MOTIVATING STUDENTS TO LEARN GRAMMAR THROUGH THE COOPERATIVE LEARNING TECHNIQUE

The case of 2nd year English students at the University Constantine

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for a Master Degree in

Sciences de langages

Submitted by:

ATHMANI Assma

Supervisor:       Examiner:

Pr. SAADI H.      Dr. BELOUAHEM R.

Academic Year: 2009-2010
ABSTRACT

The present study aims at investigating the motivational effect of using well-structured cooperative group work in teaching grammar to second year students of English as a Foreign Language at the department of English, University of Constantine. In order to check this correlation, we have hypothesised that well-structured cooperative learning would result in motivating students and that if it were used in teaching grammar, it would help students to learn grammar. To verify the validity of these hypotheses, we have conducted a pilot study, through which we have tested the students’ understanding of the questions and the relevance of their answers to our study. After, we have carried out the main investigation that is, in turn, divided into two kinds of questionnaire; the students’ questionnaire and the teachers’ questionnaire. The first one is composed of nineteen questions and administered to one hundred-sixteen 2\textsuperscript{nd} year English students at the department of English, University of Constantine. The second questionnaire consists of twenty-two questions given to seven 2\textsuperscript{nd} year grammar teachers out of among the eight teaching at the same department during the academic year 2009-2010. The discussion of the results has shown that using cooperative learning motivates second year English students and when used in grammar, well-structured cooperative group/pair work helps second year English students to learn it.
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Introduction

1. Background of the Study

The key goal in using recent approaches and methods of foreign language teaching, such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Learner-Centered Teaching, Task-Based teaching, is the development of Communicative Competence (CC). As defined by Pachler (2000a; in Pachler and Field, 2001), Communicative Competence in language teaching and learning is “a mixture of grammatical competence, socio-culture competence, discourse competence and strategic competence” (p.126). In other words, Communicative Competence is the combination of many competences that relate to the structure of language, the social context in which it is used in, and cognitive abilities. Grammatical competence, which is an aspect of Communicative Competence, encompasses “knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar, semantics, and phonology” (Canale and Swain, 1980, p.29; in Brown, 2007, p.219). Grammar, therefore, has a very important role in second and foreign language learning.

According to Pachler (1999), “[grammar] allows us to keep manageable the vocabulary we need to communicate effectively and accurately about both simple and complex matters” (p.94). Furthermore, it enables us to form longer spoken utterances and written sentences, take part in linguistic interaction with other participants and behave in accordance with the socio-cultural rules of appropriateness in different contexts (Ibid, p.94).

After acknowledging the importance of grammar in foreign language teaching/learning, Hedge (2000) explains that the questions to be asked are about the appropriate way (or ways) to integrate grammar teaching in a communicative methodology that gives importance to all aspects of communicative competence, and the adequate form that teaching should take. These two questions imply further question such as decisions concerning the methods that
would be used, classroom techniques and activities, and the content that should be highlighted.

To integrate grammar in Communicative Approach and answer these questions, we should take into consideration, first, the different ways that can be used to introduce different types of knowledge depending on many external factors like students' levels, teachers' objectives. Secondly, the activities that would be done should be interesting and involve students into these new methods of teaching grammar. Thus, implementing grammar in communicative approaches should regard the affective aspect of the learners, especially motivation.

Brown (2007) argues that motivation is at the heart of any learning process in general and, consequently, he sees the need to investigate “how to create, foster, and maintain motivation?” (p.168). In addition to that, Thornbury (1999) considers motivation one of the basic principles for learning grammar, and believes that learning grammar cannot take place under any conditions if there is a lack of motivation. For Thornbury (1999), it all depends on the teacher’s role since “it’s the teacher’s job to choose tasks and materials that engage learners” (p.26).

One teaching strategy that is considered an important component of the recent approaches to teaching a second or a foreign language (L2/FL), and that would simultaneously be implemented for all levels and in all subjects, is cooperative learning.

Most researchers have agreed on the fact that cooperative learning has positive effects on learners’ affect. According to Hill and Flynn (2006) “Educators have found that cooperative learning groups foster language acquisition in ways that whole-class instruction cannot” (p.56).
Basing this research project on the aforementioned ideas, we are going to check the impact of using cooperative learning as a technique to motivate second year students to learn grammar at the University of Constantine.

2. Aims of the Study

We aim in this study to help teachers and learners to establish and to increase the level of motivation when learning grammar through investigating the effect of the cooperative learning strategy on the inner push and interest of the learners which is motivation and to help learners and teachers implement this strategy effectively in teaching and learning grammar.

3. Statement of the Problem and the Research Question

When students exhibit a lack of motivation -which can be presented through their lack of homework's completion, poor attendance, low class participation and poor student teacher relationship- learning a foreign language and its components (pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar) becomes extremely difficult. In this study, we are going to check whether cooperative learning, as a motivational technique, has any effect on the motivation of second year students of English as a foreign language at the Department of Languages at the University of Constantine, and whether implementing well-structured cooperative group work helps the same students to learn grammar.

To achieve that, we ask the following question:

What effect does well-structured cooperative learning have on motivating second year students of English as a Foreign Language to learn grammar?

4. Assumptions and Hypotheses

To answer our question, we assume that
1. All second year English learners at the Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Constantine are learning grammar twice a week.

2. These learners have some opinions about group/pair work since they have already experienced working in groups at least once even when learning another subject.

Under these assumptions, we hypothesise that:

If second year English students at the University of Constantine use cooperative learning effectively when learning grammar, they would be more motivated to learn it.

This hypothesis can be divided into two sub-hypotheses:

1. If 2nd year English students at the University of Constantine use cooperative learning they would be motivated.

2. If 2nd year English students at the University of Constantine use well-structured cooperative learning when learning grammar, they would learn it effectively.

5. Definition of Variables

Cooperative learning is an “arrangement in which students work in mixed ability groups and are rewarded on the basis of the success of the group” (Woolfolk, 2004, p.492).

Motivation is an “internal process that activates, guides, and maintains behaviour over time” (Slavin, 2006, p.317).

Grammar is “the term that teachers and learners use to refer to the way that language is organized. It refers to the collection of rules which are used to create words and sentences” (Schellekens, 2007, p.28).

In this study, we are looking for a correlation between two variables cooperative learning technique, and students’ motivation to learn Grammar. The procedure that will be adopted is the descriptive study through using the questionnaire as a tool by which we gather the adequate data for the study. For the needs of the present study, two forms of questionnaire will be used; the first questionnaire will be delivered to second year grammar teachers at the Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Constantine; the second is administer to second year students of English as a Foreign Language, at the same department after designing a pilot study to check the understanding of the items and their relevance to our investigation.

One main reason for not adopting the experimental design as a tool of research, though it would be more appropriate for such a study, is the constraints of time. The short time allocated for undertaking this research does not allow for designing the experiment and analysing the results before the deadline.

7. Organization of the Research

This dissertation is divided into two main sections, a theoretical part which is concerned with literature review and a practical part which concerns the investigation and the analysis of the results, their interpretation and discussion. Both of the two parts are presented after the introduction which contains the reasons behind choosing this study, the statement of the problem and the organization of the research.
In the first part, we start by a chapter about the theoretical review composed of two parts, one that deals with cooperative learning in general as technique that can be used in order to teach any subject, its nature, its theoretical background, its essential characteristics and its benefits. From the affective benefits, we have specified motivation in the second part of the same chapter. We deal first with a general view of motivation referring to many approaches and theories and we create a relation between cooperative learning and motivational theory.

The second chapter of the first section is about learning grammar in a communicative approach. After presenting its notion and its role in EFL, we speak about its different ways of representations, and then relate it to communicative approach. Examples of teaching grammar in communicative approach using cooperative group/pair work are given at the end of the chapter before the conclusion.

In the second part devoted to main investigation, we start by the pilot study and analyzing its results. Then, we make the students' main study and discuss its results. After that, we analyse the teachers' questionnaire and discuss the results gathered. At the end, we make comparisons between the two last results and provide pedagogical suggestions based on this comparison.
Chapter one: Cooperative learning

Introduction

As opposed to traditional methods of teaching a second or a foreign language (L2/FL), where lecturers transform knowledge to the students and where students were considered passive receivers of this knowledge (Williams & Burden, 1997, p.5), recent approaches of teaching L2/FL emphasise the construction of knowledge by both the teacher and the learner; hence, the student is considered active constructor, discoverer and transformer of his own knowledge. Practical examples of these approaches are CLT and Competency-Based approaches.

The main principle of these recent approaches is communicating in the classroom (Richard & Roger, 2001, p.192). One central component of communication, according to Brown (2001) is interaction between learners. The reason is that teacher and learners exchange ideas during interaction; they produce and receive knowledge about the content and the forms of the language at the same time. This will give them greater opportunity to learn L2/FL using the target language itself (Finkbeiner, 2004). Moreover, practice is considered one of the effective strategies of learning. Gilbert (2002) argues that “[t]he best way of learning anything is to teach it to others” (p.54). This principle can be applied in teaching and learning L2/FL using a method that gives a great chance for L2/FL learners to apply their teaching and learning strategies (Finkbeiner, 2002; in Finkbeiner, 2004, p.112), in addition to putting in practice the target language in small groups; this method is cooperative learning.

In the first part of this chapter we are going to approach cooperative learning as a general method that can be applied in many academic subjects through presenting its conceptual definition, comparing it with other methods and structures, giving its theoretical background, criteria for using this method effectively, and its benefits.
From the benefits, we are going in the second part to specify the motivational outcome of using cooperative learning through presenting general views of motivation, and clarifying the relationship between cooperative learning method and motivation.

1. The Nature of Cooperative Learning

1.1. Conceptual Definition

Slavin (1995) has identified Cooperative Learning (CL) as the “variety of teaching methods in which students work in small groups to help one another learn academic content” (p.2). In other words, cooperative learning includes different instructional techniques in which students work in small groups and focus on achieving their shared academic goals. For Johnson and Johnson (2005), Cooperative learning is “the instructional use of small groups such that students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning” (p.117). That is to say, all members have to contribute in enhancing their learning and each others’ understanding when using CL. Hill and Flynn (2006) think that it is by using cooperative learning that students use interaction to understand and master new knowledge.

There are two major characteristics of the cooperative learning method suggested by Brown (2001). The first is the responsibility and contributions all learners have in their groups; the second is the interaction whereby students help each other. For Stevens (2008), the major characteristic of cooperative learning is the way students take responsibility from their teachers over their learning and the learning of their group mates, and how they gradually lead the instructions given by their teacher.

1.2. The Differences between Cooperative, Competitive and Individualistic Methods

Williams and Burden (1997) refer to the way teachers can organise their language lessons as classroom structure. Classroom structures include many instructional processes among which cooperative, individualistic and competitive structures. Johnson and Johnson (2005) explain them as follows:
Cooperative learning is usually constructed with competitive (student working to achieve goals that only a few can attain; students can success if and only if other students in the class fail to obtain their goals) and individualistic learning (students working alone on goal independent from the goals of others). (p. 117)

This definition implies that competitive learning is a structure of comparing one's achievement to the others' achievement so that certain rewards can be obtained by who achieved the goals better than the others. Individualistic learning is to plan learning in a way students seem to work isolated when learning; and their achievements or the reward gained are not related to those of the others.

From another point of view, Smith (1996) claims that the differences between cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning is based on “the norm of interaction” through which learners perceive each other (p.71). Smith’s (1996) opinion means that the way students exchange ideas with each other determines the structure most used in the classroom. If the student-student conversation is competitive, the main classroom structure tends then to be competitive, too. If there is no interaction between students, then the dominant structure of the classroom is the individualistic one.

In a competitive process, students work against one another; they look for achieving their goals. This determines the achievement of others whom they are competing with (Johnson et al., 1984). Ames (1984, in William & Burden, 1997) argues that in competitive situations, grades and "rewards are given only for right answers", which would increase the students’ fears of making mistakes (p.193). Thus, students would not engage in the activities presented. For Slavin (1995) this fear has negative effects for less able students, who would keep the lowest marks when using this method, if their classmates make greater efforts. Subsequently, less able students would quit participating and would relate their success only to their abilities (Slavin, 1995).

In individualistic learning, which Williams and Burden (1997) refer to as “master- based instruction”, grades and rewards are given on the basis of the differences between the
students’ last performance and his actual one; that is to say, differences within the same person. When students learn individualistically, attaining their goals is separated from others (Johnson et al., 1984).

Attle and Baker (2007) have suggested a structure that combines cooperation with competition which they think would be more beneficial especially for students in programs that aim at professional training. For Attle and Baker (2007), mixing the two strategies, by using cooperative learning in competitive environment where teams compete against each other for certain rewards, would have many advantages on many aspects of the curricular content.

1.3. Cooperative Learning versus Collaborative Learning

Cooperative learning is often regarded as a synonym of collaborative learning and sometimes is used in the same sense (China & China, 2009). However, according to some other researches there are major differences between the two of them (Pantiz, 1996; McWhaw et al., 2003). This disagreement about the differences between the two concepts results from the apparent similarities and overlapping of the meaning of two methods.

Pantiz (1996) defines collaboration as “personal” way of life of exchange and cooperative learning as ways of structuring an exchange (p.1). Pantiz (1996) states that the purpose of collaborative learning is building students’ responsibility for actions including learning and respecting the abilities and contributions of the peers, as opposed to the purpose of cooperative learning which is the achievement of specific goals through jointly working together. In other words, collaboration is defined as a system of beliefs people have about how they can help others and be helped when needed, and to what extent they value these beliefs; and cooperation refers to structuring strategies used with others to reach common goals. Hence, cooperative learning for Pantiz (1996) is considered more structured than collaborative learning in terms of its purpose and its instructional processes.
Smith and MacGregor (1992) think that collaborative learning is the superordinate concept of mutual help in the educational field either between students and students or students and teachers and cooperative learning is one among the approaches of structuring and organizing this approach. At the same time, Bruffee (1995, in McWhaw et al., 2003) thinks that collaborative learning and cooperative learning differ in two main aspects which are the level of students with whom each one is more effectively implemented and the type of knowledge that is focused on when using this method. Therefore, cooperative learning is, according to Bruffee (1995), best used with elementary and secondary schools, whereas collaborative learning fits more adults and adolescent students like those in college and faculty.

From another perspective, on the one hand, cooperative learning is effective in explaining “foundational” knowledge, which is information related to facts and formulas and has finite answers; on the other hand, collaborative learning is more appropriate to explain “non-foundational” knowledge, which is information that needs critical thinking, discussion, and has no finite answers (McWhaw et al., 2003, p.71).

2. Theoretical Background of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative leaning is supported by many theories; each one of them tries to give evidence for the effectiveness of using cooperative learning. Among these theories, we are going to speak about behavioural learning theory, cognitive theory, and social interdependence or social cohesion theory.

2.1. Behavioural Learning Theory

Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1998) suggest that students are likely to work hard when there is any kind of reward; since cooperative learning focuses on individual and group rewards, it is more probably assumed to help students to learn. Slavin (1995) and Slavin et al. (2003) named this theory “motivational theory”. According to the motivational perspective,
individual and learning group reward is based on the sum of individuals’ achievement because benefits is attained when group and individual goals are achieved when using cooperative learning. This would lead to make students more motivated to help each other and to do more efforts (Slavin, 1995, Slavin et al., 2003).

2.2. Cognitive Theory

According to Cohen et al. (2004) the cognitive theory views learning as a process of constructing knowledge through cognitive processes like reflective abstraction, recognition and so on (p.168). This is to say, meaning is built through actively participating in the learning process. There are two ways of constructing this knowledge, either according to Piaget’s theory or Vygotsky’s theory.

2.2.1. Piaget’s views

Piaget gives the learner an active role in the learning process, because according to Bentham (2002), Piaget thinks that when the learner is provided with situations where he can face “dis-equilibrium”, he will have cognitive conflict that would lead to learning new knowledge. Interacting activity is a good example of such situation. Cognitive conflict would happen when the learner realises that other learners have different opinions and points of view. Then, he would compare his old knowledge and the one he is facing in exchanging situations to build new knowledge based on cognitive processes. Stevens (2008) argues that cooperative learning either with peers or with small group is a helpful technique for such contradictory views to occur. When learners interact in cooperative learning activity, they at the same time, compare the knowledge they have with different information their group mates have. This situation causes cognitive conflict. When they agree on one opinion and view, the conflict is resolved. Through this way the new knowledge is built and constructed.
2.2.2. Vygotsky’s Views

O’Donell (2002) suggests that it is when the learner is put in contexts like cooperative learning one that he can use more beneficial learning processes. When learning with peers or in small groups, learners argue, explain, and listen; this would be a good source for them to get knowledge. One of the important key elements of Vygotsky theory is his emphasis on the social nature of learning (Slavin, 2006). Cooperative learning can be a valuable example that adds social characteristic to the learning activity.

Hence, Vygotsky’s theory has been found to support the use of cooperative learning strategies in which learners work together to support each other (Slavin et al., 2003). In his theory, Vygotsky emphasises the importance of more competent peers when they help less able students because what can be done once with help from more able students, can be done another time by oneself (Bentham, 2002). This implies that during learning in a cooperative heterogeneous group, all levels benefit; this state is known as “cognitive apprenticeship” (Stevens, 2008).

2.3. Social Interdependence Theory

According to Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1998), Social interdependence theory believes that cooperation is a result of positive interdependence among individuals’ goals. In other words, the way goals and individuals relationships are structured in a group work determines the way individuals are going to interact with each other and have great outcomes on the group goals. Slavin et al. (2003) named this theory social cohesion theory and they suggest that the effectiveness of cooperative learning is related to a large extent to the cohesiveness of the group. Cohesiveness is the situation where students help each other learn. It results from caring about the group and its members. Social psychological approaches identify social interdependence as an outcome of helping the groups’ members each other (O’Donell, 2002, p.489).
3. Criteria that Make Cooperative Learning Effective

Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1998) claim that there are forms of group work like “pseudo-groups”, which causes competition at close distance, and “Traditional Learning Group”, which consists of individualistic learning with talk; both of them do not result in any cooperation (p.28). It is then only under some circumstances that a group work will be cooperative.

In cooperative learning, students have to sit near each other, explain, discuss, and teach what they know to their teammates. They have to help each other to be productive. This is what Johnson and Johnson (2005) consider one of the elements of effective cooperative leaning, and named “face-to-face promotive interaction” (p.118). This interaction cannot fulfil its purpose without practising certain social skills which is another element of cooperative learning presented by Johnson et al. (1984). Examples of these skills are conflict management, decision making, communication, and trust building skills. When working together in cooperative groups, students should have the feeling that they need each other to accomplish their goals. Johnson et al. (1984) insist on this feeling of interdependence on one another positively to achieve the goals.

Johnson and Johnson (2005) suggest common goals, shared rewards, assigned roles for each member, using different resources, and identifying the team as techniques to build positive interdependence. Though in group goals students’ work with each other, students contributions and understanding should be evaluated separately from others. Johnson et al. (1984) labelled this characteristic “individual accountability” (p.4). Many researchers emphasise the importance of these two last elements, namely positive interdependence and individual accountability. Slavin (1995), for example, states that these two characteristics are the only two, among many others, that are shared between almost all the activities and models of cooperative learning.
Miller (2008) also has argued that positive interdependence and individual accountability are related key elements for cooperative learning to work because forming group feedback on the basis of the sum of how much each member reached the preset goals is a way to grade both individuals and the groups.

The last criterion proposed by Johnson and Johnson (2005) is “group processing” where students take some time to discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintain effective working relationship among members through controlling and managing their improvement, actions, problems and solutions.

Additional Conditions have been given by Hill and Flynn (2006) to ensure the effectiveness of cooperative learning. These conditions are forming groups in a heterogeneous way, using small groups composed of three to four students, and applying cooperative learning consistently and combining it with other instructional methods.

4. Benefits of Cooperative Learning

4.1. Learning Strategies

When using cooperative learning, learners practise many strategies either directly or indirectly. Explaining, arguing, negotiating meaning, repeating key words several times, and using words in actual contexts are important to be used in cooperative learning (Hill & Flynn, 2006). Simultaneously, Oxford (1990) considered these techniques as examples of memory and cognitive strategies.

Autonomy and responsibility are two metacognitive strategies (Oxford, 1990) that are inevitably resulted from well-structured cooperative group (Brown, 2001). That is to say, when cooperative groups are well-planned, each student becomes responsible for his/her individual learning and the group’s learning, and for the groups’ benefits as a whole, which makes all learners autonomous and responsible.
When learners use cooperative learning, they have to agree on certain goals and specific ways to achieve those goals. This obliges them to understand each others’ points of view and to try to be aware of how others think and feel. Finkbeiner (2004) assumes that this is one of the crucial outcomes of using foreign language learning. Oxford (1990) labels this “empathy with others” and classifies it under the social strategies category (p.21).

4.2. Achievement Outcomes

Many studies argue that learners who participate in cooperative learning have usually gained larger achievement than learners who use traditional groups learning (Gambrell, 2007). Hoynes (2007) indicates that for English Language Learners (ELLs), using cooperative group activities would help them achieve their academic goals because they are actively involved in “comprehensible output” and, at the same time, receiving “comprehensible input”; both have almost the same importance in learning a language (p.6). Through negotiating meaning and explaining points of view, learners adjust their speech and ideas to their peers’ needs and levels. By doing so, they can produce comprehensible input and understand comprehensible output from other peers. For this reason, Hill and Flynn (2006) think that interaction is the most important component of cooperative group work that helps to build new knowledge.

4.3. Social Outcomes

There are many positive results of using cooperative learning on the social relationships. First, it provides respect for others and cooperation between students (Hohn, 2005). When learners help their peers and feel helped by others, they start to strengthen their relationship with them and maximise their respect for them. Slavin (2006) thinks that this effect, most importantly, would last even outside the school. Stevens (2008) indicates that these social effects may go beyond time and place of using cooperative group work. In other words, the
positive relationships that were built in the classrooms are proved to remain even outside the classroom and after ending the cooperative work.

4.4. Affective Outcomes

According to Brown (2001), the use of cooperative learning makes learners feel secure from criticism; this feeling has great effect on the effectiveness of cooperative learning. This security is derived from dividing the embarrassment that one would feel when correcting his mistakes among the group members. Through this way, all learners, even the shy ones, would become active participants in the leaning process.

Johnson and Johnson (2005) note that the feeling of commitment learners have when they are involved in the cooperative work will decrease their “disruptive” and “off-task behavior” (p.118). It is the students’ feeling of participation in something meaningful and having active role in it that lead to commitment and feeling engaged in the activity.

5. Motivation and its Relation to Cooperative Learning

5.1. Motivational Theory: Overview

Motivation is considered one of the most powerful driving forces on learning (Slavin, 2006, p.317). Although many researchers agree on the undeniable effects of motivation, they have not yet agreed on a unique theory to explain or define motivation. However, in spite of the different aspects each theory focuses on in explaining motivation, they do not contradict each other but rather complement one another to have an ultimate, complete and clear view of what motivation is and how it is maintained.


5.1.1. Behavioural approach

The behavioural view of motivation insists on the impact of reinforcement on motivating desired behaviour (Williams & Burden; 1997). In other words, the nature and system of
rewards would determine the kind of the behaviour and how often it would happen again. According to Brown (2007), the behavioural perspective links motivation to a large extent to external factors, such as anticipation of reward as determiner of our behaviour.

5.1.2. Cognitive approach

Cognitive views focus on the role of our thought, expectations and understanding of the world (Feldman, 1997). That is to say, people do not react on the events or others’ behaviour but on the interpretation of these events. According to Woolfolk (2004), it includes attribution theory, Expectancy × Value theory, goal theory and self-schemas theory.

5.1.2.a. Attribution theory

Attribution theory of motivation looks for finding justifications for success and failure (Slavin, 2006). People may relate their success, or failures to self or others’ influences, like ability, effort, mood, luck, difficulty of the task influence of others and so on.

Weiner (1979, 2000; in Woolfolk, 2004) has classified these excuses into three domains. Firstly, the cause can be either external or internal to the person. Secondly, this reason can either be stable or instable. Finally, the cause can be controlled by the person or uncontrolled (p.344). Thus, the person would believe that either the cause is due to his own effort or ability or out of him; he can think of the cause as changeable or unchangeable; and, finally, he would either believe that he can control this cause or not.

5.1.2.b. Expectancy × Value theory

Expectancy × Value theory insists on the anticipated gain or benefit; the learners are motivated by how much they expect to achieve the benefits and by the value of that benefit (Cohen et al., 2004). This theory claims that the individual’s expectation of reaching a goal and the value of that goal to him/her would produce together motivational power for the learner. Woolfolk (2004) argues that if one factor is missing, no motivation would exist.
5.1.2.c. Goal theory

Locke and Latham (1990, in Woolfolk, 2004, p.359) define a goal as “an outcome or attainment an individual is striving to accomplish”. Goal theory states that setting appropriate goals and making the needed forces to reach them can be an important part of motivational theory (Williams & Burden, 1997). According to Brophy (2004), this theory focuses on deciding about the goals and structuring strategies to achieve them rather than looking just for what learners need.

Slavin (2006) claims that researchers have distinguished between two types of goals: learning goals (or mastery goals), and performance goals. Woolfolk (2004) explains that students who set mastery goals focus on gaining competences in the skills taught, they look for difficult and challenging tasks; and those who set performance goals care more about positive judgment from others and about scores and grades.

5.1.2.d. Self Schemas theory

This theory argues that what students believe about themselves is an aspect that should be considered in explaining motivation. Woolfolk (2004) insists on the motivational effect of learners’ “self schemas”, which includes self-efficacy, the learners’ beliefs about his effectiveness in certain area, and his beliefs about his ability and his self-esteem.

Brown (2007) indicates that people get their self-esteem, which is judgment and evaluation people make about themselves and their self-worth, from past experiences and from assessment of the world around them.

5.1.3. The Humanistic Approach

From a Humanistic perspective, to motivate means to look at the human as an entire individual who has many components and to make the links between these elements in order to understand human behaviours. It includes many theories, among which Maslow’s Needs Theory and Self-Determination Theory (STD).
5.1.3.a. Maslow’s Needs Theory

This theory suggests that motivation comes from the inside of the human, and that cognitive, affective and physical needs are all interrelated (Cohen et al., 2004).

Maslow (1970; in Brown, 2001) highlights a system of needs inside each individual and orders them hierarchically like a pyramid. The lowest level concerns the physiological needs, then safety needs level, followed by the level of love and belongingness needs; after that, there is esteem needs level, and the highest level consists of self-actualisation needs (Cohen et al., 2004).

Feldman (1997) argues that Maslow has explained that each level of these needs cannot be achieved unless lower levels are achieved. Therefore, self-actualisation or self-fulfilment cannot be achieved unless other lower needs are achieved first.

5.1.3.b. Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

Ryan and Deci (2000a, p.65) explain that “Self-Determination Theory is the investigation of people’s inherent growth tendencies and innate psychological needs that are the basis of their self-motivation and personality integration as well as for the conditions that foster those positive processes”. In other words, SDT examines human behaviour as an attempt to satisfy internal psychological needs and develop one’s personality traits.

In motivational theory, there are different classifications of factors initiating and maintaining behaviour. Ryan and Deci (2000b) have identified two characteristics, level and type (or orientation) (p.54). According to Ryan and Deci (2000b), level refers to the amount of motivation, or the quantity; whereas type or orientation is the kind or quality of motivation. They have defined orientation of motivation as the “underlying attitudes and goals that give rise to action” (2000b, p.54).

In SDT, there are two general types of motivation based on the goals and reasons that initiate our behaviour, intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Ryan and Deci (2000b,
p.55) define intrinsic motivation as doing something based on inherent interest in the activity per se, and extrinsic motivation as doing something based on rewards and outcome not related to the activity itself. Noels et al. (1999) claim that these two types of motivation are not “categorically different; however, but rather lie along a continuum of Self-Determination” (p. 380).

5.1.4. Sociocultural Conceptions of Motivation

Learning does not occur in empty or isolated spaces. Slavin (2006) emphasises the role of context, social environment and communities in the conception of learning, mainly to test validity and importance of the learners’ beliefs, and their ideas by comparing them to the beliefs and ideas of others who are parts of the culture around them. Woolfolk (2004) claims that “students are motivated to learn if they are members of a classroom or school community that value learning” (p.356). According to Woolfolk (2004), in such communities, learners become able to build their identities (ibid). Brown (2007) added that people have several ways to get motivated and therefore different ways of dealing with their environment; however these behaviours cannot be separated from the social and culture context (p.169). It is then the surrounding social context that has the great effect on shaping one’s individuality and thus one’s motivation

5.2. Cooperative Learning and Motivation.

![Figure 1. Models of Factors Influencing Learning Gains in Cooperative Learning. (slavin, 2005, p.45)](image_url)
5.2.1. Cooperative Learning and Cognitive Approach of Motivation

5.2.1.a. Cooperative learning and self-schemas

Brophy (2004) advocates that teachers emphasise cooperative learning as a strategy to reduce or to manage problems of self-worth protection. Self-worth is the result of using cooperative learning because learners feel valued by their peers when they participate in the learning activities. This is what Johnson and Johnson (2003) state when saying: “helping one’s group mates promotes a sense of meaning, pride and esteem” (p.118).

Self-esteem is another aspect of self-schemas that is enhanced through using cooperative learning. Brophy (2004) claims that the forms of cooperative learning establish social interaction and friendship among group members which both result in building self-esteem. Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1998) proved the existence of this result even in college. In other words, mutual support and respect of the group members produce friendship and positive interaction which are extremely correlated with maintaining positive self-esteem for learners.

Self-efficacy is another positive result of cooperative learning that Hohn (2005) insisted on especially for less competent students because when working together learners are able to achieve their goals through joint effort, existing abilities of the group members and supportive help. Johnson and Johnson (2003) believe that the manner the group members use the resources they have, help each other to reach shared desired goal and the importance of the contribution of all the members formulate feeling in the learners that what they cannot do alone, they can do it together and what they are able to do together today, will learn how to do it alone another day.

5.2.1.b. Cooperative Learning and Goal Theory

Committing oneself to achieve a goal can create motivation and motivation is aimed at achieving goal. When groups are formed, goals are constructed at the same time; learners feel
then obliged to strive for working on their goals till they accomplish them. According to Johnson and Johnson (2003), when students working cooperatively, their goals are correlated and they are more likely to achieve mastery goals through enhancing understanding and learning. It is in cooperative learning where the student values his own goal and the group’s goals, and the importance of his and others efforts.

5.2.2. Cooperative Learning and Humanistic Approach

5.2.2.a. Cooperative Learning Maslow’s Needs Theory

When cooperative groups are cohesive and well-structured, friendship and social relationships are formed; this will result in building security and safety in the learners (Brown, 2001). According to Maslow’s hierarchal needs, these belong to the third level of needs that is so important in setting up motivation.

Belongingness and love needs are other needs that are achieved when working in cooperative groups. Finkbeiner (2004) argues that one of the most useful strategies to establish respect and belonging is to give the students the chance to incorporate their unique knowledge using their specific ways in the group work. In other words, cooperative group learning maintains the feeling that the student is belonging to a group or to a community and is loved by the members of that group or community.

These two levels of needs are the last needs in Maslow’s deficiency needs; after achieving them, learner can be prepared to achieve higher needs.

5.2.2.b. Cooperative Learning and Self-Determination Theory

Brophy (2004) claims that: “[i]n classroom that future interpersonal climate and norms of collaboration, students are likely to experience enhanced intrinsic motivation when they participate in learning activities that allow them to interact with their classmates” (p.202). In other words, students are interested in the activity itself when they are working cooperatively because most learners enjoy and feel at ease when they explaining their views to others and
when they discuss others' points of view. Johnson and Johnson (2003) believe also that cooperative learning is proved to make learners want to be high achievers and make them believe that learning new ideas is important and enjoyable. As a result, learners would build a high intrinsic motivation when working together.

Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1998) also explain that cooperative learning is extrinsically motivating because of the importance of rewards that will be gained. Individual grades and group rewards serve as reinforcement for individuals to work cooperatively and effectively.

5.2.3 Cooperative Learning and Social Approach of Motivation

Learning social skills is one of the granted outcomes of well structured cooperative group work (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1998). Learners can learn easily what they practice; when they are working in cooperative learning, they know how to make respect others’ different points of view, learn turn-taking, and learn how to express their views. These are some among the several other social skills that are used and learned when working cooperatively. Johnson and Johnson (2003), state that “[motivation] occurs within a network of interpersonal relationships” (p. 140). It is then very linked to social concept. Through creating friendship relations that result from enhancing positive interdependence; teachers can make the learners feel socially motivated to have a set of connections of interpersonal relationships.

Conclusion

In the first chapter of the literature review, we approach cooperative learning as a motivational factor that can be used according to Slavin, Hurley and Chamberlain (2003) with all students' levels and almost in all the subjects. Cooperative learning is related to collaborative learning, which is, according to some authors, more general concept, more theoretical and less structured than cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is also different from other classroom structures such as competitive learning where students'
achievements and rewards are negatively interrelated and individualistic learning where students' achievement and rewards are not interrelated at all.

Cooperative learning can be compared with the plant. Its seed, which is group work, is supported by appropriate soil, which refers to theories supporting cooperative learning, naming: social interdependence, cognitive and behavioural theories. In the right conditions, which are compared to the criteria that makes cooperative learning works, this plant grow and flourish. The fruits of our plant vary from acquiring learning strategies, acquiring social skills, achieving academic objectives, and supporting the affective side of the learner positively. This last point is mainly centred in establishing and increasing motivation.

The relation between cooperative learning and motivation is supported by all motivational approaches: behavioural, cognitive, humanistic and social ones.
Chapter two: grammar

Introduction

The concept of grammar is often misunderstood in language teaching and learning. This misconception lies in the fact that grammar is viewed as a collection of rules about stable structures in language. For this reason, issues about its aspects such as its nature, how it is taught and its role in L2/FL learning have been the concern of theoretical linguists as well L2/FL language teachers. When teaching grammar, we either focus on form as it is the case of traditional methods or focus on use and meaning like in the Communicative Approach (Gardner, 2008).

In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), teaching grammar has traditionally been dominated by the grammar-translation method where the use of the mother tongue and memorisation are clearly important to elicit the meaning of the target language and its rules. According to Richard and Rodgers (2001), in such a method, learners are provided with the grammar rules and examples and told to memorise them, then they are asked to apply the rule to other examples.

In recent years, with the emergence and widespread of the use of CLT and Competency-Based Approach, there has been a heated debate about the importance of teaching grammar, whether to teach explicit or implicit knowledge, which method (or methods) have to be adopted (inductive or deductive) and how to make natural connections between grammar and communication.

In this chapter, we are going to define grammar and identify its role in English language teaching. We are further going to present different types of grammatical rules and different categories of grammatical knowledge. In addition to that we are going to speak about sides of
teaching grammar in Communicative Approach with some examples of activities that can be used through cooperative group/pair work.

1. The Nature of Grammar

Grammar has been identified in different ways depending on the linguistic theory that sets the definition, either traditional, structural, transformational or cognitive theory of linguistic; however, as Al-Moutawa and Kailani (1989) has stated, all the theories agree on the fact that grammar is "the internal organization of language" (p. 69).

There are many definitions for grammar. For Ur (1980), grammar is "the way a language manipulates and combines words or bits of words in order to form longer units of meaning" (p. 4). In other words it is the formation of words and the constructions of sentences and discourses in order to have a meaningful product. According to Harmer (2001), the grammar of a language can be defined as the descriptions of the rules through words that can be formed and that can change their meaning, in addition to the possible ways of their construction into sentences. It is, then, grammar which tells us that "meaningful", is acceptable in English, but "meaningable" is not; and a sentence like "she says it is difficult" is appropriate in English, but "say difficult she it is" is not.

For many writers (El-Moutawa & Kailani, 1989; Harmer, 2001; Thornbury, 1999; Ur, 1980), grammar consists of the study of Syntax and Morphology; however, for others (for example, (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2002) it refers just to syntax.

1.1 Morphology

Morphology is the study of the "internal structure of words"(Akmajian et al. p. 12). In other words, morphology is the study of word formation. It studies the morphemes and their combinations to structure a word. Morphemes are defined as the "the smallest meaningful
part of the word" (ibid). "Smallest" does not refer to the phonological or written length but it means that they can no more be divided into other meaningful units. For instance, "interchangeable" is composed of three morphemes: "inter-", "change", "-able", each one of them conveys a meaning and can no more be divided into other meaningful units.

There are two types of morphemes: inflectional and derivational morphemes. Derivational morphemes are prefixes and suffixes that change the nature of the word or its meaning (Bolinger & Sears, 1982), such as, "–ise" which change the nature of a noun to a verb as in "memory (noun)" to "memorize (verb)" and "re-" which change the meaning of the verb as in "start" to "restart". Inflection morphemes are those morphemes that have effects on the form of the word. They include in, English, the following markers "-s" of the plural, "s" of the possessive case, "s" of the third person singular in the present, "-ed", of the past simple, "-ing" of the progressive form, "-en" of the past participle, "-er" of the comparative form of adjectives and "-est" of the superlative form of adjectives (Akmajian, 1997; Bolinger & Sears 1981). The following are some examples respectively to each inflectional morpheme: boy → boys, john → john's (pen), eat → eats, live → lived, walk → walking, write → written, tall → taller → tallest.

1.2 Syntax

Syntax is defined by Harmer (2001) as the way words are ordered and combined to make sentences (p.13). According to Akmajian (1997), syntax is the study of "how words fit in to the overall structure of sentences in which it can be used"(p. 12). Syntax, therefore, focuses on the rules that underlay the building of sentences and utterances.
Since it would be impossible to memorise all sentences and utterances of a language, there are certain rules that govern the link and organization of words to have a larger number of sentences and utterances using a finite set of words. These rules then is the main concern of syntax.

2. The Role of Grammar in English Language Learning (ELL)

Studying any language helps us to use it more effectively. One central aspect for using the language accurately is the grammar of that language. Hedge (2000) claims that many teachers give grammar teaching their great attention in their classroom methodology. Grammar gains such importance because of its inevitable role. Pacheler (1999) state: "the rules of grammar facilitate communicative economy" (p. 94). That is to say that thanks to grammar we can produce unlimited number of utterances and sentences with a limited number of words and sounds. Ur (1980) argues that units of the language can only be used successfully if and only if we know how to combine them appropriately; for this reason, grammar is important for acquiring a language. Moreover, the role of grammar is not limited to the level of the sentence but it affects other longer discourses. This is argued by Williams (2005) who emphasises the fact that the effects of grammar is essential for writing since it provides information about forms and functions of the words. Widodo (2006) also stress that the roles of grammar go beyond the sentence and utterance level to affect the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In listening and reading, we cannot grasp the intended information or make the interrelationship between the parts of the discourse if we have not had a basis of grammatical knowledge. In speaking and writing, producing comprehensible meaningful sentences and utterances, and relating them depend to a large extent on grammar. Greenbaum and Nelson (2002) think that grammar has many applications on many aspects of the language, among which punctuation, interpreting literally (or non-literally) texts and
understanding discourses. As an example, if we don not know what a clause is or what are the types of clauses, we cannot put appropriate punctuation markers when clauses are combined together.

3. Grammar as Form and Grammar as Function

Sentences are made up of words. The classification of these words into grammatical categories, according to Williams (2005, p.53), is called "form". For example, a word like "table" is a noun; a word like "jump" is a verb and so on. Williams (2005) state that the form of the word is usually not related to the sentence. That is to say, if "table" is a noun, it is a noun either in "This is a table" or in "I brought a beautiful table" or in "The broken table is there". Theoretical grammar has described eight possible forms of words in English: noun, verb, adjective, adverbs, conjunctions, pronouns, prepositions and articles.

However, language exists in reality as sentences not as individual words. Williams (2005) defines "function" as the state of words when they work jointly in several ways, when they are put together in sentences (p. 54). There are two levels of functions, function at the level of words within the sentences and function of sentences in discourse. For example, in a sentence, a noun can function as a subject, like in: "The man is talking now"; or as an object, like in: "Are you calling that man?"

At the level of the sentences and utterances, according to Al-Moutawa and Kailani (1989), "Function" refers to the intended meaning or speech act of that sentence such as greeting, offering, thanking and explaining. They are more related to the context and to the social environment. For example, If a father asks his son' friend "Do you drink?" it would not mean offering him a drink but asking him if he is a drinker or not. In this example, there is literal meaning "Are you a drinker of Alcohol?" and a situational meaning of certain contexts. Thornbury (1999) has stated that words put together have specific intended meaning in
certain situations, this function they have, has a direct link to communication. That is to say that there is a relation between identifying grammatical function and communication because what is communicated is usually the intended meaning of the speaker that depends on the context.

Williams (2005) believes that forms and functions can be related in several possible ways; knowing one of them would sometimes help us to determine the other. For example, the following question form "Do you study here?", would mean in certain cases a direct interrogative function. However, according to Thornbury (1999), it is not always the case because one form can express different functions as well as one function can be expressed through many forms. For instance, on the one hand asking for help can be expressed through the following forms

- Can you help me, please?
- Would you mind helping me?
- If you can help me, I would be so thankful.
- I need your help

On the other hand, "If- clause" form, for example, can express many functions

- If I find you out, I would kill you (It expresses warning)
- If you suffer from headache, take medicaments. (It expresses advice)
- If David didn't come, you must ring me (It expresses obligation)
- If they were not so busy, they would help you (It expresses explanation)
4. Direct and Indirect Representation of Grammar in the Language Classroom

4.1 Descriptive rules and Perspective rules

In any language, there are two types of rules. The first type of rules regulates the way words are put together and describes how words combination can be possible or impossible; these rules are what Greenbaum and Nelson (2002) name "Descriptive rules". Swan (2005) states "[d]escriptive rules are simply accounts of linguistic regularities" (p.66). That is to say, descriptive rules are agreed on among linguists and they permit people to judge if a sentence can be said in a language or no. For example, the descriptive rules of English allows us to say that a sentence like "He went out of home quickly" is possible but a sentence like "Went home out he of quickly" is not.

The second type of rules is related to the standard boundaries speakers of the standard language put. These are the rules that state which "usage" should be employed and which usage should not be used (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2005, p.5). For instance, it is not preferred for speakers of Standard English to split an infinitive like in "to actually feel". Swan (2005) defines perspective rules as "linguistics regulation rules which individuals devise in the belief that their languages need regulating, tiding up or protecting against change" (p. 66). They are then put and used by certain people in certain situations like formal writings.

4.2 Explicit and Implicit Knowledge of Grammar

According to Brown (2007), a person with explicit knowledge knows about language and the ability to articulate those facts in some way (pp.66-7). It is acquired according to Pacheler (1999) through "form-instruction" (p. 67). That is to say, it is taken in formal sittings, like classrooms, through direct focus on grammar rules. It is the conscious knowledge that has the
advantages of facilitating input and the benefit of monitoring the output (Widodo, 2006, p.125). Explicit grammar involves the use of grammatical terminology of grammar so that grammar can be pointed to in a clear way.

Implicit knowledge on the other hand is, according to Brown (2007), unconscious internalized knowledge of language that is easily used during spontaneous language tasks similar to written or spoken conscious learning process (Widodo, 2006, p.126). Grammatical knowledge is acquired for instance when learners are engaged in natural communicating activities or continuous exposure to authentic language. Learners through this way unconsciously acquire to use them naturally. For example, a native speaker would speak his mother tongue correctly but may not know the rules that govern his spoken or written language.

4.3 Deductive versus Inductive Approach

Thornbury (1999) defines deductive approach as the way of teaching grammar where rules are presented first and then their applications through examples, and inductive approach as the way of teaching grammar through examples from which rules are understood. These two approaches are firmly rooted in linguistic and psychological theories.

According to Broughton et al. (1980), the deductive approach is supported linguistically by structuralisms and psychologically by the behaviourist; while, the inductive approach is supported linguistically by the generative grammarians and psychologically by the mentalists. The behaviourists for examples emphasize the importance of reinforcement through repetition of correct form that characterizes the deductive approach and the mentalists’ emphasize the subconscious cognitive devices that are used in the inductive approach which are similar to those used in the first language acquisition (ibid).
Widodo (2006) suggests five advantages for each approach. Deductive approach could be time-saving since it points in a direct way to the rule; simultaneously, inductive approach trains learners to be autonomous through the indirect way of knowing the rule. It is the cognitive ability of adults which is developed in the inductive approach; at the same time, in the deductive approach, it is their cognitive process and its role to use metalanguage which is acknowledged. When teaching deductively, a number of applications and practice is immediately given, whereas, teaching inductively helps the learners to be more active in the learning process. On the one hand, learners with analytical style find themselves at ease when learning deductively; on the other hand, there are learners who are interested in the challenge presented in problem-solving ability found in the inductive way of teaching. There are some rules or aspects of rules, like form, which can be simply and clearly presented deductively not to confuse the learners; if the problem solving is done collaboratively, learners will have more opportunities to use the language.

5. Grammar and Communicative Approach

Recently, with the widespread of communicative approach, many teachers and syllabus designers think about the possibility of teaching grammar in a communicative approach and look for the probable appropriate ways to do so. Nunan (1996) argues that it is important to relate grammar rules to the discourses in which they occur in through authentic educational situations (p. 69). It is, then, central to teach grammar through a communicative approach in which it is presented in written or spoken passages.

5.1 Written Grammar

According to Harmer (2001), grammar has initially told us how to produce a written language. For example, it is known that a written text is composed of grammatical sentences which are in turn composed, at least, of a verb and a subject; and sometimes, an object, a
complement, or modifier is added. Grammar of written texts insists on expressing ideas in full sentences, in addition to avoiding repetition and unnecessary details (Eastwood, 1994). Swan (2005), suggests that written discourse is produced as "monologue", Where there is no instant clarification or correction (p. 40). It is, therefore, clarity and the straightforward style that are the dominant for written discourse to avoid misunderstanding which cannot be corrected at the moment.

Writing is usually used in formal situations, thus, it utilizes formal language which is reflected in vocabulary and also in grammar. Swan (2005), gave examples of using phrasal verbs like "get up" instead of "rise" and of avoidance of constructed auxiliary phrases like, "I do not" instead of "I don't" to illustrate using formal grammar in writing.

5.2 Spoken Grammar

Spoken grammar is different from the writing one (Harmer, 2001). Spoken grammar is used in informal situations and interpreted in a dissimilar way from that of writing. Eastwood (1994) think that in spoken grammar there are more words used and less structural clauses. More words are used in spoken grammar because the interlocutors clarify and correct what they say at the same time of speaking. Less structural clauses are applied because people would think that they are unnecessary details since they share the same contexts. Harmer (2001) argues that spoken grammar has its own constructional principles and organization and it has its own discourse markers like interjections (ah, oh, wow) hesitators (er, um) and so on. For instance, One would offer; "sugar?" and the other answers: "Yeah!"; native speakers would see nothing wrong with these interaction.

According to Swan (2005), spoken grammar is used in informal situations where constructions are permitted and speakers can interrupt and complete each other utterances. Conrad et al. (2002, p. 102) have given six characteristics of functional grammar in
conversation which is the main form of spoken language. These characteristics include contexts, interaction, uncomplicated meaning, self-involvement, occurrence in real time, using vernacular range of expressions like informal usage of grammar. Carter et al. (2000) have argued that spoken grammar is much more "flexible" than written grammar (p. 145) because it does not obey strictly the set rules of the language like written grammar. Carter et al. (2000) have given the examples of using ellipsis in spoken grammar. Ellipses are fragments made in the clauses but they are understood from the context like in the following.

A: Have you heard what happened to John

B: Yes, I have.

[heard about what happened to John] is omitted but understood from the context.

5.3 Using Grammar in Communication Approach

Haynes (2007) states "[t]o acquire a new language, [learners] need a source of natural communication, memorizing grammar rules will not help them to speak and write English quickly" (p. 11). This means that, it is more effective to learn grammar communicatively so that L2/FL learner can produce it spontaneously rather than teaching units of grammar as separate entities. According to Pacheler (1999), communicative approach provides the learners, especially in large classes, with situations where they can apply their language and their understanding of grammatical rules and where they are able to make and correct their errors. This interactive way of learning results in the meaningful use of language. Nunan (1996) states that for communicative teaching grammar to be helpful, it should involve "achieving harmony between functional interpretation and formal appropriacy" (p. 69). In other Words, teachers should relate in their classroom methodology usage and use and implement them together. Al Moutawa and Kailani (1989) are also of the same opinion when
they suggest using the grammatical rules for communicative purposes in order for the learner to learn the rules that construct a language and to have the ability to apply them in communicative acts for real and natural communicative situations.

Thornbury (1999) says that communicative grammar teaching is sometimes referred to as "covert grammar teaching" (p. 23). Covert grammar teaching involves teaching grammar through doing communicative activities in communicative approach; grammar would be therefore, according to Thornbury (1999), a means of tidying meanings up as a way to achieve communicative competence.

6. Models and Examples of Teaching and Learning Grammar Using Cooperative Groups/Pairs

According to Al Moutawa and Kailani (1989), one feature of communicative approach of teaching grammar is its learner-centred characteristic; group and pair works are example to achieve this quality (p.75). In other words, when learning grammar in groups or pairs, learners are encouraged to work out activities by themselves and thus, they become less dependent on the teacher as the only source of knowledge.

When using cooperative learning for language teaching, according to Slavin (1991), there are three techniques which are widely used: Jigsaw, Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD) and Team-Games Tournament (TGT). According to their characteristics, the first is mainly used in teaching reading and vocabulary; however; the other two, STAD and TGT, can be implemented in teaching grammar. STAD and TGT, as defined by Slavin (1995), share the two basic features of cooperative group work: shared goals and individual accountability, in addition to equal opportunity of success, team competition and face to face interaction. However, they differ in that TGT students play academic games to show their individual mastery of the subject matter and STAD focus on individual quizzes to get the
group grade (Slavin, 1991, p.8). It depends on the teachers' objectives and the levels of the learners to choose a method of cooperative learning group.

The following is an example of an activity concerning the use of different English tenses. This activity can be done using TGT model of cooperative learning as the following:

Students may be divided into heterogeneous groups of four or three members. To each group, the teacher may give six to eight sentences that would seem at the beginning to have any relation with each other. The sentences may be supported by pictures. The teacher asks the groups to work together to join these sentences into one paragraph where the appropriate tense is used. In each time, the students of the same group use one sentence correctly a point is given to the whole group. At the end, if the tenses are used correctly by all members and the paragraph made is meaningful, bonus points are given to the whole group members. The teacher may choose any student of the group randomly to ask if there is any irrelevant sentence or the reason to choose certain tense to ensure the participation and cooperation between the group members. The stories of the groups are read to the whole class to choose among them the most coherent and interesting one.

STAD model can be used through using role plays to practice certain structure like the interrogative form. The type of activities, where the teacher decides about the rule to be practiced but the content is chosen by the learner, is called, according to Ur (1980), "semi controlled" group work (p.30). In such activity, the learners of the groups structure dialogues where each member plays a role of a real person in the real life. For example, one is a player, the other is a journalist, the third is player from other team different than the team of the first player, the fourth and the fifth are the coaches of the two teams where the two players belong. The dialogue is structured by the members of the group where the focus is on the interrogative structure and present perfect, present, past simple, past continuous tense are
insisted on. Later, each student takes individual quiz about the use of each tense and the structure of the interrogation in their dialogue. The marks of the members of the same group are summed and divided on their number to have the mark of the group. After, the marks of all the groups are compared so that the best group will have bonus points or another reward.

Another kind of activities that can be done through group work is what Ur (1980) named "free controlled" group work (p. 30) where the teacher controls neither the form nor the content. For instance, the teacher may divide the students into groups and ask them to make free writing about specific topic such as describing a trip, without limiting or specifying the ideas. The correction of the piece of writing of the whole group will be done by the teacher. After, the teacher may test any member individually about the mistakes that have been done when writing their essay. The mark of the group will be derived from the marks of the members and the best group will take reward.

Conclusion

Language is a form of a social behaviour. Grammar is one of its basic components; it is composed of the rules that direct the formation of words and structuring of sentences. It is also composed of forms that are used to address different functions depending on the contexts where they are used. Grammar is one essential component of any language learning and any language cannot be established without learning its grammar.

Since the language is used to communicate certain ideas and communication occurs between people and among people, involving people, then, is necessary for learning grammar as a component of a language. Therefore, there are two categories of grammar, spoken and written grammar, depending on the communication channel used: either speaking or writing. Though the focus of communicative approach is not mainly improving grammar, but teaching grammar through this approach can be implemented through such approach using many
activities among which group work and pair work activities that can be done cooperatively. When doing such activities, many benefits can be gained in addition to the learning of certain grammatical structures, such as learning how to use the language correctly and fluently in natural and real contexts when discussing among the group members.
Section Two: Practical Study

Introduction

This chapter deals with the practical study as it explains the method and process used for the research. It starts by describing the population of the study, then explaining the design, implementation and results of the pilot work. The second part deals with the main study which consists of both students' questionnaire and teachers' questionnaire; the results will be discussed after presenting how the research will be implemented. Pedagogical suggestions will be the result of this analysis.

1. The Population

The whole population of the study consists of second year students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at Department of English at the University of Constantine during the academic year 2009-2010 and is composed of 2nd year grammar teachers at the same department. The total number of the students' population is one thousand one hundred and sixty two students divided into 20 groups and the teachers' population is 08 teachers. The students are from different socio-economic background and from different geographical regions in Algeria and different genders, male and female. The teachers have different degrees and different years of work experience at the Department of English at University of Constantine.

This population has been chosen for two reasons. The first reason is that 2nd year students have already studied at least one year at university, thus, they would have experienced working in groups at least once, even in other subject and hence, they would have an opinion and an attitude toward it. The second reason is that 2nd year students take a course in grammar which is not the case of third year students. The syllabus of Grammar course at second year
consists of more practice, especially the second part which is taught during the second semester where teachers would have many opportunities to implement cooperative group work.

2. The Means of Research

This study aims at making correlation between two variables: using well-structured cooperative learning and motivating students to learn grammar. Thus, we have chosen the descriptive method to confirm our hypotheses. The tool used that can fairly represent this method to undertake this research is the questionnaire. The questionnaire is composed of a series of written questions that particular persons would answer for the sake of gathering information. According to Moore, (1983), the questionnaire is used to gather information on almost any topic from a large or small number of people. This qualitative way of researching is used in this study in the form of closed questions which require particular answers.

3. The pilot work

3.1 Design and Implementation

The pilot study is presented in the form of a questionnaire that consists of twenty (20) questions. In each question, students are supposed to choose a correspondent answer. In 13 questions, only one answer is possible from the list of prepositions. In the seven remaining, more than one answer is permitted. There are three items where students are asked to give their explanations and five items where students are given an opportunity to give their suggestions if it is not found in the list.

The questionnaire is divided into three (03) major categories. The first section, which is composed of eight (08) questions, concerns the students' perceptions about learning grammar. The second section, which is composed of seven (07) questions, concerns the teachers'
supervision of group/ pair work. The last section is about the students' attitudes and opinions concerning cooperative group work which consists of five (05) questions.

The purpose of using this design is to check if all words used are understood by the students, to know if there is a question or item which would be interpreted in a wrong way and if there is an item (s) which is irrelevant.

The pilot work was done three days before the main study with a group of thirty-two students (32) and the time taken was thirty five (35) minutes.

The participants were asked to answer the question using any language and to write any additional comments on the back of the pages. They were asked to seek clarification when they feel the need to, from the researcher. Difficult words and technical terms were explained orally, first for all the students and then for any learner if he asked for.

3.2 Results and Interpretation of the Pilot Work

The number of the students who participated in the pilot study is 32 students, that is to say 27.59 % of the whole sample.

In the first item of the first section, 22 students (68.75%) think learning grammar is very much important, 07 think it is important (21.87%) and only 03 report it is a little important (9.48%). 19 students from 32 students believe they have an average level in grammar (59.37%); 10 students think they have a good level (31.25%) and only 3 inform they have a poor level in grammar (9.38%). In the third and fourth items, 28 students (87.5%) say that they have grammatical spoken problems when they are practicing English and 30 students (93.75%) report that they need more speaking in grammar class to solve such problem. Concerning the reason of learning grammar, 18 students learn grammar because it is obligatory (56.25%) while 09 think it is an interesting part of learning the language (28.12%);
one notifies that it is both interesting and obligatory while only 04 tell that learning grammar is boring (12.54%). Equal numbers of students, 14 for each, prefer the deductive method of teaching grammar and the eclectic method (43.75% for each) and only 04 (12.5%) prefer the inductive method. In the last question of this first section; 17 students (53.12%) claim that their teacher tries to create a good atmosphere but only 7 (21.87%) report that it is through involving them in the learning process that the teacher tries to create a good atmosphere. For this reason, we have omitted this question from the questionnaire since the other arguments of creating a good atmosphere are not related to activities done in the classroom but rather are related to personal reasons and subjective opinions.

In the second question, the majority of students, 23 students (71.87%) like to work either in groups or in pairs and only 9 students (28.125%) like to work individually. In the second item; 18 students (56.25%) state that they never use group work; 09 students say they rarely use group/pair work. 2 (6.25%) students say they often use group/pair work and equal number say they always use group/pair work, two students have not answered this question. This question has been formed more precisely in the main study through specifying this question about the frequency of using group work when learning grammar. In the third item, 19 students (59.37%) state that they are chosen on the basis of setting, and 8 students (25%) think they choose their partners, and the other students have not answered the question. For the forth item in this section, 17 students (53.125%) suggested that their teacher checks if they are on the task or no and 13 students (40.625%) inform that their teacher does not check if they are doing the activities or no.19 students (59.375%) report that their teacher does not insist on them to use English when interacting in the same group, while 11 students (34.375%) report that their teacher insists on them to use English when interacting; two students (6.25) have not answered this question. Concerning the skills that are insisted on, 12 (37.5%) students inform that their teacher insists on building good relationships among
students; 22 students (68.75%) report that their teacher focuses on respecting each other; listening to others' arguments score the highest number of students who report that their teacher insists on among the other skills. Half of the participants think that their teacher focuses also on arguing their ideas to convince the others. When students are asked about the problems that they face when using group work; only 11 (34.37%) from 30 students inform they have problems and two students have not answered. All those 11 students report that they face the problem of expressing their ideas to their group mates; 8 from those 11 students say that they do not have enough opportunities to speak with their group mates, and only one students tells that s/he does not like when her/his group mates correct her/his mistakes.

In the third category which is about the students attitudes towards group work, the first question is about the degree of motivation of students when they work in groups. 8 students (25%), say that they are strongly motivated and 15 students (46.875%), report they are motivated; 2 students (6.25%) say that they feel less motivated and 2 students feel they are not motivated at all. For the benefits of using group/pair work, 09 students (28.125%) say that they learn to respect each other. 14 students (43.75%) learn how to express themselves; 18 students (56.26%) learn how to speak correctly and 6 students (18.75%) how to speak fluently. The students' answers about how they feel when working in groups vary from 19 (59.375%) students who feel satisfied with themselves, 16 (50%) students less embarrassed to make mistakes; 18 students (56.25%) feel more confident and only one (3.125%) feels not good at all when working in groups or pairs. In the 19th question, two students (6.25%) tell they learned very much from the group/pair work; 12 (37.5%) students inform they learned much from group/pair work; 12 (37.5%) students learn little and only one (3.125%) reports that s/he learned nothing from group work. In the last question, 18 students (56.25%) say that group/ pair work is good if compared to individual work, and 5 (15.625%) students report that they think group/pair work is very good if compared with individual learning, only one
student thinks group pair work is excellent in comparison to individual work and 3 think that group/pair work is poor if contrasted with leaning individually. The diagram that shows the results of questions 16, 19, and 20 is shown in the following figure:

Figure 2: Degrees of Motivation Effects, Learning Effects and Evaluation of Group/Pair Work

All in all, the results of the study show that the majority of the students answered the majority of the questions. Those who have not answered would be excused for their coming late, which does not give them enough time to answer all the questions. Participants have asked about the meaning of many words though many of those words were explained when the questionnaire was handed out, such as, "interaction", "motivation", "on the task" and so on. This leads us to change, in the main questionnaire, all the words that students have not understood, and write the definition of technical terms at the end of the main questionnaire. Question 7 of the pilot work is removed from the main questionnaire because the answers would not yield any addition to our study since they were subjective and has not given any practical teaching activities that can be done in the classroom.

To conclude with, as the results of the pilot work inform, the answers of the students concerning their attitudes about group pair work show that cooperative group/pair work is
motivating for our students, and using it in grammar, would help students to learn, mainly if the teacher tries to solve the problems of students through managing and structuring the group tasks. These two results are, therefore, in the direction of confirming our two hypotheses.

4. Main investigation

4.1 The Students' Questionnaire

4.1.1 The Main Study Design:

The students’ questionnaire of the main investigation was derived from the one of the pilot work. Some modifications has been made concerning changing words and expression that students had asked about in the pilot study, ordering the items according to the category which they belong to and omitting one question for the subjective answers given by the learners in the pilot work. The questionnaire consists of 19 questions divided into three categories: Students opinions about learning grammar which consists of 06 questions, students' perceptions about the teachers' supervision of group/pair work which is composed of 06 questions and finally the third section is about students attitudes about using cooperative group/pair; the first one is specific to learning grammar and the others are general.

4.1.2 Implementation

The questionnaire has taken place three days after the pilot work. A sample, which is defined by Moore (1983) as the representative group of people selected randomly from the population, has been identified. It is composed of 116 students from five different second year groups who study English as Foreign Language at the Department of English University of Constantine; thus, most of the characteristic of the whole population would be represented
in it. Students finished answering the questionnaire's items in 40 minutes before or after their lecture of Linguistics with the presence of their teacher. Students were supervised by the researcher and their teacher. The way of answering and key terms were explained orally as well as written. The researcher asked the learners to seek clarification at anytime they feel the need to.

4.1.3 Results and Interpretations

When they are asked about their attitudes toward learning grammar in the fifth statement of the first section, 48 students (41.83%) inform that it is interesting and the majority, 65 students (56.03%), report that it is obligatory and only 4 students (3.45%) say that learning grammar is boring. 09 students explained their choice by loving grammar and enjoying doing its activities which they consider like games. 03 students from the students who consider learning grammar boring argue their opinions by studying the same things the same way. The rest of the participants explain their choice by the importance of grammar in language learning. These explanations were supported by answers to the first statement of the first section where the majority of 99 students (85.341%), think that grammar is very much important in language learning, and 15 (12.93%) students inform that grammar is important in EFL, whereas only one (0.86%) thinks that grammar has a little importance and one students (0.86%) thinks grammar has no importance at all in language teaching. The results are presented in Figure 03.
Concerning the answers about the third statement of the first section, the majority of students, 110 students (94.83%), report that they face situations where they produce ungrammatical sentences (performance) though they know the rule (competence), and only 06 students say that they do not face such problem. In the following question; 106 students (93.10%), agree that they need more spoken practice during the grammar lecture as a solution for such problem and only 08 (6.90%) students report that they do not need speaking to practice grammar. Though there is a large agreement about the need for speaking to practice grammar, the number of the students who report in the question number 10 that is a part of section two that their teachers do not insist on using English to interact in group/ pair work; 62 students (53.45%), is higher than those who say that their teachers ask them to use English to exchange and discuss ideas when working in groups or pairs; (54 students (46.55%)). These results are presented in figure number 4

Figure 03: The Degree of Importance of Grammar for 2nd Year Students
The most preferable method of teaching grammar for the students, according to their answers in question number 06, is the deductive one, which is chosen by 76 students (65.52%), because they think it is easy, clear, direct and practical. 22 (18.96%) students have chosen the eclectic method because they think that both methods complete each other depending on the lecture, and only 18 students (15.52%) has chosen the inductive method because they think it is pleasurable, challenging and helps them to remember the rules better and to be active.

As for teachers' use of cooperative group work in teaching grammar, only 6 students (5.17%) report that they always use group/pair work in the grammar class. Almost an equal number of students say that they use group/pair work often or rarely with 27 students (23.28%), and 33 students (28.45%) respectively.; however, the number of students who report that they never use group/ pair work to learn grammar was higher than the others choices, 50 students (43.10 %) as the in the figure 03
On the other hand, when students are asked how much they learned from group/ pair work without reference to any subject, in question 18 that belongs to section 03, only two students (1.73%) who say they learnt nothing; almost an equal number of students who inform that either they learned little or much, with 43 students (37.07%) and 49 (42.24%) respectively. In addition to 22 students (18.96%) who report that they learned very much from work/ pair work as illustrated in the figure bellow
In the question related to the way of grouping used by teachers, the majority of students, 85 students (73.76%) say that their teachers group them according to their sittings; 21 students (18.10%) inform that they are asked to choose their partner and 09 students say that students of the same level are grouped together. However, when they are asked about the preferable way of grouping, 19 students (16.38%) inform that they like their group mates to be the same level as they are; 18 students say they like to work with their mates who are sitting with them 41 students (35.35%) say that their prefer to choose their group mates according to their level and 11 students report that they like to work in all kinds of heterogeneous groups; only one students (0.86%) who inform that s/he likes to work in groups of the same gender.

Although 70 students (60.34%) inform that their teachers control group/ pair work and only 46 report that their teachers do not do so when they answer question number nine, 41 students (35.34%) find it difficult to express their ideas and 07 students (6.03%) do not like when they are corrected by their group mates. 25 students (21.55%) report that they do not have enough opportunities to participate in the group/ pair work; 07 students (6.03) suffer from unequal participation and lack of seriousness of group members and the same number face the problem of imposing ideas by some group members. 4 students (3.45%) find it so noisy; thus they cannot concentrate. These problems are stated in the answers of students to question number 13 which is the last one of the second section. These would mean that teachers should not just control if all the activities are done or no but also if there are problems students face when working in groups.

Among the 60 (51.72%) students who say they face problems when doing group/ pair work, there are 18 students who report that they have a good level and 39 students who say they have average level and 03 who have poor level; And among the 55 students (48.28%) who report they do not face problems doing group/pair work, there are 16 (13.79%) students
who say they have a good level and; 39 students (33.62%) who say they have average level and one student (0.86%) who informs that s/he has poor level.

The results are presented in Figure 07

![Figure 07: Group/Pair Work Problems in Relation to the Students' Levels](image)

The students' responses on question 14 about the preferable instruction when learning grammar is as follows: 44 students (37.93%) prefer individual work; 47 students (40.51%) prefer pair work and only 25 students (21.55%) prefer group work. Among the 44 students who prefer individual work there are 14 students (12.07%) who think they have good level, and 27 students (23.28%) who think they have average level and 03 students who think they have poor level. The group of 47 students who prefer to work in pairs is composed of 15 students (12.93%) who think they have a good level and 33 students (27.59%) who report that they have average level. The group of 25 students who choose group work is divided to only 5 students (4.31%) who think they have a good level and 19 students (16.38%) who say they have average level and one student who reports that s/he has a poor level. These results are shown in the following figure.
When they are asked to identify the degree of their motivation when they work in groups/pairs in question 15, which belongs to the third question, 20 students (17.24%) say they feel strongly motivated; 70 students (60.35%) inform they feel motivated and 22 students (18.96%) feel less motivated; only 04 students think they feel they are not motivated at all. To confirm that the students have answered with full understanding of the concept "motivation", a further question, which is numbered 17, is asked about their feelings when they work in groups or in pairs. 69 students (59.48%) say that they feel satisfied with themselves; 78 students (67.24%) do not feel shy to make mistakes in group/pair work; 80 students (68.96) say they feel more confident when they work in groups and only 03 students (2.57%) say they do not feel good at all. These results are shown in figure 9, and figure 10 respectively:
Though a significant number of students prefer to work individually as shown in the answers to question 14, in the last section of the questionnaire, 13 (11.21%) students report that group/pair work is excellent if compared to individual work; 25 students (21.55%) think it is very good; 60 students (56.90), which is the majority, think it is good and only 12 students (10.35%) think that group/ pair work is poor if compared to individual learning. These answers would be better explained by the students' answers to the question 16 about the benefits of using group/ pair work, in which 34 students (29.31%) think they learn to respect others when using group/ pair work; 65 students (56.03%) inform that group/ pair
work help them to express themselves; 53 students (45.69%) and 15 students (12.93%) say that group pair work encourage them to speak English correctly and fluently respectively. Figure 11 shows these results

![Figure 11: Benefits of Using Group/Pair Work](image)

4.1.4 Discussion of the Results of the Students' Questionnaire

The answers to question 1 and question 05 mean that most students value the importance of grammar in learning a foreign language.

The answers to question 3 and question 4 represent the need of students to practise grammar through speaking and the answers to question 10 would mean that insisting on using English to interact when using group and pair work would be a good chance to practise grammar orally during the grammar class.

Since in question 6 the majority report that they prefer the deductive approach, teachers would help them to see the importance of inductive approach and to use the deductive approach when learners need a direct way to understand.
Concerning the answers to questions 14 and 19 which would seem they are not in harmony since in question 14, a large number of students prefer individual work but in question 19, the majority think that group work is good if compared to individual work, would be better explained by the fact that the learners have a positive attitudes toward group/pair work but because of the problems presented in question 13 they like better to avoid them. In addition, the answers to questions 15 and 17 confirm that using group/pair work has positive effects on the attitudes of the learners toward learning a second language. All these confirm our first sub-hypothesis which is using well-structured group/pair work has a motivational effect and positive attitudes on learners.

The answers to question number 2 and question number 12 express that all levels of students do face problems working in groups and solving them does not require from the teachers to check just the activities but the be aware of all these problems. The answers to question 07 show that group/pair work is rarely or never used in grammar class; however, the answers to question 16 and question 18 mean that learners benefit from group/pair work and among those benefits a significant number learn how to speak grammar correctly. All these confirm our second sub-hypothesis which tells that using group/pair work in grammar class helps learners to learn grammatical rules.

4.2. The Teachers' Questionnaire

The teachers' questionnaire is given to 7 teachers among 8 second year teachers of grammar at the Department of English, University of Constantine during the academic year: 2009-2010.

The teachers' questionnaire is mainly used to see to what extent teachers and students have the same perceptions and to investigate whether or not 2nd year grammar teachers at the Department of English at the University of Constantine implement cooperative group work in
teaching grammar and what elements of cooperative learning they insist on when doing so. It is also used to have an overview about the teachers' evaluation of the outcomes of using cooperative group work.

The questionnaire is composed of 03 first questions concerning personal information about the university, the degree and the number of years' experience. The first section, which concerns the teachers' perception of students' learning grammar, is composed of 4 questions. The second section, which is about teachers' insights of the students’ affective domain of the learners, consists of 2 questions. The third section is about teachers' incorporation of cooperative group work and its elements; it is made of 08 questions. The last section that includes 5 questions is related to teachers' evaluation of cooperative learning and its outcomes.

4.2.1 Results and interpretation

All the teachers to whom the questionnaire is delivered are teaching at the University of Constantine. Among the 4 teachers who have a Magister degree, one has worked for 11 years at the Department of English at the University of Constantine; 2 have worked for 10 years at the same department and one has been working since 04 years. The 03 remaining teachers of the sample have a Master degree and have 2 years of work experience at the Department of English at the University of Constantine. These results show that our sample is composed of two different degrees and different years of experience and this would be the cause of having different opinions and different points of view.

In the first question of the first section, 5 teachers (42.86%), the majority of the teachers, think that their students value the importance of learning to a very large extent and 2 teachers think that their students consider grammar important in EFL. Only 2 teachers (28.57%) report that their students think that grammar is of a little importance in learning English as Foreign
Language. This is to say that the majority of teachers believe that their students are aware of the importance of grammar in learning English.

The answers to the 2nd question show that all teachers but one inform that their students sometimes produce ungrammatical sentences though they know the rules (85.71%); however in the answer to the following question, only 02 think that their students need enormous spoken practice and the majority (71.43%) think that their students need spoken practice to a little extent to acquire the grammar rules. This means that the majority of teachers are conscious about the students' grammatical problems in speaking but they do not think that spoken practice would be the solution. They would think of drills and written practices as the solution for such problems. The figures 12 and 13 respectively show these results:

Figure 12: Teachers’ Opinions about Grammatical Spoken Problems

Figure 13: Teachers’ Opinions about Students’ Need of Spoken Practice
The majority of teachers, which consists of 5 teachers (71.43%), use the eclectic method and only 2 teachers use the deductive method. The use of the eclectic method would be explained by the differences of the nature of each lecture and if the learners have encountered this lecture before or no. The use of the deductive method would be explained by its effect in saving more time and in being direct.

In the answers to the first question in the second section, 3 teachers (42.86%) think that their students are motivated during the grammar class and equal number (42.86%) think that their students are not motivated during the grammar class, Only one (14.28) states that some of the students are motivated and the others are not as the figure 14 shows:

![Figure 14: Teachers Opinions about Students’ Motivation in Grammar Class](image)

When they are asked about the strategies to build Self-esteem which is, according to the literature review, one essential component of motivation, 1 teacher informs that s/he allows her/his students to ask and answer questions, and one teacher informs that s/he, in addition, gives a positive feedback when necessary to her/his students. The other teacher allows the students to express and to argue their points of view and give them positive feedback when necessary as strategies to build the students’ self-esteem. 03 teachers (42.86%) involve the students through a combination of allowing them to ask and answer questions and permitting
them to express and argue their points of view. Only one teacher (14.28%) uses the three strategies to build her/his students self-esteem. These strategies can be implemented in many activities among which, cooperative group work.

The statistics of the first question in the third section shows that only one teacher (14.58%) reports that s/he never uses group work in teaching grammar, and one says s/he rarely uses it; the other five teachers (71.43%) claim that they often use group/pair work in the classroom activities as it is presented in figure 15.

![Figure 15: the Frequency of Grammar Teachers’ use of Group/Pair Work](image)

Among the 6 teachers who use group/pair work, 2 teachers (33.33%) use pair work and 3 use small groups (50%), and only one uses group and pair work together, depending on the lecture. The reason behind using pairs and small groups of (3-4 students) would be that both are manageable and can be controlled in terms of participation of the members; and at the same time, they help in negotiating ideas and information.

All the teachers who use group/pair work, form students on the basis of sitting and only one adds the students' choices from time to time. This way of forming the groups would be explained by avoiding noise and consuming time that would be caused especially in large classes.
The majority of teachers (83.33%) inform that they always check if the students are doing the activities or no, and only 1 reports that s/he often does. Moreover, all the 6 teachers admit that they insist on using English to interact with each other in the same group. This would mean that using English to exchange ideas is a chance of practicing it.

Concerning the skills necessary for cooperative group work, 3 teachers (50%) insist on equal participation of all the students; one (16.66%) insists on respecting others and arguing the points of views. Only one (16.66%) combines three strategies which are turn taking, respecting each other and equal opportunities of participation and only one (16.66%) insists on the students to respect each other, argue their points of view and on equal opportunities of participation. These results signify that all teachers who use group work to teach grammar report that they are aware of the importance of social skills for ensuring working cooperatively; however depending on the teacher, each one thinks that certain skill (s) is (are) more important than the others.

In their answers to question 16 and question 17, only 1 teacher from 6 (16.66%) makes practice situations as an initial step for mastering cooperative group work skills. The other 5 teachers (83.33%) do not set up practice situations. However, the majority of teachers (83.33%) help their students see the value and importance of group work, and only one does not. This means that though most teachers do not think making initial practices for cooperative group work skills obligatory, most of them consider helping students to see the benefits and advantages of group work as important in the achievement of group work objectives and in encouraging and motivating students to work in groups. The figure that represents these results is the following:
When they are asked about their evaluation of cooperative group work in the third section, most teachers (4 from 6; that it is to say 66.66%) inform that their students do not face any problems when they are working together and only 2 teachers report that their students face problems working together, as illustrated in the figure 17 bellow, one has 4 years of work experience and one has two years. One teacher's students face the problem of imposing ideas, and the other teacher's students encounter, in addition to imposing ideas problems, social skills problems like turn taking, respecting each other and so on. These problem, according to one teacher, are faced mainly by excellent and good students and according to the other teacher are faced by excellent and lass able students. To solve these problems, one of the 2 teachers divides the group work between the group members and the other grades the members individually. These problems as shown in the results are not faced by the most experienced teachers of the sample; thus, work experience would be an explanation of encountering these problems. As we can notice, the solutions that are presented are the two forms of individual accountability which if they can solve the problem of equal participation can create another problem of poor- help giving and the students would not then work cooperatively in the same group.

Figure 16: Grammar Teachers’ Use of Cooperative Group/Pair Work
The whole number of teachers who use group work state that group work enhances their students' participation. Only 1 thinks that cooperative group work makes students highly motivated, the rest of teachers (5 teachers, 83.33%) state that cooperative group work make their students motivated to learn; the results are demonstrated in the following figure. This means that teachers has experienced the positive effects of working in groups cooperatively that appears in involving students in the learning process through enhancing their participation and motivating them to learn.

Figure 17: Teachers’ Opinions about Students’ Problems when Working in Groups/Pairs

Figure 18: Outcomes of Cooperative Group/Pair Work
4.2.2 Discussion of the Teachers' Questionnaire Results

The Answers to the forth questions demonstrate that 2nd year teachers have a positive perceptions about how much students value the importance of grammar. This would be considered as a motivating factor for the students to learn grammar; however, a significant number of teachers think that their students are not motivated to learn grammar though all the teachers use certain techniques to encourage their students to build their positive self-esteem. Simultaneously, all teachers who use cooperative group work think that it results in motivating students to learn. The strategies that the teachers use to build the students' self-esteem can be easily implemented in cooperative group work. Cooperative group/pair work then, can be used as a solution to motivate the students who lack motivation and to increase the motivation of the learners who are already motivated. These results confirm our first sub-hypothesis which states that there would be a positive correlation between cooperative learning and motivation.

The majority of the teachers who use group work, according to the skills they insist on and to the way they help their students see the benefits and advantages of group/ pair work, want their students to work cooperatively. In addition, they insist on using English to interact with each other which they would think is the solution for the ungrammatical spoken English they produce, rather than using a separate spoken practice. Moreover, all teachers report that cooperative group work enhances their students' participation which in turn, would help in correcting mistakes and exchanging ideas and information. As a result of this, students would build new input in grammar and activate their knowledge which both of them help students to learn. The last results confort our second sub-hypothesis about positive effect of cooperative learning and teaching grammar.

Having only two teachers who say that their students face problems when working together, does not guarantee for us the non-existence of these problems with other teachers.
Teachers may not be aware of all what is going on in the groups or may not be able to check the students' real reflection and opinions about group work.

4.3 Comparison between Students' Questionnaire results and Teachers' Questionnaire results

After analysing interpreting, and discussing the results of both students' questionnaire and teachers' questionnaire, we are going to check, through comparing the main results, if students and teachers have the same perception to the activities and the same opinion towards what are done in the classroom.

We begin with the first elements students and teachers have agreed on, which is the importance of grammar for Foreign Language Learning (FLL). Learners state that grammar is very much important for English learning and teachers are aware of the value their learners give to grammar. Students and teachers decide, also, on the existence of the learners' grammatical spoken problems. However, the majority of learners think they need spoken practice which is not what teachers think is the solution. The reason would be that teachers would think that other forms of practice would be sufficient for solving such a problem.

Concerning the frequency of using group/pair work and the formation of groups, most students, on the one hand, say they never or rarely use group work; and the majority of teachers, on the other hand, inform that they often use group/pair work. This diversity would be explained that student are sometimes asked to do activities in pairs or small groups during a short period of time taken from the lecture which students do not consider them included in the group/pair work tasks they have been asked about. In addition, students and teachers inform that the groups are formed on the basis of students' sitting; yet, many teachers do not take into their considerations that students prefer to choose their partners who would feel at ease to work with, either because of their levels or because of personal relationships.
Though many teachers report that their students do not face problems when working together, there are significant numbers of learners who say that they encounter very often more than one problem when working in groups. These discrepancies in views could be answered that some problems could not appear clearly. The teachers, hence, sometimes cannot notice them; and some students would feel shy to speak with their teachers about their problems. In addition, some teachers would think that doing the activities given is significance for the success of the group work objectives; still, it is not always the case.

For the outcomes gained from group/pair work, students opinions about the affective, learning and social benefits of group work go with the teachers' points of view concerning motivation and participation

5. Limitation of the study

The results and discussion have indicated that our hypotheses which are supported; that is to say, that using cooperative group/pair work in the grammar class would motivate students to learn grammar. Nevertheless, this study has some limitations.

The first limitation is time constraints. Longer time would help us to use different tool and a larger sample of students and a population or a sample of teachers who teach second year English grammar at the Department of English at the University of Constantine 2009-2010. This would give our results different dimensions. Extended time would also permit us to extend our research through specifying the grammar subjects that are taught during 2nd year and that can be taught through cooperative group appropriately because this method would give better results when used in teaching one aspect of grammar and than in teaching other aspects.
The second limitation is the nature of the tool used. In investigating a correlation study, the experimental method of research would be more helpful for the quantitative results that provides and would yield also more reliable and valid outcomes which is not always the case of the questionnaire where the answers would not reflect the students' real opinion or answer.

The third limitation is the number of sample. Different teachers teach different groups of the population, hence different methods and techniques would be used. Therefore, the number of sample (10%) would not represent the whole population, thus it is difficult to generalize these conclusions.

6. Pedagogical Suggestions

As it is said before, not all group/pair works are cooperative. Group/ pair work is an initial step, which in the presence of some other conditions, becomes cooperative learning. After analyzing the students’ answers and the teachers’ points of view and relating them together and to the literature review, we are going to give some suggestions for using cooperative group effectively.

First of all, many students would have some negative beliefs about group/ pair work in general. To make them want to work cooperatively, teachers would state some periods of time helping them see the value of cooperative group/ pair work and maintaining the social and learning skills necessary for making cooperative learning different from other ways of grouping.

Second, it is advisable for the teachers to use pairs or small groups, especially at the beginning, in order to be able to manage them and to help their students master working in a cooperative way with small number of students first, then move to larger number of groups. Moreover, students can be given the opportunity to choose their partners instead of imposing
on them the same groups' forms which are usually the students sitting together. In doing so, learners would manipulate how to work with different people and experience working in different groups and, at the same time, teachers would be aware about the type of forming groups that their students prefer.

Two main problems that students and teachers report in their answers are imposing ideas and unequal participation. These two problems can be solved if teachers use the two following strategies together: grading students individually and establishing a shared group goals and relating the two together. The first one enhances the students' participation in the group work and the second one states help between the members to achieve the group goal or get the group reward.

To end with, teachers can evaluate the effectiveness of group/pair work by controlling the students improvement at all levels: affective, academic, and social. They can, at the time, ask their students for self-evaluation of success and shortcoming of their group/pair work and their suggestion to solve them.

**Conclusion**

This chapter is concerned with getting real data about students' attitudes and opinions and teachers perception concerning learning and teaching grammar, as well as, about implementing cooperative group/pair work in teaching and learning grammar and the outcomes of this method.

The information was gathered through three steps. The first step is the pilot work questionnaire which is administered to a small number of students taken from the sample to check how much their question are understood and how much the answers would serve our study. The second questionnaire is constructed basing on the results taken after the analysis
of the pilot study. This questionnaire is submitted to a sample taken randomly from the 
population. The analysis of the results of the students' questionnaire confort our sub-
hypotheses. The third step is the teachers' questionnaire which aimed at checking the 
grammar teachers' perceptions about using cooperative group/pair work and about what they 
think concerning its effectiveness on the affective and learning domains. This last step is 
followed by analysis and interpretation of results and these appear to be in the direction of 
our sub-hypotheses. Comparison between the results of the last two steps is made to identify 
common points and differences between students' opinions and teachers' opinions when 
using group/pair work in grammar class.

Though this study has some limitation, its consequences are presented in terms of some 
pedagogical suggestions about using cooperative group/pair work in teaching grammar
**General Conclusion**

This study aims at studying the correlation between well-structured cooperative group/pair work in grammar class and motivation of students to learn grammar in second year English students at the Department of Foreign Languages at University of Constantine. To test this hypothesis, we divide it into two hypotheses: the first one is if we use cooperative group work, students will be more motivated, and the second one is if we use cooperative learning to teach grammar, students will learn it more effectively.

Basing our research on investigating these two hypotheses, we begin by a section of theoretical review composed of a chapter concerning cooperative learning: its nature, its characteristics that underlay it and its outcomes. Among the affective outcomes, we specify, in the second part of this chapter, the concept of motivation, starting by a general view of the definition of motivation according to many theories and concluding the whole chapter by stating a relationship made between cooperative group/pair work and motivational theories.

In the second chapter, we presented theoretical literature about grammar and its relation to Communicative Approach of teaching L2/FL. We first present its nature and main interest then we speak about different ways of presenting different types of grammatical knowledge. Later, We specify teaching grammar in communicative approach and distinguish between spoken grammar and written grammar. Since one of many ways to implement grammar in communicative language teaching is group/pair work, we conclude this chapter by making a relation between it and the last one through given some examples of cooperative activities that can be use do teach grammar.

The second section of this dissertation is devoted to the practical study which is in turn divide into three parts: pilot work, and its results; students’ main investigation, its results and its discussion; and the teachers' main investigation, its results and its discussions. We
conclude these three parts by a comparison between the results of two sides of the main investigation, students' and teachers' questionnaires which helps us in presenting some pedagogical suggestions. We concluded this chapter by confirming both hypotheses for all the parts of the practical study.

These results cannot be fairly generalized on the whole population because of two main reasons, the first one the simple is just 10% of the population which done not certificate the representation of all the characteristics of the population. The second reason is the nature of the research because it is concerned with the affective domain of the learners and the attitudes towards using such a method are linked to many other uncontrollable variables like personality factors and past experiences.
Bibliography


Hill, J. D. & Flynn, K.M. (2006). Classroom Instruction that works with English Language Learners. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, USA.


http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/deliberations/collaborative_learning/pantiz_paper.cfm.


Appendix A: Pilot Study Questionnaire

Dear Students,

We would be so grateful if you could answer the following questions about your opinions concerning learning grammar and your attitudes concerning the use of cooperative group work when learning grammar.

Your answer will be very helpful for the research project we are undertaking.

We hope that you will answer with full attention, honesty and interest. To answer the questions, you are required to put a tick ( ) in the box correspondent to your answer. You may seek clarification from us whenever you feel the need for that.

Be sure that any information you will provide us with in this questionnaire will remain strictly anonymous.

Thank you.
1. When leaning the English language, do you think that learning grammar is

- Very much important? 
- Important? 
- Little? 
- Not important?

2. Do you think your level in grammar is

- Excellent? 
- Good? 
- Average? 
- Poor?

3. Do you often think that you know most of grammar rules, but you still make mistakes when using the language?

- Yes 
- No

4. Do you think you need to do more speaking in your grammar classes?

- Yes 
- No
5. Do you think learning grammar can be

- An interesting activity? □
- An obligatory activity? □
- A boring activity? □

Can you be more precise about your answer, please?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

6. Do you learn grammar better

- When the teacher does not give the rules, but guides the learners to get the rules by themselves through activities? □
- When the teacher gives the rules, explains them and then gives activities? □
- When the teacher combines the two methods? □

7. Does your teacher of grammar try to create a good atmosphere

- Yes □
- No □

If yes, what does your teacher do to create a good atmosphere?

- Establishes a good relationship with students □
➢ Praises students

➢ Checks that students are involved in learning

➢ Allows students to ask questions and gives answers

➢ Other

_ Can you specify, please?

………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

8. When learning grammar in class, do you prefer

➢ To work individually

➢ To work in pair

➢ To work in small group

_ Can you add more information about your answer

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

9. How often does your teacher ask you to work in small groups/pairs

➢ Always

➢ Often

➢ Rarely

➢ Never
10. When you work in small group/pairs, on what basis students are usually grouped

- Students with the same level together
- Students sitting with each other together
- Students choose their partners
- Other

Can you specify, please

...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................
... Which one from the last list do you prefer?
...........................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................

11. Does your teacher check if students are on the tasks

- Yes
- No

12. Does your teacher insist on using English to interact with each other when working in small groups/pairs

- Yes
- No

13. Which skills does your teacher focus on when working in small groups/pairs
If there are others, please specify

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

14. Do you face problems working in pairs or groups during grammar classes

➢ Yes

➢ No

15. If yes, which problems do you usually face when working in groups/pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to express my ideas to the members of my group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like when students in my group correct my mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have enough opportunities to speak with students of my group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If there are other problems, can you specify please?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

16. When you work in small groups/ pairs, do you feel that you are

➢ Strongly motivated

➢ Motivated

➢ Less motivated

➢ Not motivated

17. Do you think that this way of learning helps you

➢ To learn to respect others

➢ To learn to express yourself

➢ To learn how to speak English correctly

➢ To learn how to speak English fluently

If there are other benefits from working in group/pair, please specify.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

18. When working in a group/ pair do you feel?
19. How much did you learn from group/ pair work

- Very much
- Much
- Little
- Nothing

20. According to you, group/ pair work as opposed to individual work is

- Excellent
- Very good
- Good
- Poor

Thank you for your participation in this questionnaire
Appendix B:
The Students’ Main Questionnaire

Dear Students,

We would be so grateful if you could answer the following questions about your opinions concerning learning grammar and your attitudes concerning the use of cooperative group work when learning grammar.

Your answer will be very helpful for the research project we are undertaking.

We hope that you will answer with full attention, honesty and interest. To answer the questions, you are required to put a tick ( ) in the box correspondent to your answer. You may seek clarification from us whenever you feel the need for that.

Be sure that any information you will provide us with in this questionnaire will remain strictly anonymous.

Thank you.
Section one: students’ perceptions about learning grammar

16. When leaning the English language, do you think that learning grammar is

- Very much important? □
- Important? □
- Little? □
- Not important? □

17. Do you think your level in grammar is

- Excellent? □
- Good? □
- Average? □
- Poor? □

18. Do you often think that you know most of grammar rules, but you still make mistakes when using the language?

- Yes □
- No □
19. Do you think you need to do more speaking in your grammar classes?

➢ Yes □

➢ No □

20. Do you think learning grammar can be

➢ An interesting activity? □

➢ An obligatory activity? □

➢ A boring activity? □

_ Can you be more precise about your answer, please?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

21. Do you learn grammar better?

➢ When the teacher does not give the rules, but guides the learners to get the rules by themselves through activities? □

➢ When the teacher gives the rules, explains them and then gives activities? □

➢ When the teacher combines the two methods? □
Section Two: Students’ Perceptions about the Teacher’s Supervision of Group/Pair work

22. How often does your grammar teacher ask you to work in small groups/pairs?

➢ Always □
➢ Often □
➢ Rarely □
➢ Never □

23. When you work in small group/pairs, on what basis students are usually grouped?

➢ Students with the same level together □
➢ Students sitting with each other together □
➢ Students choose their partners □

_If there are others, can you specify, please

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
_Which way of grouping from the list above do you prefer?
24. When working in groups/pairs, does your teacher check if all students are doing the activities given?

- Yes
- No

25. Does your teacher insist on using English to speak with each other when working in small groups/pairs?

- Yes
- No

26. Which skills does your teacher focus on when working in small groups/pairs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building good relationships among students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting each other’s ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to others arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguing your ideas to convince others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are others, please specify

27. Do you face problems working in pairs or small groups?
28. If yes, which of the following problems do you usually face when working in groups/pairs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to express my ideas to the members of my group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like when students in my group correct my mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have enough opportunities to speak with students of my group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_If there are other problems, can you specify please?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

**Section Three: Students’ attitudes about Using Cooperative Group/Pair Work**

29. When learning grammar in class, do you prefer

- To work individually
- To work in pair
- To work in small group
30. When you work in small groups/pairs, do you feel that you are

- Strongly motivated* [ ]
- Motivated [ ]
- Less motivated [ ]
- Not motivated [ ]

31. Do you think that this way of learning helps you

- To learn to respect others [ ]
- To learn to express yourself [ ]
- To learn how to speak English correctly [ ]
- To learn how to speak English fluently [ ]

If there are other benefits from working in group/pair, please specify.

32. When working in a group/pair do you feel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not shy if you make mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are more confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are not good at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. How much did you learn from group/ pair work?

- Very much
- Much
- Little
- Nothing

19. According to you, group/ pair work, if compared to individual work, is

- Excellent?
- Very good?
- Good?
- Poor?

Thank you for your participation in this questionnaire

*Motivation: Willingness and desire of doing something

If you are motivated to do something it means you want to do that thing

Appendix C: The Teachers’ Questionnaire

Dear Teachers,
We would be so grateful if you could answer the following questions about your opinions concerning teaching grammar and your attitudes concerning the use of cooperative group work when teaching grammar.

Your answer will be very helpful for the research project we are undertaking.

You are required to put a tick ( ) in the box correspondent to your answer.

Definition of technical terms is found at the end of the questionnaire.

Be sure that any information you will provide us with in this questionnaire will remain strictly anonymous.

Thank you.

**Personal Information**

1. University/ college ..................

2. Degree
   - BA (licence)                   
   - Master                       
   - Magister                     
   - PhD (doctorat)               

3. Work experience................

**Section One: Teachers’ Perceptions of Students’ Learning Grammar**

4. To what extent do you think your students value the importance of grammar in learning a foreign language?
   - Very much                     
   - Much                         

5. Do you face situations where students produce sentences that are incorrect grammatically, though they sometimes know the rules?
   Yes □
   No □

6. To what extent do you think your students need more speaking to practice grammar rules?
   _ So much □
   _ Much □
   _ Little □
   _ Not at all □

7. Which method do you use when teaching grammar?
   _ Inductive □
   _ Deductive □
   _ Eclectic □

Section two: Teachers’ Perception of the Affective Domain of the Learners

8. Do you think that your students are motivated* during the grammar class?
   Yes □
   No □
9. How do you try to build self-esteem in your students during the grammar class?

- allow them to express and argue their points of view
- allow them to ask and answer questions
- make positive feedback when necessary
- If there are others, can you specify please

Section Three: The Teachers’ Incorporation of Cooperative Group Work

10. How often do you use group work when teaching grammar?

- Never
- Rarely
- Often
- Always

11. How many students are there in each group?

- Pairs
- 3-4
- 5-6
- More than 6

12. Do you set up the groups on the basis of

- Gender
_ Proficiency

_ Students’ preference

_ Students sitting together

_ If there are others, can you specify please

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……

13. How often do you check if your students are doing the activities

_ Never

_ Rarely

_ Often

_ Always

14. Do you emphasize using English when students are interacting within the same group

_ Yes

_ No

15. What are the skills you focus on when using cooperative* group work activities

_ Turn taking

_ Respecting others

_ Arguing the points of views
_ Equal opportunities of participation

If there are others, can you specify please

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…

16. Do you set up practice situations for the skills necessary for cooperative learning?
   _ Yes
   _ No

17. Do you help students see the value of cooperative learning
   _ Yes
   _ No

Section Four: Teachers’ Evaluation of Cooperative Learning

18. Do your students have problems working together
   _ Yes
   _ No

If yes, what are these problems?
   _ An unequal participation of the learners
   _ Imposing points of view
   _ Social skills problems
19. Are the students who face such problems

- Excellent students
- Good students
- Average students
- Less able students

20. How do you try to solve such problems

- Grading students individually
- Putting shared group reward
- Dividing the work between the group members

If there are others, can you specify please,

21. Does cooperative group work enhance your students’ participation

- Yes
- No

22. When using Cooperative Learning, do you think your students are
Thank you for your participation in this questionnaire

*Self-esteem: the value each of us places on our own characteristics abilities, and behavior

*Motivation: an internal state that arouses, directs and maintains behavior

*Cooperative Learning : Arrangement in which students work in mixed ability groups and rewards on the basis of success of the group

Resume
La présente étude vise à étudier l’effet de motivation d’employer le travail coopératif bien-structuré de groupe dans l’enseignement de la grammaire aux étudiants de deuxième année d’Anglais comme Langue Etrangère au Département de d’Anglais, Université de Constantine. A fin de vérifier cette corrélation, nous avons présumé que l’étude bien structurée de coopérative aurait comme conséquence la motivation des étudiants et que si elle était employée dans l’enseignement de grammaire, elle aurait aidé des étudiants à apprendre la grammaire. Pour vérifier la validité de ces hypothèses, nous avons conduit une étude préliminaire, par laquelle nous avons examiné la compréhension des questions par les étudiants et la pertinence de leurs réponses avec notre étude. Après, nous avons effectué la recherche principale, c’est-à-dire, alternativement, divisé en deux genres de questionnaire ; le questionnaire des étudiants et le questionnaire des professeurs. Le premier se compose de dix-neuf questions et administré à cent-seize étudiants d’anglais de la 2ème année au département de d’Anglais, Université de Constantine. Le deuxième questionnaire se compose de vingt-deux questions données aux sept professeurs de grammaire de deuxième année parmi huit professeurs au même département pendant l’année scolaire 2009-2010. La discussion des résultats a prouvé qu’en utilisant l’étude coopérative, elle motive les étudiants d’Anglais de deuxième année et une fois utilisé dans l’enseignement de la grammaire, le travail coopératif bien-structuré de groupes aide les étudiants d’Anglais de la deuxième année à son apprentissage.
الملخص

يهدف هذا البحث لدراسة أثر تطبيق العمل التعاوني لتفعيل الطلبة و استعماله في مجال تدريس قواعد اللغة لطلبة السنة الثانية في اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بجامعة قسنطينة. لاستكشاف ذلك، بنينا حثنا على فرضيتيين. الأولى أن للعمل الجماعي التعاوني أثر تحفيزي على الطلبة، والثانية أن العمل الجماعي التعاوني يساعد الطلبة على التحصيل المعرفي في مجال قواعد اللغة. لاحتفظ بالرضاي كل شروط، للتحقق من هاتين الفرضيتيين، أجزنا دراسة تجريبية على فئة مختارة بطريقة عشوائية من العينة الرئيسية لتقييم فهم الطلبة للمفردات والأسئلة المستخدمة في استبان الدراسة الرئيسية. استبان الدراسة الرئيسية يتكون من 19 سؤال تم توزيعه على 116 طالبا وطالبة في السنة الثانية الإنجليزية بجامعة قسنطينة في نهاية السنة الجامعية 2009-2010. استبان الأسئلة المشاركين هو الجزء الثاني من الدراسة الرئيسية يتكون من 22 سؤال قدم ل 7 من بين 8 أساتذة في السنة الثانية. مناقشة تحليل النتائج أثبتت صحة الفرضيتيين. ما يعني أن للعمل الجماعي التعاوني أثر تحفيزي على الطلبة، وأن العمل الجماعي التعاوني يساعد الطلبة على التحصيل المعرفي في مجال قواعد اللغة. لاحتفظ بالرضاي كل شروط.