on the creative thinking. She said “there was effect on creative thinking, for example in a role play, we should do improvisation on our action or expression” (Ang.33). Anto said “we got more knowledge, for example if we did not understand about some materials, then our friends explained more the details of materials.” (Ant.34). He also gave more opinion, as he said “every member has different opinion and explanation, therefore we were motivated to create better ideas” (Ant.39). All of those opinions were similar with Wichadee and Orawiwatnakul (2012), They argued that in the process of giving opinion, they will face other students’ opinion. Hence, they will give more explanation to support their opinion. This process forced student to develop their way to think. Those also in line with Motaei (2014) who said that students who worked in small group shared ideas with the other member that raise creative thinking and problem solving skill.

Cooperative learning increases students’ social skill. The third advantages found by the researcher were cooperative learning increases students’ social skill. First opinion came from Afi. She said “we knew how to understand the character of our friends” (Af.37). She gave more opinion, as she said “besides, there were our friends who had sensitive feeling, so we knew how to explain our

opinion politely” (Af.39). Then Alex knew many characteristics from group discussion as he said “I learned many of peoples’ characteristics” (Al.36). Alex also understood that his opinion was not the best, as he reported “I thought that my opinion may not be true, so I listening to friends’ opinion” (Al.37). Anggi thought that she could learn to cooperate with other people as she answered “I could cooperate with other people” (Ang.31). Anto also thought that he could create harmony with his friends, as he said “we could create harmony with our friends” (Ant.33), “it might be influence on socialization among friends” (Ant.37). Those statements were in line Wichadee and Orawiwatnakul (2012), They stated that when working together, students could see how much effort that other students do. They could feel team situation. So that they could know the problems faced by other member and try to assist each other. Other expert also said that using cooperative learning made some benefits, such as students learn to know and communicate each other, understand other members’ role, learn to manage their time effectively, and being willing to take some risks with their learning. (Gillies and Boyle, 2009)

Cooperative learning reduced students’ anxiety. The last advantages found by the researcher was cooperative learning could reduce students’ anxiety. All of participants had same opinion. Afi said that “we became more confidence to share opinion” (Af.35). Then Alex argued “because we were already familiar join in the discussion, therefore we were accustomed to talk” (Al.38). Anggi also has statement, as she reported “we could be confidence to share opinion with other friends” (Ang.29). The last was Anto, the fourth participant said “might be I

became confidence when join discussion and presentation” (Ant.38). Their opinions were same with Wichadee and Orawiwatnakul (2012) they expressed that cooperative learning provides small group discussion. It can make students more relax and confident to explain their ideas.

Disadvantages of cooperative learning based on perception of English Education Department students batch 2014. After all of advantages of cooperative learning had been founded, all off participants also had their opinions on disadvantages of cooperative learning. The researcher found three disadvantages, which were teacher could not control the activities, time consuming to learn, and disorganizing classroom arrangement.

Teacher cannot control the activities fully. The first disadvantages of cooperative learning were teacher cannot control the activities. Three participants had experience on it. Beginning from Afi, the first participant said that “it might be a risk for student who were passive, sometimes lecturer gave more attention on active students” (Af.42). Then Anggi stated “I thought that it was not conducive, might be better if the activities conducted outside of class” (Ang.36). Anto gave examples of the disadvantages. As he reported “for example, the group consisted of five students, three or two students among them were lazy and only as a complement” (Ant.40). Then he added more “if there was lecturer approaching the groups, the students were seen work hard, when lecturer moved to other, the students were talking and joking with their friends” (Ant.43). That

was coherent with Celik, Aytin, and Bayram (2013), in their research found that there are some disadvantages of cooperative learning, such as: sometimes, teacher could not control the activities about what students were talking about all the time. It is proved by when the students are alone or the teacher did not near of them, they will not speak English. Then, not all of students worked with same effort. For example, some students do the assignment seriously but some of students may only talk with friends which is not related with the material.

Time consuming to learn materials. Second disadvantages were time consuming to learn. Only Anto, the fourth participant argued that using cooperative learning made learning the materials became slower. As he expressed, “if we got lazy partner, the task might be postponed or not accomplished” (Ant.41). Wichadee and Orawiwatnakul (2012), there are disadvantage of cooperative learning, it is time-consuming for students to learn materials in a cooperative way and to work together in groups.

Disorganizing classroom arrangement. The last disadvantages were disorganizing classroom arrangement. Only Anggi who did not say that disadvantages. Afi was said “sometimes, if the classroom was constrained, then we were coincided” (Af.41). Alex also stated that “after discussion was finished, it made classroom disorganized” (Al.41). Anto was not different, he expressed “if the class was smaller, it made the discussion looked more crowded because the space between groups were narrow” (Ant.42). Alansari (2006) found that there were some disadvantages of cooperative learning, such as: it requires changes in the classroom atmosphere, it needs particular technical skills and knowledge,

students may have lost attention on the learning, often teachers only pay attention on the most active students.