

Chapter 5

Conclusion and Suggestion

In this final chapter, the major findings and the data analysis are briefly summarized. Recommendations for teacher and future researchers are also explained in the last section of this chapter.

5.1. Conclusion

The first research question investigates how the undergraduate students perceived *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. Qualitative data taken from the students' perception questionnaire is used to answer the question. The findings reveal that students have perceived positive perceptions on preferences and usefulness, individual accountability and positive interdependence after implementing *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation.

In the findings and analysis presented in Chapter 4, it is found that 77.2% students were consented to participate in *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation activities. This result showed that students had positive preference on the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. It means that most of the undergraduate students who have implemented *A-aikem 3* models preferred to use this model because they found it to be very useful to engage in a cooperative learning situation and improve their learning process.

Furthermore, the undergraduate students also perceived individual accountability during the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. The findings reveal that 77.1% of the students have positive perception on the way that *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation can improve their attitude towards their work's contribution inside the group and 88.2% of them think that *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation could enhance good

working relationships among students. These two findings indicate that individual accountability, one of the important elements in cooperative learning, had been positively perceived by most of the students.

The findings and analysis from the students' perception questionnaire also revealed that most of them had perceived positive interdependence. The perceived positive interdependence can be seen from the results which are showing 80% of the students show positive views on level of fairness regarding the need of lottery in order to determine the role of each group member and 77.2% of the students have positive perception regarding the use of role division in *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation which can enhance their participation among group members. It means that role interdependence, one of the characteristic of positive interdependence, was positively perceived by the undergraduate students during the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation.

However, the results shown from the questionnaire also found that *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation is considered as a complicated method to implement. This result means that *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation is a relatively complicated method to implement for these students. Meanwhile, the result also reveals that negative tension is felt by 51.5% of the students during the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation which made the students could not concentrate on the preparation of their presentation. Consequently, 68.5% of the students realized that the mechanism of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation is forcing them to read and master all of the material which is going to be presented and avoid reading the material partially. It means that 68.5% of the students realized the complexities and difficulties of *A-aikem 3* model.

The second research question investigates the student's positive and negative feedback on the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. The positive feedback from the undergraduate students indicate that *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation is preferred by students because unlike traditional model of group work presentation that tend to have low participation in among group members, the new model made them more responsible in term of group work and prepare the material that needed to be presented. In addition, some students think that *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation is useful to enhance students' capability to perform and present better in a group work discussion or presentation.

Meanwhile dealing with the positive feedback regarding the use of 'on the spot' lottery to determine the role of each group member, the students think that the use of lottery is effective and fair. Thus, the use of lottery is helping the students to comprehend the whole contents of the materials that they have to present and make the students who rarely active during the presentation become active as they are chosen as the spokesperson.

However, some students also encountered difficulties during the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. The necessity to memorize all of the materials that had to be presented is considered as an intricate task for students to deal with. Another difficulty is dealing with time management regarding the group discussion before the presentation. Some students who have to work during their part-time job are having difficulties to manage their time with their group mates. The analysis of the findings found that negative interdependence might be the cause of those difficulties.

Despite some difficulties that the students perceived during the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation, most of the feedback tends to be positive in

supporting the use of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation as new model in group presentation.

5.2.Suggestion

For Teacher

It is important for teachers and students to select appropriate learning strategies and models for use in cooperative learning environments in order to improve student achievement, interaction, and positive attitude during cooperative learning. The findings of this study provide some implications for teachers who are willing to integrate cooperative learning activities and resources in their courses and for students who want to know the best ways to participate in group activities and how to interact with their group members productively.

First, teachers would be advised to include positive interdependence activities into their courses as it is one of the important components for fostering effective group work. Further, they should be prepared to help their students conduct their group activities effectively by facilitating the students' cooperative learning activities throughout the course. In addition, teachers and students should be encouraged to implement cooperative learning models which promote positive interdependence and individual accountability rather than traditional group activities among the components of cooperative learning in order to improve student achievement in cooperative learning environments.

Second, it is recommended that teachers apply both positive interdependence strategies and individual accountability strategies to increase and facilitate student interaction effectively; in other words, these structured learning strategies, such as *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation, are essential for students to participate fully in group discussion activities. Specifically, the findings of student interaction in this study imply that positive interdependence

and individual accountability are important components for teachers and students to define a problem and advance their arguments when group members begin and activate their group discussion participation. They also imply that teachers and students should be recommended to choose between positive interdependence and other cooperative learning components when they struggle to proceed to the next step for structured and active discussion. Specifically, it can be more effective for teachers to choose several components of positive interdependence strategies, such as role interdependence, reward interdependence or task interdependence, in order to increase student interaction, especially when students do not know how to share information among their group members. However, it can be more effective if the teachers choose to focus on role interdependence strategies rather than task interdependence strategies in situations where students do not know how to negotiate meaning and construct knowledge during their group activities.

Third, teachers who are interested in improving positive student attitude toward group discussion and presentation activities are advised to consider the use of some components of positive interdependence strategies in group activities. Specifically, it is recommended that teachers help students perceive that they should actively contribute to, and be more aware of, their group activities by utilizing positive interdependence strategies such as goal-, reward-, role- and resource-interdependence strategies. In addition, they should be prepared to provide students with the information or evaluation about whether they can effectively cooperate with each other or not during their discussion activities. Facilitating and fostering semi-instructed cooperative learning strategies, by having the students present their group reports using selected role, are essentially required by the teachers.

Finally, teachers are recommended to organize both positive interdependence strategies and individual accountability strategies, and prepare their instructional materials thoroughly before group activities begin. If teachers fail to organize these two strategies or perceive specific methods for facilitating these two strategies in advance of the group activities or presentation, they may feel frustrated when students are not willing to actively participate in their group presentation or when they cannot find the proper means or methods to participate. These situations can lead to decreasing student interaction and negative influences on student attitude toward cooperative learning activities.

For Further Research

Future research can build on these findings to refine the instructional resources of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation and offer specific perspective on positive interdependence and individual accountability strategies to enhance students' effectiveness and extend the educational settings and academic areas to which they may be applied.

This study did not investigate the quantitative relationships between individual student characteristics and their achievement, interaction, and attitude during the implementation of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. Such individual differences in student characteristics may have had confounding effects strong enough to make the inference of treatment effects difficult to determine. Further research may provide insight on the role of such individual differences on these relationships and provide a means of modifying the activities to accommodate the profiles and backgrounds of specific students.

In addition, some findings related to students' feedback in this study do not support the results of previous research that the use of positive interdependence strategies and group processing strategies can increase positive student attitude toward cooperative learning activities

(Brewer & Klein, 2006; Garibaldi et al., 1989; Jensen et al., 2002). By exploring this discrepancy in results between previous studies and this study and whether there are additional factors related to measuring student attitude toward cooperative learning, future studies can provide additional insights on the effective application of group work presentation in cooperative learning.

Moreover, this study did not investigate any instructor or teacher attributes, for example, the relationships: 1) between instructor's perception and student achievement, interaction, and attitude, 2) between instructor's self-efficacy and student achievement, interaction, and attitude, or 3) between instructor's attitude toward the use of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation and student achievement, interaction, and attitude.

Finally, this study did not investigate the effectiveness of positive interdependence-plus-individual accountability on student achievement, interaction, and attitude after they experience *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation. Previous research on positive interdependence has shown that combined interdependence strategies such as roles-plus-rewards are often a more effective influence on student interaction than any single strategy (Brewer & Klein, 2006). Therefore, future studies can provide additional insights of experimental research on effective use of *A-aikem 3* model of group work presentation by exploring how students interact with each other when they receive combined interdependence-plus-individual accountability treatment in their group activities.

References

- Abass, F. (2008). Cooperative Learning and Motivation. *Aichi University Bulletin: Language and Culture*, 15-35.
- Biehler, R., & Snowman, J. (1997). *Psychology Applied to Teaching*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. In Herrmann, K. J. (Ed.). The impact of cooperative learning on student engagement: Results from an intervention. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14 (3), 175-187.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, D. (2007). *Teaching By Principles: An Interactive Approach To Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching By Principles: An Interactive Approach To Language Pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Campbell, J. (2006). Asian Students' Perceptions of Group Work and Group Assignments in a New Zealand Tertiary Institution. *EDU-COM International*, 1-13.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge: MIT Press. In Pishghadam, R., & Moghaddam, M. M. (2011). Group Work in EFL Children's Classes: A Qualitative Study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 622-629.
- Cohen, J. (2003). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for The Behavioral Sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: SAGE
- Deutsch, M. (1949). An Experimental Study Of The Effects Of Cooperation And Competition Upon Group Process, *Human Relations*, 2, 199-231. In Har, L. B. (Ed.). Cooperative Learning. *A CLASS The Active Classroom*, 1-33.
- Ellis, G. (1995). How Culturally Appropriate Is the Communicative Approach?. *ELT Journal*, 50(2), 213- 218, 1996. Ibsen, E.B. *The Double Role of Fiction in Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford University Press. In Ngoc, T. T. (Ed.). Group Work in EFL Literature Classes. *Teacher's Edition*, 12-16.
- Farzaneh, N., & Nejadansari, D. (2014). Students' Attitude towards Using Cooperative Learning for Teaching Reading Comprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(2), 287-292.

- Har, L. B. (2013). Cooperative Learning. *A CLASS The Active Classroom*, 1-33.
- Hayes, J. (2002). *Interpersonal skills at work (2nd Edition)*. Hove: Routledge.
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Herrmann, K. J. (2013). The Impact Of Cooperative Learning On Student Engagement:Results From An Intervention. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(3), 175-187.
- Jensen, M., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2002). Impact of positive interdependence during electronic quizzes on discourse and achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95(3), 161-166.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. (2006). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson R.T. (1994). Learning together. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Handbook of cooperative learning methods* (pp. 51-81). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Smith, K.A. (1998). Cooperative learning returns to college. *Change*, 30(4), 26-35.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. (2007). The state of cooperative learning in Post secondary and professional settings. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(1), 33-38
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., Stanne, M.B., & Garibaldi, A. (1989). Impact of group processing on achievement in cooperative groups. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 130, 507-516.
- Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning* (2nd ed.). San Juan Capistrano, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
- Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (1994). The structural approach: Six keys to co-operative learning. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Handbook of cooperative learning methods* (pp. 115-133). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Koppenhaver, G.D. and Shrader, C.B. (2003). Structuring the Classrooms for Performance: Cooperative Learning With Instructor-Assigned Teams. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*. 1, 1, 1-21. In Farzaneh, N., & Nejadansari, D. (Ed.). Students' Attitude towards Using Cooperative Learning for Teaching Reading Comprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(2), 287-292.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). *Interactive Discourse in Small and Large Groups*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C., and S.Patricia. (1996). "Appropriate Pedagogy." *ELT Journal* 50 (3), 199-211

- Krashen, S. (1986). Bilingual Education and Second Language Acquisition Theory. In Pishghadam, R., & Moghaddam, M. M. (Ed.). *Group Work in EFL Children's Classes: A Qualitative Study. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 622-629.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond Methods: Macrostrategies For Language Teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nam, C. W. (2008). *The Relative Effectiveness of Positive Interdependence and Group Processing on Student Achievement, Interaction, and Attitude in Online Cooperative Learning*. Texas: Graduate Studies of Texas A&M University.
- Ngoc, T. T. (2003). Group Work in EFL Literature Classes. *Teacher's Edition*, 12-16.
- Nunan, D & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Obaya, A. (1999). Getting Cooperative Learning. *Science Education International*, 10(2), 25-27
- Pishghadam, R., & Moghaddam, M. M. (2011). Group Work in EFL Children's Classes: A Qualitative Study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 622-629.
- Race P (2005) *Making Learning Happen: A Guide for Post-Compulsory Education*, 1st edn. Thousand Oaks, CA/London: SAGE. In Herrmann, K. J. (Ed.). The impact of cooperative learning on student engagement: Results from an intervention. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(3), 175-187.
- Raja, N., & Saeed, A. (2012). The Effectiveness of Group Work and Pair Work for Students of English at Undergraduate Level in Public and Private Sector Colleges. *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In Business*, 4(5), 155-163.
- Richards, K. (2009). Interviews. In J. Heigham, & R. A. Crocker. (Ed.). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction* (pp. 182-196). London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Richards, J.C, & Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodologies in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rungapadiachy, D.M. (1999). *Interpersonal Communication And Psychology For Health Care Professionals: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Butterworth-Heinemann. In Hayes, J. (Ed.). *Interpersonal skills at work (2nd Edition)*. Hove: Routledge.
- Sarfo, F & Elen, J. (2011) Investigating the Impact of Positive Resource Interdependence and Individual Accountability on Students' Academic Performance in Cooperative Learning. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*. 9(1), 73-94.
- Sharan, S. (1990). Co-operative learning: A perspective on research and practice. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Co-operative learning: Theory and research*. New York: Praeger.

- Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1992). *Expanding cooperative learning through group investigation*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, R. (1988). *Educational psychology: Theory into practice* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Springer, L., Stanne, M. E., & Donovan, S. S. (1999). Effects Of Small-Group Learning On Undergraduates In Science, Mathematics, Engineering, And Technology: A Metaanalysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 69(1), 21. In Nam, C. W. (2008). *The Relative Effectiveness of Positive Interdependence and Group Processing on Student Achievement, Interaction, and Attitude in Online Cooperative Learning*. Texas: Graduate Studies of Texas A&M University.
- Steward, G. (2014). Promoting & Managing Effective Collaborative Group Work. *iteach Quality Learning and Teaching*, 1-20.
- Strahm, M. F. (2007). Cooperative Learning: Group Processing and Students Needs for Self-Worth and Belonging. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 53(1), 63-76.
- Sutikno, S. (2014). *Metode dan model-model pembelajaran: Menjadikan proses pembelajaran lebih variatif, aktif, inovatif, efektif dan menyenangkan*. Lombok: Holistica.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypotheses: theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. In Pishghadam, R., & Moghaddam, M. M. (Ed.). Group Work in EFL Children's Classes: A Qualitative Study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 622-629.
- Tamah, S. M. (2011). *Student Interaction in the Implementation of the Jigsaw Technique in Language Teaching*. Published thesis, the University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands.
- Tamah, S. M. (2012). Teacher's Enforcing Positive Interdependence: Students' Perceptions. *Magister Scientiae* 31(7), 74-83.
- Tamah, S. M. (2014). Idea Sharing: Assessment in a Cooperative Learning Class. *PASAA* 47, 200-210.
- Tamah, S. M. (2015). Innovation in Group Work Presentation: A Challenge Responded. *Proceedings of The 24th MELTA International Conference* (pp. 380-393). Kuala Lumpur: August Publishing Sdn. Bhd.
- Tamah, S. M. (2017). *Pernak-Pernik Kerja Kelompok Berbasis Pembelajaran Kooperatif*. Surabaya: Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.

- Tamah, S. M., & Prijambodo, V. L. (2015). *Model Asesmen Pembelajaran Kooperatif: Strategi Menjawab Tantangan*. Surabaya: Revka Petra Media.
- Taqi, H. A., & Al-Nouh, N. A. (2014). Effect of Group Work on EFL Students' Attitudes and Learning in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(2), 52-61.
- Trytten, D. (1999). Progressing from Small Group Work to Cooperative Learning: A Case Study from Computer Science. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 85-91.
- Trytten, D.A., 1999. "Progressing From Small Group Work To Cooperative Learning: A Case Study From Computer Science,": *Frontiers in Ed*. In Herrmann, K. J. (Ed.). *The Impact Of Cooperative Learning On Student Engagement:Results From An Intervention*. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(3), 175-187.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. In Pishghadam, R., & Moghaddam, M. M. (Ed.). *Group Work in EFL Children's Classes: A Qualitative Study*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 622-629.