

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the writer presents background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, theoretical framework, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study, definition of key terms, and thesis organization.

1.1 Background of the Study

Nowadays in which technology has influenced all areas, teachers are no longer the main sources of learning. Students easily get the information from various sources like television especially TV cable, internet like messenger, online forum discussion, and many more. Students, moreover, can access information easily – by using one click, they can dig everything that they want to know. This highly information era then has changed students' and teachers' role in the classroom. In the past, students tend to come to the class without any information then teachers transfer all information that they know to the students. However, the old approach, teacher-centered cannot be applied in the present days. In Tamah and Prijambodo's (2015) study, it is found that teacher-centered has been abandoned by quite a lot of Indonesian teachers. One of possible reasons of that abandonment is teachers might have realized that they are not the only sources of learning. In fact, their students might get lots of data from other learning sources. In addition, students might get bored if their teachers keep giving fact that they have realized. Therefore, teachers try to shift their attention to student-centeredness.

In student-centered learning, students are actively finding and discussing the information which is contrasted with the old approach where students passively received the knowledge. Here, the students are given greater chance and opportunity to talk because they are engaged in the learning process. Several of studies have reported that student-centered learning promotes better learning outcomes, greater retention, and more inclusive class environments than does the lecture alone (Freeman et al., 2014; Hake, 1998; Springer, Stanne & Donovan, 1999 as cited in Hodges, 2017). Simply students are often involved in group work.

The philosophy behind group work is social constructivism, which is developed by Lee Vygotsky. He has the same point of view with Piaget, who believes that children actively construct their knowledge. However, Vygotsky gives social interaction and culture far more important roles in cognitive development rather than Piaget does (Santrock, 2009). For that reason, students who work and have social interaction with more-skilled adults and peers are indispensable to their cognitive development (Holzman, 2009; Tamah, 2017). When students work in group and interact with each other, they indirectly learn to use the tools that will help them to be successful in the future.

Group work is a term which is defined differently in various sources: as a technique (Tamah, 2017 who refers to Brown, 2001), as tasks and exercises completed by learners (Tamah, 2017 who cites Nunan, 1999), as learning methodology (Tamah, 2017 who refers to Sutikno, 2014). Tamah (2017) then summarizes those terms as a technique of doing academic assignment involving students who can work together under the minimum supervision of teacher or even without teacher supervision.

Numerous of researches demonstrate that group work interaction engages students in learning concepts and problems solving strategies, improves self-confidence, and overcomes the fear of mistake (Davidson 1985; Kocak et al., 2009; Berneto, 2000 as cited in Sofroniou & Poutos, 2016).

Even though group work has several advantages, there are several drawbacks found in the implementation of group work. First, one of the members might sit quietly because he is too shy to participate. Then the other members might dominate in the decision making, while another member talk about unrelated things. Therefore, the result of group work application tends to be perceived as negative (Lie, 2002). The failure of accomplishing the task will be remarked by blaming on one another. The success yet will raise fairness issue between high and low achievers.

Those problems might happen because the application of group work does not follow cooperative learning components. As pointed out by Lie (2002) & Tamah (2017), cooperative learning is not only about learning and sitting together, but more on structuring the group work. Sparks (2017), moreover, convincingly states that collaboration is just like any other skill, so it must be taught. It means teachers cannot expect the students to do the work by themselves without any supervision. The supervision can be applied when teachers intervene and monitor students' interaction in group.

Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning (Smith, 1996 who refers Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991). Here, students are placed to work together on a common task, sharing information and supporting one another. Even though students have already sat and worked in groups, teachers still have a significant role in leading the learning process. In a cooperative learning class, teachers design and assign group learning tasks, manage time, and resources, monitor students' learning, check to see that students are on task and that group process is working well (Cranton, 1996; Smith, 1996 as cited in Barkley, Cross & Major, 2005). In addition, cooperative learning can be an alternative from competition in teacher-centered situation. As pointed out by Johnson, Johnson and Hulubec (1994 as cited in Tamah, 2012) cooperative learning could replace the competitive organizational structures with a team-based, high-performance organizational structure. In teacher-centered situation, students tend to compete to be the best among all. In cooperative learning, however, students are pushed to

help all the group members to be successful. To form effective group work, teachers need to guide students applying five components.

Five basic components to consider when applying group work based on cooperative learning is mentioned in numerous articles repeatedly (Felder & Brent, 2007; Johnson & Johnson 1994; Kagan & Kagan, 1994 as cited in Tamah, 2011, 2013, 2014). They are (1) Face to Face interaction, (2) Collaborative Skills, (3) Group Processing, (4) Individual Accountability and (5) Positive Interdependence.

Face to face interaction refers to setting up the group environment so that it encourages students to interact and communicate with one another. Collaborative skills are a social, communication and critical thinking skills the students need to work effectively in groups. Groups processing refers to reflection and assessing the group's effort both in terms of academic and collaborative interaction. Individual accountability is the responsibility of each student in group work. It means every student must realize that everybody holds an individual responsibility to achieve group goals. Each student should be active whenever he finds problems in understanding the lesson. If a student does all the work and the others hitchhike the work, then the group will not function effectively. Positive interdependence is the heart of cooperative learning. Students must believe that their success is linked with others. One cannot succeed unless the other members of group succeed. As a result, students are working together and helping one another to achieve the same goal. Among those five components, individual accountability and positive interdependence are two most significant components in cooperative learning class (Tamah, 2011 who refers to Kagan & Kagan, 1994; Tinzmann et al., 1990).

Learning and assessment are inseparable in which they complete one another. One of the literatures also says that assessment is the celebration of learning. Assessment or a test, in plain words, is a method of measuring a person ability or knowledge in a given domain (Brown, 2001). In this study, assessment is also meant to measure students' ability and knowledge in cooperative group work.

When assessing the result of group work, teachers mostly still assess students in individually, either by taking the score of the lowest student or averaging the scores of each team member (Lie, 2002; Tamah & Prijambodo, 2015 who refers to Tamah & Prijambodo, 2014). It is said that both options have its own advantages and disadvantages. Possible problems that might arise are high achiever's students feel disappointed, while low achiever's students feel guilty. It might be concluded that there is a disassociation between the application of cooperative group work and the implementation of cooperative group work assessment. Referring to a research report (Tamah & Prijambodo, 2014; Tamah & Wirjawan, 2018) and the explicit ideas of representativeness in

assessment (Tamah and Prijambodo, 2015; Tamah, 2017), three current insights with regard to assessment-oriented formative test are introduced. First, the change from individual (conventional) assessment into group assessment. Second, the change from individual (conventional) assessment into representative assessment, and the third articulates the change from individual (conventional) assessment into representative assessment with structured discussion (Tamah & Prijambodo, 2015; Tamah & Wirjawan, 2018).

This study underlies the concept of group work in cooperative learning which is named cooperative group work. Tamah (2017) defined cooperative group work as a very structured group work that enables students to work together optimally and help each other in their academic tasks. The implementation of cooperative group work was adopted from Tamah (2017). This paper was designed to find out student's perception about language learning on cooperative group work. In addition, this study also investigated student's perception on representative assessment in cooperative group work.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The present study attempts to answer the following questions;

1. What is student's perception about language learning through cooperative group work?
 - a. What is student's perception about ice breaker?
 - b. What is student's perception about modelling group work?
 - c. What is student's perception about group naming?
 - d. What is student's perception about role of group members?
2. What is student's perception about representative assessment in cooperative group work?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out student's perception about language learning on cooperative group work enforcing ice breaker, model of group work, group naming, role of group members. In addition, this study also investigated student's perception on representative assessment in cooperative group work.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

The theory underlying this study is the theory of cooperative learning and social constructivism. Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other learning (Smith, 1996). Five basic components in Cooperative learning are (1) Face to Face interaction, (2) Collaborative Skills, (3) Group Processing, (4) Individual Accountability and (5) Positive Interdependence.

Social Constructivism is the theory behind cooperative learning which was advanced by Vygotsky. He considered the roles of society, language and interaction are important in understanding how humans learn. It, moreover, stated that interaction that happens in the social environment help human learn, develop, and grow. In fact, adults, parents, teachers, and peers play important roles in the process of learning a new language (Li & Lam, 2013 as cited in Angelia, 2015).

1.5 Significance of the Study

Practically, this study tries to redefine the concept of group work in the classroom. Group work cannot be done instantly by assigning project to students in team without teacher supervision. Group work, in addition should be based on cooperative learning. In this study it is called cooperative group work which students work together and help each other structurally in their academic task. The findings are expected to change the society assumption, especially students about group work.

Theoretically, the findings are expected to support cooperative learning framework which is stated learning altogether promotes better student learning outcomes, greater student retention, and more inclusive class environments (Freeman et.al., 2014; Hake, 1998; Springer, Stanne & Donovan, 1999 as cited in Hodges, 2017).

1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Study

This present study mainly dealt with 7th grader's perception toward the application of Cooperative group work in English class. The implementation of cooperative group work will be adopted from Tamah (2017). There are seven strategies mentioned in the book; however, this study will use only some of it. The details are elaborated in Chapter 2. In addition, this study had small population, which was only 28 students.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding, the writer defines the following key terms related to this study:

1. Cooperative group work

Cooperative group work is a very structured group work that enables students to work together optimally and help each other in their academic tasks (Tamah, 2017).

2. Student's Perception

Student's perception refers to the emotion and opinion that a student has towards the learning experience. In this study, it means how the student feels and thinks about learning using cooperative group work and conventional group work.

1.8 Organization of the Thesis

This present study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter is introduction, covers background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, theoretical framework, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study, definition of key terms and thesis organization. The second chapter consists of review of related literature. Research method is presented in chapter three. Chapter four deals with data analysis, interpretation of the findings and also discussion. In the last chapter, the writer draws conclusion and gives some suggestions that will be useful for the readers especially the teacher and future studies.