

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study is about "Effectiveness of co-operative learning approach in teaching writing." This chapter consists of general background of co-operative learning, review of related literature, objectives of the study and the significance of the study.

1.1 General Background

Communication has long been desired outcome of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. The common belief among teachers is that "the surest path to engagement in learning a second language is communication in that language" (McCaffetry et al. 2006, p. 3). Researchers have shown that an opportunity to use language in a meaningful situation increases pace of acquisition of the second / foreign language. Indeed, if asked to describe their teaching methodology, many teachers today would say they use communicative language teaching. For this reason, there are many methods and approaches adapted by the teachers in teaching language which focus on creation of such environment where there is increased opportunity to use language. According to Harmer (1998) "Group activities have become one of the key tools in communicative language teachers' tool boxes because groups provide so many opportunities for students to communicate and because groups provide a means of integrating listening, speaking, reading and writing" (as cited in McCaffetry et al.2006,p.3). Group work allows learners to develop fluency in the use of language features that they have already learned (Davies 1982). Similarly, it gives learners the opportunity to learn communication strategies. It provides opportunity for real interpersonal interaction and dramatically increase the amount of talking for individual students. It also promotes learner autonomy by allowing students to make their own decision in the group without being told what to do by the teachers.

Contrary to popular group works, problems also arise - Problems that have led some teachers to give up on using group work. "These problems include members not participating, groups not getting along, or learners unable to do the task" (McCaffetry et al. 2006, p. 3). In group activities situation (group work), the best student in group might do all the given task, while other members are off task. In group work sometimes the participation of the group members is not equal and there are group members who indulge on a free ride without contributing the group's work and objectives. Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1995) agreed that simply placing students in groups telling them to work together does not in and of itself promote higher achievement (Ibid., p.230). According to McCaffetry et al. (2006), "Co-operative learning arose in mainstream of education as an effort to address such problems and to generally facilitate student-student interaction" (p. 3). Richards and Rodgers (2001) mention:

Co-operative learning was more generally promoted and developed in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s as a response to the forced integration of public schools and has been substantially refined and developed since then. Educators were concerned that traditional models of classroom learning were teachers fronted, fostered competition rather than cooperation (p. 192).

Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec(1993), leaders of co-operative learning since the 1970s offer the following definition "Co-operative Learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning"(as cited in McCaffetry et al.2006 p.3). They suggested if we are to maximize the benefits of groups, we need to understand the complexities that are involved in groups works and introduce co-operative learning which boots its efficacy (as cited ibid. p. 3).

In the Nepalese context, most of the EFL classes at secondary level are made up of mixed ability groups. Their communicative competence in English varies

significantly. In most of the secondary classes some students are higher achievers, some others at the middle and some learners who fall in low achievers. This heterogeneity creates a situation that challenges teachers, teaching materials and techniques. As the result teachers as well as students found many problems associated with the promotion of active learning across all language levels.

As Jahn (2008), mentioned that problems can be solved in a great extend by introducing and promoting collaborative environment in language classes. He holds, “this type of environment will not only help to achieve a balance between the struggle of teacher's teaching techniques and students dynamic and diversified need, but also established a convenient environment in the classes to negotiate meaning in a social milieu” (p. 49).

1.1.1 Defining Co-operative Language Learning

Life is by nature, highly interdependent. To try to achieve maximum effectiveness through independence is trying to play tennis with a gold club. Being interdependent and working in a team gives a person an opportunity to share himself deeply, meaningfully with others and have access to the vast resources and potential of other human beings. Human beings are social creatures by nature and cooperation has been used throughout history in all aspects of our lives.

Co-operative Language Learning (CLL) is the part of a more general instructional approach also known as collaborative learning. It is used as an umbrella term for variety of activities in education that involves joint intellectual effort of two or more people who attempt to learn something together. It is based on the belief that learning is naturally a social act so, knowledge can be created among the learning members activity interacting, sharing experiences and taking different roles. Co-operative learning is similar to collaborative learning and it stands in contrast to the concept of competitive learning. This education approach to teaching involves group of learners

working together to solve a problem, complete task as create to some new products.

According to Nunan (1992, p.1) "While drawing on traditions reaching back to the turn of the century, collaborative teaching and learning have emerged over the last ten years as significant concepts with in the field of language education" (p.1). He further writes:

In language education teachers, learners, researchers and curriculum specialists can collaborate for number of reasons. They way wish to experiment with alternative ways of organizing teaching and learning, they may be concerned with promoting a philosophy of cooperation rather than competition, they may wish to create an environment in which learners, teachers and researchers are teaching and learning from each other in an equitable way (a trend which is enhanced by growing interest in action research) or they may wish to experiment with ways of incorporating principles of learner centeredness into their programs.

Therefore, co-operative learning is an instructional strategy based on the human instinct of cooperation. The concept of co-operative learning refers to the instructional method and technique in which students work in small groups and are rewarded in same way for performance as a group. The idea behind the co-operative learning method is that when group rather than individual are rewarded, students will be motivated to help one another to master academic materials. It is a successful teaching strategy in which small teams, each with students of different levels of ability use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of subject. Each member of a team is responsible not only for learning what is taught but also for helping team mates learn, thus creating atmosphere of achievement.

This terminology is defined variously by various scholars, researchers and linguists. Slavin (1980) defines co-operative learning as students working in small groups and are given reward and recognition based on the group's

performance. Artz and Newman (1990) define co-operative learning as a small group of learners who work as a team to solve a problem, complete a task or achieve a common goal. Similarly, Brown (2001, p. 47) As the students work together in Pairs and groups, they share information and come to each others' aid. They are 'team' which players must work together in order to achieve goals successfully (as cited in Bhattari,2009p.3).

In the same way Olsen and Kagan (1992, p. 8) state:

Co-operative learning is group learning activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others" (as cited in Richard and Rodgers, 2001 p. 192).

Johnson and Johnson (1993, p. 9) put "Co-operative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each others learning (as cited in McCaffetry et al. 2006, p.3)

According to Richard and Rodgers (2001), "Co-operative learning is an approach to teaching that makes maximum use of co-operative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom" (p. 192).

David and Roger (2001) also put the similar view regarding the co-operative learning. They say:

Co-operative learning is a successful teaching strategy in which small team each with students of different levels of ability uses a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject. Each member of a team is responsible not only for learning what is taught but also for helping teammates learn, thus creating an atmosphere of achievement. Students work through the assignment until all group members successfully understand and complete it. Co-operative efforts result in participants striving for mutual benefits so that all groups

members gain from each others efforts" (Co-operative learning online 15 October 2001 .[http:// www.oclcrc.com/ pages/cl](http://www.oclcrc.com/pages/cl) retrieved on November 29, 2009).

Therefore, co-operative learning is teaching arrangement that refers to small heterogeneous groups of students working together to achieve common goal. The higher level students help lower level students to improve their understanding of concepts being taught. Students work together to learn and are responsible for their teammates learning as well as their own. Students encourage and support each other assume responsibility for their own and each other's learning employ group related social skills and evaluate the group's progress. In a well-functioning co-operative group, there is sense of joint responsibility where learners care about and get committed for each other's success as well as their own: a sense of 'sinking or swimming together. A team environment where learners celebrate each other's successes and provide assistance to each other is likely to promote more positive peer relationships, social support, and partly for that reason, higher self-esteem and academic achievement

Thus, co-operative learning is learning approach which has been proven to culminate positive result and outcome. This approach is believed to enhance student's performance and achievement in various subjects and aspects of the language and producing positive social outcomes.

1.1.2 Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Co-operative Learning

Second language refers to any additional language that children learn after they have acquired their mother tongue even though it may actually be the third fourth or tenth language to be acquired. Second language acquisition (SLA) is the process by which people learn language addition to their native languages. According to Ellis (1985) "Second language acquisition refers to the subconscious or conscious process by which a language other than the mother tongue is learnt in natural or tutored setting"(p. 6). It is the process of learning

a second language when the learner has mastered a certain mother tongue system, in most cases far away from the social environment of the target language. Krashen (1982) argues that simple language importation or language input is not enough, and what the learners need is 'understandable importation which is necessary condition for language acquisition'. The so called 'comprehensible input' is the understandable language materials heard and read by the language learner. Importation should also be interesting or relevant. So, learners can easily and unknowingly achieve language acquisition. Thus, understandable importation language materials is the key to language acquisition.

An important aspect of effective and efficient language learning involves the awareness of effective in language teaching. One phenomenon that exists in second language acquisition is that various learners are at different levels of speed and efficiency. This affects their ability to complete learning tasks and gain the same quality of comprehensible input. In the process from inputting to intake, the students' learning motivation for learning, their attitude, self confidence and anxiety are playing their roles as well. Krashen (1982) calls these factors "Emotional factors". They play a role of filter in the process of language input, which determines the amount of language input taken up by the learners. Specifically, when the emotional filter" is low means, it means learners' purpose is clear, dynamic, strong self confidence with the appropriate anxiety. Krashen (1982) states:

learners with high motivation, self confidence and with low anxiety have low filters and so obtain and let in plenty of input. Learners with low motivation, little self confidence, and high anxiety have high filters and so receive little input and allow ever less in (as cited in Ellis 1985, p. 263).

In the co-operative learning environment, learners can naturally feel relaxed and free and enjoy themselves in the language acquisition process. Long and

Porter (1985, p. 211) suggested "In contrast to the public atmosphere of lockstep instruction, a small group of peers provides a relatively intimate setting and usually a more support environment in which to try out embryonic second language skills". Similarly, Tusi (1996) found, Student-student collaboration to be an effective means of reducing debilitating anxiety among the learners. Long and Porter believed that this "more supportive environment" may also increase motivation (as cited in McCaffetry, 2006, p. 27). In the same way, Johnson, Johnson and Smith (1999) agreed that "Simply placing students in groups and telling them to work together does not in and itself promote higher achievement" (p. 230). They maintained that in order for students to reap the benefits provided through co-operative learning, two conditions must be met. The first condition is clearly perceived positive interdependence. Johnson,Johnson and Smith(1995) maintain it exists "When one perceives that one is linked with others in a way so that one cannot success unless they do (and vice versa) and / or that are must coordinate one's efforts of others to complete a task (as cited in Yang, 2008, p. 31).

When students work together without expressing the feeling that everyone in their group either sinks or swim together, the learning situation is not co-operative. If a lesson is devoid of any of the elements of co-operative learning, thus the lesson could not be considered as a co-operative learning lesson. Even though co-operative lesson is learner centered the teacher has a paramount role to play instructing and planning the lesson. According to Krashen(1982), The ideal foreign language teachers should be able to provide students with such learning environment which enables students to obtain more direct use of the target language and provides them with opportunities to immerse themselves in the use of language. This approach results in meaningful communication and encourages students to participate in problem solving and communication activities that accomplish their tasks. Loertscher (2007) in other words, the foreign language acquisition teaching environment which is conducive to the

students in communication and content that students can value, comprehend and imitate.

Researchers have argued that co-operative learning methods are beneficial in learning a second language because, among other justifications, they provide opportunities for increased language production and allow learners to negotiate meaning in natural, low anxiety environments (Bailey, Daley 1999, Ford 1991: Long and Porter, 1985) (as cited in Yang, 2008, p. 31). Similarly, Kagan (1995) says 'for English language learners, CL promotes language acquisition by providing comprehensible input in developmentally appropriate ways and in a supportive and motivating environment (as cited in Dellicarpini 2010, p. 42). In the same way, McGroarty (1993, p. 20) maintained that co-operative learning provides a powerful tool for language acquisition because it establishes an instructional context that supports many of the aspects of language development taken as central by recent 12 acquisition theories.

It is important for teachers to create harmonious and relaxed classroom and reduce effective disorder. The classroom is the main place where learning occurs and a good classroom-learning environment will greatly improve the language acquisition effect. According to 'input hypothesis' the class should not only provide with adequate comprehensible input but also have low affective filter environment. We should therefore strive to create a harmonious and comfortable classroom environment. This involves changing the traditional model of instruction, and creating a pleasant, decent learning environment for students of English (Robinson 2007).

Thus, co-operative learning often creates student centered climate in the classroom. Students in such classroom will feel more relaxed and find it easier to perform, either listening or speaking. Many students are afraid of speaking in front of a whole class because they are worried about criticism and loosing face or they simply feel shy. If speaking tasks are however, designed to be completed in small groups, this anxiety is less likely to happen. Students can

learn much faster and easily when they are learning in co-operative learning atmosphere. Through co-operative learning, they enhance their talking, listening, reading and writing abilities so co-operative learning plays an important role in second language acquisition.

1.1.3 The Theoretical Bases of Co-operative Learning

Co-operative language learning is based on the idea that second language learning can be done best in heterogeneous groups, when all students work collaboratively and in co-operative way for one common goal. It replaces the idea that students have to work competitively against one another. On the contrary, it rather supports the idea of Vygotsky. Vygotsky (1978) claimed in his interaction hypothesis which states that "Interaction not only facilitates language learning but is a causative force in acquisition (as cited in Saville-Troike 2006, p. 111).

Vygotsky was of the opinion that social interaction is seen as the only way of learning a language sufficiently and therefore he came up with his idea of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) "an area of potential development where learners can achieve that potential only with assistance" (ibid., p. 112).

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001),

Taking development psychologists Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky both of whom stress the central role of social interaction in learning. They indicated a central premise of CLL is that Learners develop communicative competence in a language by conversing in socially or pedagogically structured situations (p 194).

While working co-operatively, students share the idea of working together and achieving a common goal. Every members of the group has got different ideas and skills and in sharing them with the others, the group can take a maximal profit out of it all. Furthermore, different skills include that every member of the group has the chance to participate and so every group member is important

for the success of group work. It emphasizes of this approach is on co-operative work rather than on competitive work.

Therefore co-operative language learning focuses on language learning in natural setting through the use of interaction in pairs or and group works. This means that interaction with in one heterogeneous group can lead to maximum of language learning, if the students work collaboratively. To do so, they have to use the L2 and share the idea of achieving a common goal, which is not on the first side of the learning the languages, but solving the exercises. This means that the actual language learning process can be seen as a side effect of the tasks, because students have to use the foreign language just as a means of communication. That also lowers the anxiety of taking in a foreign language and therefore it encourages students to make use of it, but being less afraid of making mistakes.

Richards and Rodgers (2001, p. 193) present five basic premises about the interactive co-operative nature of language and language learning.

Humans are born to talk and communication is generally considered to be the primary purpose of learning.

. . . most talk / speech is organized as conversation.

. . . conversation operates according to certain agreed upon sets of co-operative rules or maxims.

. . . one learns how these co-operative maxims are realized in one's native language through causal, everyday conversational interaction.

. . . one learns how the maxims are realized in second language through participation in co-operatively structured interactional activities.

Co-operative language learning puts these principles of language and language learning in the diverse sets. Behaviourists psychology of learning focuses group reinforce and reward are necessary conditions for learning. Bandura

focuses on imitation, Skinner focused on group contingencies and Homan focused on the balance of reward and cross in social exchange among the independent individuals. Similarly, Murray (1982) found that “Two students neither of whom was able to do a particular task alone were able to complete the task when working together” (as cited in McCaffetry, et al. 2006, p. 11).

1.1.4 Basic Elements of CL

Cooperation is working together to accomplish shared goals. Within co-operative situations, individual seeks outcome beneficial to him/herself and all other group members. There are different approaches and models in co-operative learning. Johnson's model of co-operative learning is referred to as "Learning together". Learning together can be applied at any level with any subject (Kessler, 1992). Another co-operative learning model is introduced by Spenser Kagan (1994) called structural approach. Structural approach is based on the use of content free ways of organizing interaction called structures. The structures can be adopted and adapted in various contexts (Ibid., 1992). The elements of co-operative learning differ from one approach to another. The co-operative learning model, 'Learning together' focuses on five elements which are positive interdependence, individual accountability, face to face interaction, social skills and group processing (Johnson, Johnson and Holubes, 1994). There are other four important elements of co-operative learning which are introduced by Kagan: positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation and simultaneous interaction.

Based on the syntehsis of the main elements of co-operative learning from the erudite co-operative learning researchers, seven elements are discovered (Biehler and Snowman, 1997). The elements of co-operative learning are group heterogeneity, positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal skills, equal opportunities for success and team competition.

The brief introduction of all those stages is given below:

1. **Group Heterogeneity:-** Co-operative learning teams are deliberately heterogeneous and consist of two to four members. According to Slavin 1987, 'In bigger groups, there is a high achiever, one or two average achievers and a low achiever. The groups are chosen by the teacher after careful consideration. The teams are responsible for learning and task together, helping each other. Learners are encouraged to explain ideas or skills to one another, each member being an active participant and an important resources person for the whole team. Such discussion can be beneficial to all. Faster learners will consolidate their own understanding of issues at hand. It hand when explaining them to slower learners. Thus engaging in cognitive elaboration that enhances their own understanding. Similarly, slower learners will benefit from peer-tutoring by their teammates who are wrestling with the same question (as cited in Nunan 1993, p. 35).
2. **Positive interdependence :** The work in co-operative learning teams is structured so that there is positive interdependence among the members in the group: the learners feel that they work together for mutual benefit. Johnson et al. 1990 state:

Positive interdependence needs to be structured carefully in order to encourage all group members to work to their full capacity. In a well functioning co-operative group there is a sense of joint responsibility where learners care about and get committed to each others' success as well as their own; a sense of sinking or swimming together (as cited in Nunan 1993, p. 34).

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), it is the heart of CL. It means when group members feel that "what helps one member helps all and what hurts one member hurts all" (p. 196). It is the perception that you are linked with others in a way their work benefits you and your work benefits them.

Thus, it is a sense of working together for a common goal and caring about each others' learning.

3. Face to face promotive interaction: It means the group must participate by communicating and discussing the goal. It helps to promote each other's success. In face to face interaction, teacher needs to maximize the opportunity for students to promote each other's success by helping, assisting, supporting encouraging and praising each other's efforts to learn. Here, students work together to solve problems, assist each other, praise each other's efforts, support and encourage each other. Accountability to peers, ability to influence each other's reasoning and conclusions, social modelling, social support and interpersonal rewards all increase as the face to face interaction among group members increase.
4. Individual Accountability: This feature suggests that each member of a group has to participate and make meaningful contribution and demonstrate their knowledge and skills to achieve the group's goal. As Slavin (1985, p. 5) defines individual accountability as being present when the team's success depends on the individual learning of all the team members. In individual accountability, every team members feel in charge of their own and their team-mates learning and makes an active contribution to the group. Thus there is no hitchhiking or freeloading for anyone in a team- everyone pulls their weight (Nunan, 1993, p. 35). It exists when the performance of each individual student is assessed and results are given back to the group and the individual. It is important that the group knows who needs more assistance, supports and encouragement in completion of assignment. The purpose of CL groups is to make each member and a stranger individual in his or her right. To ensure that each member is strengthened, students are held individually accountable for doing a share of the work and for mastery of the materials to be learned.

5. Interpersonal skills: Contributing to the success of a co-operative effort requires interpersonal and small group skills. Social skills include leadership, decision making, trust building, communication and conflict management skills are required for cooperation. Placing socially unskilled individuals in a group and telling them to cooperate does not guarantee that they will be able to do so effectively. Therefore, persons must be taught above mentioned social skills for working effectively in the group.
6. Equal opportunities for success: In co-operative learning, the teacher needs to provide a conducive environment and appropriate task for equal opportunities such as giving students learning assignments which are on par with their current level or giving marks for the improvement of scores compared to the previous test scores. Ghazi Ghaith and Anwar found co-operative learning is very useful while teaching with co-operative learning students, irrespective of aptitude are given equal opportunities to contribute improvement to their teams. Similarly, McCafferty et al. put for successful learning, each individual should be given equal, chance for actualizing their own potential.
7. Team competitions: The element of team competition should also be incorporated once in a while in co-operative learning between well matched competitors and without grading them for the norm referenced grading system. This is because team competition can spur students to achieve the group's goal.

Thus, co-operative learning is an approach under the umbrella of 'collaborative learning'. But unlike collaborative learning and group work, in co-operative learning the teacher plays a significant role to incorporate elements of co-operative learning and ensure that the students know how to work co-operatively in a co-operative learning situation. The absence of even one element in the lesson will lead to a non co-operative environment.

1.1.5 Roles of Teachers and Learners in CL

Co-operative learning focuses on learning as a social activity and support the notion that learning should be Fun (McCaffetry, 2006, p. 154). So that learning is viewed as an enjoyable, social interaction with friendship, co-operative learning activities provide meaningful, realistic practice combined with useful developmental feedback. It may be contrasted with competitive learning in which students work against each other to achieve an academic goal and establish harmonious and relax environment in the classroom and reduce effective disorder.

a) Teacher's Roles

The role of the teacher in CLL differs considerably from the role of teachers in traditional teacher fronted classroom. According to Johnson et al. (1994) “The teacher has to create a highly structured and well organized learning environment in the classroom setting goals, planning and structuring tasks, establishing the physical arrangement of the classroom, assigning students to groups and roles and selected materials and time” (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 199). Therefore, Wenglinsky (2002) states input of teacher impacts professional development, professional development impacts classroom practises and classroom practises influence students achievement (as cited in Hada, 2009, p. 173). In the co-operative learning oriented language class, the teacher's role is multifaceted and ever changing to complement and developing need of individual students as they learn and then begin to take control of group and learning processes. Some of the more enjoyable teacher roles are those of co-participant in co-operative learning activities (McCaffetry, 2006, p. 154). Similarly, Freeman (2009) states, ‘In co-operative learning teachers teach students collaborative or social skills so that they can work together more effectively’ (p. 164). Thus, teacher in co-operative learning is seen as a helpful source of guidance who is there to make them successful rather than judge who hands out graders and marks papers with red ink. The

main work of the teacher is to provide the material to set the classroom setting, to set the goals for the students in the work phase. The role of teacher is that of facilitator of learning (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 199). Harel (1992, p. 169) puts if a teacher's role is as a facilitator, he must move around the class helping students and groups as needs arise. Facilitators gives feedback, encourage the group to solve its own problem and encourage in thinking, managing conflict, observe students and supplying resources. Therefore, teachers' have great role in creating harmonious and relax environment in the classroom which help to reduce affective filters for enhancing learning of learners.

b) Learner's Role

The learner role is primarily to work collaboratively and develop social skills. It is important to accept and reward others' ideas than the own ones, because the students have to share ideas (not competitive who has got best), accept criticism and learn to make use of the foreign language when the teacher is not around. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001):

Learners are also director of their own learning. They are taught to plan, monitor and evaluate their own learning, which is viewed as a compilation of life long learning skills. Thus, learning is something that requires students' direct and active involvement and participation. Pair grouping is the most typical CLL format, ensuring the maximum amount of time both learners spend engaged on learning tasks (p. 199).

Thus, co-operative learning provides maximum opportunities to work together involving pairs and small groups of learners and learn co-operatively rather than competitively.

1.1.6 Teaching Writing

"Good writers are those who keep the language efficient. That is to say, keep it accurate keep it clear". - Ezra Pound

In English classroom, teacher aims at developing four skills of his/her learners' ability to understand, to speak, to read and to write. The ability to write occupies the last place in this order, but it doesn't mean that it is least important 'Reading makes a full-man, conference a ready man and writing an exact man' says Bacon. It is an important tool, which enables man to communicate with others people in many ways. Our abilities in language are made perfect in writing, writing trains ears and eyes and fixed vocabulary, spelling and patterns in our mind. Speaking and reading forms the basis for writing work. In this regard, Harmer (2004, p. 31) believes "Writing leads to learning because it reinforces language use because writing gives learners time to think and the opportunity to think about language rules". Therefore, writing is a creative process because it is a process of reaching out for one's thought and discovering them. Writing, as such is a process of making meaning.

Writing is the act of putting down ideas which is spoken in conventional graphic form. It refers to the expression of ideas in a consecutive way according to the graphic conventions of the language. In this regard, Byrne (1986, p. 1) writes "When we write, we use graphic symbols i.e. Letters or combination of letters which relate to the sound we make when we speak. On one level, then writing can be said to be the act of forming these symbols: making marks on a flat surface of some kind. But writing is clearly much more than production of graphic symbols, just as speech is more than the production of sounds." It involves the encoding of a message of some kind : i.e. translating our thoughts into language. However, White and Arndt (1991) put "Writing is far from being a simple matter of transcribing language into written symbols, that is thinking process in its own right. It demands conscious intellectual effort which usually has to be sustained over a considerable period of time". The symbols we produce have to be arranged in accordance with certain convention to form meaningful words and words into sentence and sentence into a text, and text into a coherent whole which is an explicit as possible and complete in itself, that we are able to communicate successfully

with our reader through the medium of writing. Therefore to use writing as a medium of communication proficiently, one needs the knowledge of sub skills related to writing. Munby (1979) has given a list of sub skills of writing skill which are as below:

1. Manipulating the script of language
 - (i) Forming the shapes of letters.
 - (ii) Using the spelling system and
 - (iii) Using punctuation.
2. Expressing information explicitly.
3. Expressing information implicitly through
 - (a) inference and (b) figurative language
4. Expressing the communicative value of sentence and utterances.
5. Expressing relations within sentences using
 - (a) elements of sentence structure.
 - (b) modal auxiliaries, and
 - (c) intra-sentential connectors.
6. Expressing relations between parts of a text through lexical and cohesion devices.
7. Expressing relations between part of a text through grammatical cohesion devices.
8. Using indicators in discourse for
 - (i) introducing an idea
 - (ii) developing an idea
 - (iii) transition to another idea
 - (iv) concluding an idea
 - (v) emphasizing a point
 - (vi) explanation of point already made

(vii) anticipating an objection.

9. Reducing the text through avoiding irrelevant information (as cited in Sharma and Phyak, 2009, p. 255).

Thus, writing is not a single activity but a cluster of activities. Rivers (1968, p. 242) suggested writing as "a stage wise process of putting down conventional graphic forms of something which has been spoken to the expression of idea in a consecutive way according to graphic communication of language."

Writing is regarded as the more difficult activity for most of the people, both in the mother tongue and in a foreign language. Byrne (1986, p. 4) gives three problems that make writing difficult.

(a) Psychological problem

Speech is the natural and normal medium of communication for us in most circumstances and accustoms us both to have someone physically present when we use language and to getting feedback of some kind. Writing on the other hand is solitary activity and the fact that we are required to write on our own, without the possibility of interaction or the benefits of feedback in itself makes the act of writing difficult.

(b) Linguistic Problem

Oral communication is sustained through a process of interaction and, except in special circumstances, such as lecture, all the participants help to keep it going. Because speech is normally spontaneous in writing we have to keep the channel of communication open through our own efforts and to ensure both through our choice of sentence structure and by the way our sentences are linked together and sequenced, that the text we produced can be interpreted on its own.

(c) Cognitive problem

We appear to speak without much conscious effort on thought and generally we talk because we want to talk about matters which are of interest or relevant to us socially or professionally. Writing, on the other hand, is learnt through a process of instruction: We have to master the written form of the language and to learn certain structures which are less used in speech, or perhaps not used at all, but which are important for effective communication in writing. We also have to learn how to organize our ideas in such a way that they can be understood by a reader who is not present and perhaps by a reader who is not known to us.

1.1.7 Approaches to Teaching Writing

There are no fixed approaches to teaching writing. Teachers have developed a variety of approaches while teaching writing skill. The approaches to teaching writing gives answer to the question of 'how to teach writing in EFL/ESL classes. There are several approaches to teaching writing. According to Raimes (1983, pp. 5-10) there are following approaches of teaching writing.

(1) The Controlled to Free Approach

This approach was widely practised during 1950 and early 1960s. That is the period when audio-lingual method was widely adapted for teaching a foreign language in North American colleges and universities. The controlled to free approach in writing is sequential: Students are first given sentences exercises, then paragraph to copy or manipulate grammatically by, for instance, changing questions to statements, present to past, or plural to singular. This approach stresses grammar, syntax and mechanics. It emphasizes accuracy rather than fluency or originality.

(2) The Free Writing Approach

This approach emphasized quantity of writing rather than quality and content and a fluency rather than form. To emphasize fluency even more, some ESL teachers begin many of their classes by asking students to write freely on any topic without worrying about grammar and spelling for five or ten minutes. Teachers do not correct these short pieces of free writing : they simply read them and perhaps comment on the idea the writer expressed.

(3) The Paragraph-Pattern Approach

In stead of accuracy of grammar or fluency of content, the paragraph-pattern approach stresses another feature of the diagram and organization. This approach is based on the principle that in different cultures people construct and organize their communication with each other in different ways. Here, students put scrambled sentences into a paragraph in a proper order, they identify general and specific statements, they choose or invent an appropriate topic sentence, they insert or delete sentences.

(4) The Grammar Syntax-Organization Approach

This approach of teaching writing emphasized the need to work simultaneously on more than one of the features in the composition diagram. Some teachers say writing cannot be seen as composed of separate skills which are learned one by one. So, they devise writing tasks that lead students to pay attention to organization while they also work on the necessary grammar and syntax.

(5) The Communicative Approach

This approach stresses the purpose of a piece of writing and audience for it. Student writers are encouraged to behave like writers in real life and to ask themselves the crucial questions about purpose and audience.

) Why am I writing this ?

) Who will read it ?

The communicative approach to teaching language provides platform for communicative approach to teaching writing. The students are taken as real writers, teachers extend it to other students in the class, who not only read but actually do something within, such as respond, rewrite in another form, summarize or make comments but not correct.

6. The Process Approach

The process approach is recent shift from a concentration on the written product to an analysis of the process of writing. Process oriented approach of writing believes that competent writers do not produce final text at their first attempt but final text emerges through successive drafts. Moreover, they believe that good writers plan and revise, rearrange and delete the text, re-reading and produce multiple drafts before they produce their final document. Thus, process approach treats all writing as creative act which requires time and again positive feedback to be done well.

a. Stages of Writing Process

- (i) Pre writing : The teacher needs to stimulate students' creativity, to get thinking how to approach a writing topic. In this stage, the most important thing is the flow of ideas, and it is not always necessary that students actually produce much if any written work. If they do, then the teacher can contribute with advice or how to improve their initial ideas.
- (ii) Focusing ideas: During this stage, students write without much attention to the accuracy of their work or the organization. The most important feature is meaning. Here, the teacher (or other students) should concentrate on the content of the writing. Is it coherent ? Is there anything missing ? Anything extra ?
- (iii) Evaluating, structuring and editing : Now the writing is adapted to a readership. Students should focus more on form and on producing a

finished piece of work. The teacher can help with error correction and given organization advice.

1.1.8 Stages of Teaching Writing

Learning to write coherently and in a way which is suitable for one's purpose and audience is something which many people can never easily manage in the foreign language. Because there exist a number of conflicting theories of planning and teaching a course in writing. Generally, the stages of teaching process writing can be outlined below: (Sharma and Phyak 2009, p. 270)

1. Planning

Planning is a pre-writing activity that fosters writing environment in such a way in which it stimulates for getting started. In planning, ideas and a structures should effectively organize. This stage includes the following sub activities:-

- (a) **Brainstorming:** Brain storming refers to listing of any ideas that comes to mind about the topic in any order. These ideas may be idea of actual content or idea for organizing the content. It involves thinking quickly and without inhibition so as to produce as many ideas as possible in given area or in a given topic or problem.
- (b) **Consulting Resources for Data or Information:** The students may consult resources for different kinds of information after assigning a writing task. The sources may be consulting libraries for different kinds of publication like books, journals newspapers etc.
- (c) **Making Notes:** The students can make structured and unstructured notes. If it is unstructured the students produce notes rather like brain-storming on paper if it is structured, it provides a basis for organizing ideas when drafting.

- (d) **Organizing Notes:** Organizing means grouping of ideas into framework. Organizing gives the rough idea of maintaining coherence and utility. Different ideas can be dealt in different paragraphs. We can follow the given ideas to organize of notes.

2. Making an Outline

The writer makes an outline on the basis of organized notes which are to be sent in certain order and relationship. It might be written in short phrases, incomplete sentences, but it must be legible. The writer can add, drop and expand, substitute, coordinate and subordinate the idea later.

3. Preparing the first draft

The writer prepared draft on the basis of outlined prepared. The first attempt at writing that is drafting. According to White and Arndt (1991) "Drafting activities make the move from pre-writing activities to actual writing process. They are moving from writer-based writing to reader based writing" (p. 99).

While and Arndt (ibid.) have given the following suggestions in this stage.

- Keep in mind the assumed readers and their knowledge of the subject.
- Think of what information the readers and their knowledge of the subject.
- Identify missing information.
- Add the new information at appropriate points in the text.
- Delete the information that is repeated.
- Re-order words, sentences to maintain coherence.

4. Revising, Editing and Producing and Final Draft

First draft is not the final product. The writer can change the words, sentences, even some part of organization. S/he can judge the overall coherence of the text. He can go the text several times in order to remove mistakes and irrelevances. He can revise the whole text to check the characters, events and

situation. Revising is not merely checking of language errors (i.e. editing). It is done to improve global context and the organization of ideas so that the writer's intent is made clearer to the readers.

- Editing: Editing involves the careful checking or proof reading of the text to ensure there are no errors of spelling, punctuation word order, word choice and grammar. For editing in the classroom context we can encourage the students to work in the pairs and in group.
- Producing of final draft: Producing of the final copy is goal of writing. This is the post writing, which includes publishing, sharing, reading aloud, transforming texts, for stage performances or merely displaying texts on notice boards.

1.1.9 Co-operative Learning and Writing

Writing is one of the skills that students need to master. Students' acquisition of the writing skill are given much emphasis in the educational system. However, Grabe and Kaplan (1996) state that writing process received relatively little attention in research on foreign language teaching. Yet it is a valuable communication skill to convey a person's thoughts and feelings. It is also a mean of self-discovery and linguistic discipline.

Harmer (2007) believes that writing is effective in genre-based and process approach. Students found the activity motivating in terms of the writing itself. They also found the activity to be motivating when they embark on the research, discussed on the topics, had peer evaluation and achieved the group's goal.

The writing in small groups is an efficient way to promote writing abilities and it was an excellent interaction activity. Their views were supported by a study conducted by Kagan and High (2002) which showed that students performed better in writing when co-operative learning was incorporated in the classroom. In a study conducted in catalina venture school in phoenix where a high

percentage of the students were students who learned English as a second language and low income students, the school's eight graders showed tremendous improvement in writing which is from 49% to 82% in their mastery level (Phukm web.ukm.my/~ solls09/proceeding/PDF/shafini.pdf).

Similarly Mentero (2005, p. 36) says:

Collaborative writing presents not only a highly motivating learning experience for EFL/ESL students but also creative pedagogical tool for teachers. This type of activity can yield multiple positive results, including peer cooperation and increased motivation. When students work together on a writing assignment, they learn from each others and edit each others' mistakes. At the same time the change in the routine from writing assignments individually to writing as a group can be very motivating for students who dislike writing in the first place.

Mariam and Napisah (2005) postulated that when peer interaction was incorporated in learning writing, the students generated ideas and constructed sentences together. Thus, this will lead to a better understanding of the topic that they are required to write on. The students will also be able to write concrete, accurate and creative piece of writing.

Collaborative work between learner is encouraged to increase motivation and develop positive attitudes towards writing activities (Nunan 1993). The students should be responsible in their writing and given the opportunity to share their work with others. The immediate feedback and positive reinforcement will boost their motivation to engage in writing activities.

1.1.10 Action Research

As the name suggests, action research comprises two components: action and research. As we know 'action' means some kind of activity or work, action research' encompasses two things at time: work or activity and research. Kurt Lewin First coined the term 'action research in his paper 'Action research and

minority problem' in 1946 characterizing action research as "a comparative research on the conditions and effects of various forms of social action and research." According to McFarland and Stansell (1993) "Lewin is credited with coining the term action research 'to describe work that did not separate the investigation from the action needed to solve the problem (as cited in Sinha, 2008, p. 77-82). His process was cyclical, involving a "non-linear pattern of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting on the changes in the social situations" (Noffke and Stevenson, 1995, p. 2). Stephen Corey used the concept of action research in the field of education. He believed that the scientific method in education would bring about change because educators would be involved in both the research and the application of information. Corey (1953) believed that the value of action research is in the change that occurs in everyday practice rather than generalization to a broader audience. He saw the need for teachers and researchers to work together. However, in the mid 1950s action research has attacked as unscientific, little more than common sense and the work of amateurs (McFarland and Stansell 1993). Interest in action research waned over the next few years as experiments with research design and quantitative data collection became the norm. By the 1970s, we saw again the emergence of action research. It has been adopted in a variety of context for a range of purpose. It is becoming increasingly prevalent in teacher education as a means to enhance classroom practice and to effect educational change.

1.1.11 Defining Action Research

Action research came into existence assuming to bridge the gap between the theoretical and the applied research. As mentioned earlier action research is propounded by Kurt Lewin and he discussed its features. After him many scholars discussed characteristics purposes and process of this type of research. "Some of them preferred slightly different names for Johnson (1992) it is a teacher research because real teacher is researcher. For Wallace (1998) it is a professional reflection. It is a research conducted by practitioners to find out and solve the difficulty of the subjects as well as for the Feedback of their

activity (as cited in Bhattarai 2005, p. 14). According to Nunan (1992) action research is becoming increasingly significant in language education as it addresses the immediate practical problems". But it should be able to identify and solve the problem in specific context, only if it is initiated by a question supported by data and interpretation is carried out by a practitioner investigating aspect of his/her own context and situation. A more succinct definition of action research is Action research aims to contribute both to the practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and to further the goals of social science simultaneously. Thus, there is a dual commitment in action research to study a system and concurrently to collaborate with members of the system in changing it in what is together regarded as a desirable direction. Accomplishing this twin goal requires the active collaboration of researcher and client, and thus it stresses the importance of co-learning as a primary aspect of the research process. Best and Kahn (1992, p. 21) state "Action research is focused on immediate application not on the development of theory or on general application. Its findings are to be evaluated in terms of local applicability not universal validity." Similarly, in the word of Cohen and Maninon's (1985) action research is conducted aiming at the improvement of current affairs through the process of identifying and solving problem in specific context (as cited in Bhattarai, 2005). In the same way Corey (1962) "action research is process by which practitioners attempt to study their problems scientifically in order to guide, correct and evaluate their decisions and actions". According to Wallace (1998) 'action research as a strategy for professional development which is accomplished by reflecting on the practitioners regular activities.

For Mills (2003) action research is systematic inquiry conducted by teacher researchers, principals, school counsellors, or other stakeholders in the teaching / learning environment to gather information about how their particular schools operate, how they teach, and how well their students learn. This information is gathered with the goals of gaining insight, developing reflective practise,

effecting positive changes in the school environment and on educational practises in general, and improving student outcomes and the lives of those involved.

In the words of Lier (1990, p. 236), action research refers to the process of "studying activities through changing them and seeing the effects". In other words, change is made in the existing work activities (i.e. intervention) and the effects of change in the activities are carefully watched (i.e. close examination) in action research (as cited in Luitel 2000,p.56).

Common features of action research highlighted by all these scholars are as follows:

1. In action research problem is identified in a local situation and it is instantly solved in the same situation.
2. Action research is participants self reflective inquiry teaching through enquiry.
3. It aims at improving current states of affairs participant's regular activities, quality of action with in a social setting (as cited in Bhattarai, 2005).

It can be concluded that action research is done by the practitioner's involved in the concerned work-by language teachers in language teaching learning research. It is done by analyzing the results of the teacher's own action's or reflecting upon them. The aim of this kind of research is to bring about improvement in classroom teaching learning.

1.1.12 Process of Action Research

Process of action research refers to the different steps used in this research. According to Burns (1999) the process of action research should be seen as flexible and different combinations of researchers in different situations will need to make their own interpretation of what are appropriate processes for the

circumstances of the research. Therefore, the process of action research has been recommended in number of ways.

Wallace (1998) exhibits the process of action research in the following five steps:

1. Consider problem / issues
2. Ask questions
3. Action research
4. Data collection and analysis
5. Application to professional practise.

Similarly Denscombe (1999) proposes the following five-step process of action research.

1. Professional practice
2. Critical reflection identifying problem or evaluating change.
3. Research
4. Strategic planning translation finding into action
5. Action.

Sanford (1981) based on the proposal of Kurt Lewin. For example, poists the seven steps of action research : (a) analysis (b) Fact finding, (c) Conceptualization (d) Planning (e) Execution, (f) More fact finding or evaluation and (g) repetition of this whole circle of activities 'a spiral of such circles.'

According to Nunan (1992, p. 19), there are seven steps that should be followed while carrying out action research. They are as follows:

Step 1: Initiation : First of all, the teacher is confronted with problem in course of his / her job. This is the point where the process of action research begins. Now, the teacher asks why has the problem come and what is its solution ? for this, s/he consults the experts in this stage.

Step 2: Preliminary Investigation : In an attempt to get answer of those questions, the teacher (either with a researcher or himself) spends sometime to observe the classroom situation, record classroom interaction (if possible) and collect baseline data related to the concerned problem.

Step 3: Hypothesis : The initial data are reviewed: all the relevant factors possible to play role in the problem are considered, and hypothesis is postulated regarding the cause of the problem.

Step 4: Intervention: The teacher needs to devise same new strategy by means of which the factor causing the immediate problem can be neutralized. Thereafter, the new strategy is implemented in the same learners with whom there is real problem.

Step 5: Evaluation: After several weeks, the class will be recorded again. There will be much greater involvement of the students, and the complexity of their language and students led interactions will be enhanced.

Step 6: Dissemination:- The finding of the action research are disseminated among colleagues so that all can share the ideas and get benefit from the feedback derived from the research findings. This is done especially in the form of a workshop or a seminar.

Step 7: Follow-up : Since the work of an action research can "take the form of an ongoing cycle", until the teacher -cum researcher gets satisfactory conclusion, some of the above mentioned steps can be repeated again e.g. hypothesis, intervention and evaluation. The cycle should be revised particularly if the intervening measure so far tried out does not work to satisfy the hypothesis. In such a case, another hypothesis is postulated and alternative intervening measure is devised or only the intervening

measure is altered, keeping the hypothesis the same. Thereafter, the remaining steps that follow intervention are followed again.

1.2 Review of the Related Literature

Co-operative learning is regarded as a teaching arrangement in which small heterogeneous groups of students work together to achieve a common goal. Students encourage and support each other, assume responsibility, for their own and each other's learning employ group related social skills and evaluate the group's progress. Co-operative learning has a strong foundation in research. Many hundreds of studies across a wide range of subject areas and aged groups have been conducted. These studies suggest that when compared to other instructional approaches, co-operative learning activities are associated with gain in achievement, higher-level thinking, self-esteem and interethnic relations. Students in co-operative learning settings tend to like the subject matter and their school more. Indeed, Johnson (1997) claims that co-operative learning is one of the best researched approaches in education (McCafferty et al. 2006, p. 6).

For decades co-operative learning has been implemented in classroom with diverse population primary as a means of fostering positive students interaction. In the United States, co-operative learning was first viewed as an approach to facilitate integration.

A synthesis of research about co-operative learning finds that co-operative learning strategies improve the achievement of students and their interpersonal relationships. In 67 studies of the achievement effects of co-operative learning 61% found significantly greater achievement in co-operative than in traditionally taught control groups. Positive effects were found in all major subjects all grades levels, in urban, rural and sub-urban schools, and for high, average, and low achievers (Slavin, 1991). LittleWood (2001, p. 43) investigated the attitudes towards classroom English learning in three European and eight East Asian countries and found that most of the student from all

represented countries questioned the traditional authority based transmission mode of learning. More over these students expressed and desire to be active participant in learning and they had positive attitude towards group work and working towards a common goal.

Ghaith and Yaghi (1998, as cited in Baral, 2006, p. 3) have published a research article on "Effect of CL on the acquisition of second language rules and Mechanics" investigating the effect of CL in ESL classroom by conducting a true experiment with fourth, fifth and sixth-grades. They found CL is beneficial for low proficient students.

In the context of Nepal, there are three research studies carried out in the area of CL under the faculty of education, T.U. but there is not a single record of the research work on the efficiency of CL in writing.

Baral (2006) has carried out research on "Effectiveness of CL on the lower secondary students, achievement in English". The research was limited to Surket district in a single school and with only the students of grade eight. The findings of the research showed that CL is more effective instructional paradigm for ELT compared to the current method (s) of teaching in practise. He further mentions that group/pair work and collaboration is the core of any CL activity but its focus lies on individual performance as the goal of any educational program is to make sure the learning outcomes of each individual student.

Bhattarai (2009) has carried out research on "Effectiveness of CL method in developing students vocabulary". The findings show that CL method is an effective method in developing student's vocabulary in second language learning and the performances in specified items in pre-test, progressive test and post test was impressive.

Pandey (2010) has carried out research on "Effectiveness of CL on achievement of secondary level students in English." The findings showed that

CL is highly beneficial and more effective than usual classroom teaching techniques in teaching English in secondary level students in Nepal. It further mentions that communicating in co-operative groups and trusting and supporting each other helped them to learn team skills and social responsibility.

There are few research works carried out in the area of group work effectiveness and effectiveness of different methods and techniques on teaching writing skill.

Regmi (2004) has carried out a research work on 'A study on the effectiveness of group work techniques in teaching English tense. It was an experimental research. Students were divided into experimental and control group. Experimental group were taught group work techniques and control group were taught through usual techniques. The research shows the positive effect of the techniques. Following the same methodology, Rimal (2004) made a case study on the effectiveness of group work on learning writing skill in English of grade IX students. The findings of the research show positive effects of group work on students' learning.

Niure (2008) carried a research on written communication skills of students of grade X. His findings give impression that only thirty percentage of the total students bear good proficiency in writing skills. Even in the all variables of writing skills are not equally attended. His finding skills are not equally attended. His findings provoke the need of effective methods and materials for teaching writing skills.

Chapagain (2008) carried out research on "The effectiveness of communicative approach in teaching writing in class six.' The research was limited to the Panchthar district in government school and pretest and post test were used as the research tools. The finding showed that communicative approach is more effective than traditional approach in teaching writing.

Dahal (2009) carried out research on "Effectiveness of process writing in writing free composition. He experimented process writing in grade ix. His overall findings show that process writing is fruitful in developing students ability to write free composition. He writes "The experimental group has higher incremental percentages than control group by twenty three percentages.

In a similar context Niraula (2009) conducted an experimental research on 'ungraded non-stop writing as a tool to improve writing skills'. Twenty four students of grade IX were his subjects of study. His post test result shows that both (experimental and control group) the groups involved a little bit. But the experimental group progressed five percentage more than the control group.

Though various studies have been carried out in the field of ELT and few on writing skill. Still there is lack of research in the area of co-operative learning in teaching writing in the department of English Education, T.U., Kirtipur. The present research is different from the researches that have been carried out till the data in the field of second language teaching in the sense that it attempts to explore the degree of effectiveness of CL methods particularly in teaching writing in secondary level.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- a. To find out the effectiveness of co-operative learning in teaching writing skill.
- b. To list some pedagogical implications on the basis of findings of the study.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Cooperation is working together to accomplish shared goals. As this study aims at establishing the degree of effectiveness of CL strategy, it will certainly arouse a new interest among experts, curriculum designers, teachers and

students who are willing to make their career in teaching sector. It will equally be useful for the prospective researchers who want to undertake researches in the area of co-operative learning. It will offer another option for dealing with the challenges created by heterogeneous class of students in teaching writing. It deals with the possibility of direct implication of the strategy under consideration therefore this student-centred approach is supposed to benefit both the teachers and the students by providing them opportunity to take advantages of each others expertise and strength.

The present study is highly significant for secondary level English teachers who are trying their best to develop writing and social skills of students. It will encourage curriculum and syllabus designers to design English language syllabus including CL as one of the instructional techniques. The ELT practitioners, text book writers and others who are directly or indirectly involved in English language teaching and learning will get benefit from this study. This will have remarkable contribution in the field of teaching writing skills.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

This chapter on methodology briefly describes the methods and procedures adopted to carry out this study. The population, sampling procedures, research tools and their preparation, administration and other procedures are described below. Hence, to fulfil the objectives of the study, the following methodology was adopted.

2.1 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used to meet the objectives of the study.

2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data

The primary data was elicited from the students of grade ten of Janasewa Higher Secondary School, Kirtipur, Kathmandu by administering pre-test, progressive tests and post-test. So those students were the primary source of this research.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data

The secondary sources of data for this research were the various books, articles, reports, research studies, dictionaries, journals and internet related to the study area. The detail list is given on the reference section. Some of them are Dellicarpini (2010), Hada (2009), Larsen-Freeman (2009), Bhattarai (2009), Yang (2008), McCaffetry et al. (2006), Kumar (2006), Harmer (2004, 2008), English Teaching Forum (2005), Richards and Rodgers (2001), Hedge (1988), Byrne (1986), Raimes (1983), Best and Kahn (1993), Nunan (1993, 1992), Rivers (1968), NELTA Journal an so on.

2.2 Population of the Study

The total population of the study was 30 students of grade ten section B of a government added school of Kirtipur named Janasewa Higher Secondary School, Kathmandu.

2.3 Sampling Procedures

To meet the need of required population for the study, Janasewa Higher Secondary school was selected through, non-random judgemental sampling procedure. All the students of grade ten of section 'B' were taken as the sample of the study. So, the students were purposively selected.

2.4 Tools of Data Collection

The tools I used to elicit the data include a pre-test, three progressive tests and a post-test. The pre-test and post-test consisted of the same items whereas progressive tests consisted of the test items related to how lessons were in progress. Regarding the structure and making scheme pre-test and post-test were designed with ten items of writing skill carrying 50 full marks and each of them was assigned 5 marks. Likewise, each of the progressive tests had fifteen full marks.

2.5 Process of Data Collection

The researcher followed the following steps for the collection of primary data.

- i. First of all, the I consulted the relevant literature, curriculum and textbook of class X. A set of test items was prepared as a tool for taking pre-test and post test. The set of test items was constructed from selected portion of the course.

- ii. Then, I visited the school's head teacher and established rapport with her. I explained the purpose of my study and asked for her permission to carry out action research on the ten graders for a month.
- iii. After that, I met the subject teacher and asked for his permission to carry out experiment teaching and for necessary assistance.
- iv. In collaboration with the school head and subject teacher, I got the period fixed for carrying out the experimental teaching.
- v. After fixing the time, I met the tenth graders of the school to inform them as to how and for what purpose I would teach them English.
- vi. I consulted the record keeping desk to receive the name list of the students.
- vii. Then, I administered a pre-test to determine the initial level of proficiency on writing skill. The set of pre-test items carried 50 full marks. After assessing their performance, I found their scores on pre-test distributed around the average 19 out of 50 full marks and it was clear that their proficiency level on writing was not satisfactory.
- viii. Then I began to intervene in the ongoing teaching writing practices with CL method. Everyday I prepared a complete lesson plan and taught the students accordingly. Each cooperative lesson continued 45 minutes. I taught 20 class days i.e. 20 lesson.
- ix. I administered the progressive tests in the interval of five classes.
- x. At the end, a post-test was taken. The same test items used in pre-test were utilized for the post test.
- xi. Finally, I analyzed and compared individual scores on the pre-test, progressive tests and post-test items.

2.6 Limitations of the Study

It was impossible to include a large area in this kind of small research because of limited time and resources. Therefore, I limited the study within a selected area. This study consisted of the following limitations:

- a. The study was limited to a single governmental added school of Kathmandu district i.e. Janasewa Higher Secondary School.
- b. Among many methods, it was limited to co-operative learning only.
- c. It was limited to the testing of writing skill only.
- d. The population of this study was only ten grade students.
- e. It was also limited to testing guided writing and free composition: describing pictures, writing leaflet, writing paragraph, short story writing, writing dialogue, writing letter, giving opinion, writing essay, writing letter of condolence and job application letter writing.
- f. The findings were based on the analysis and interpretation of the test scores obtained through pre-test, progressive tests, and post-test.

CHAPTER-THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In this chapter, I have analyzed and interpreted the data collected from primary sources. The primary sources of data were obtained through a pre-test three progressive tests and a post-test.

Data collection was initiated keeping the objectives of research study in mind i.e. to find out the effectiveness of co-operative learning in teaching writing skill and to give some pedagogical implication. Similarly, in this chapter, pre-test is analyzed as the same i.e. as pre-test, but second-test, third-test, fourth-test and post-test are analyzed as the first progress test, second-progress test, third progress test and post-test respectively. For this purpose, I tabulated, analyzed and interpreted under the three main headings:

- i. Analysis and interpretation of pre-test and post-test scores
- ii. Analysis and interpretation of the individual test scores obtained from pre-test, progressive tests and post-test
- iii. Item-wise analysis and interpretation of the test results
- iv. Comparative analysis and interpretation of test scores

3.1 Analysis and Interpretation of Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Pre-test was administered before starting any lesson which was set covering all the teaching items on writing skill which were taught during the field study. But post-test was administered after teaching all the lessons. The question items were the same of the pre-test and post-test. Full mark of the both tests was fifty. But percentage of the two tests were very different. The comparison of the both tests have been shown in the following table:

Table No. 1
Pre-test and Post-test Score

Test	Students No.	Total marks	Obtained marks	Percentage	Increased Marks	Increased Percentage	Average score
Pre-test	30	1500	549	36.6%	-	-	18.3
Post-test	30	1500	808	53.33%	259	16.73%	26.93

The above table clearly shows that the total score of pre-test was 549 i.e. 36.6% and the total score of post-test was 808 i.e. 53.33%. The percentage of the post-test increased by 259 or 16.73%. The percentage of the post-test had increased very high than that of the pre-test. Thus, there is a vast difference between the score of pre-test and the post-test. So, the difference of the percentage between the two tests proved that grade ten students' proficiency level on writing skill was increased through cooperative learning method.

3.2 Analysis and Interpretation of the Individual Test Scores Obtained through Pre-test, Progressive Tests and Post-test

This section comprises the analysis and interpretation of the scores of the students on the pre-test, progressive tests and post-test.

3.2.1 Analysis and Interpretation of Pre-test Score

Before I administered the action research using co-operative learning method. I administered a set of test items (i.e. pre-test) to determine the students' initial level on writing. The pre-test items consisted of writing story from pictures (picture description), writing leaflet, writing paragraph, short story writing, dialogue writing, writing letter, giving opinion, writing letter of condolence and job application letter writing.

The scores of the students on pre-test were obtained as follows:

Table No. 2
Individual Scores on the Pre-test

S.N.	F.M.	Marks obtained in frequency	Percentage	No. of students	Percentage
1	50	31	62%	2	6.66%
2	50	30	60%	1	3.33%
3	50	28	56%	1	3.33%
4	50	25	50%	1	3.33%
5	50	24	48%	3	10%
6	50	23	46%	1	3.33%
7	50	21	42%	1	3.33%
8	50	20	40%	3	10%
9	50	19	38%	2	6.66%
10	50	18	36%	4	13.33%
11	50	16	32%	1	3.33%
12	50	15	30%	2	3.33%
13	50	12	24%	2	6.66%
14	50	11	22%	1	3.33%
15	50	10	20%	1	3.33%
16	50	8	16%	1	3.33%
17	50	7	14%	2	6.66%
18	50	5	10%	1	3.33%
Total	1500	549	36.6%	30	100%
Average score : 18.3					

The above table shows that the total full marks of the pre-test is 1500. Out of 1500, total obtained marks is 549 i.e. 36.6%. Similarly, the total average score of the pre-test is 549. And the individual average score is 18.03. As the table reveals, 6.66% of the students have scored 31 marks out of 50 full marks. It is the highest score on the pre-test. The lowest score is 5 which is obtained by the 3.33% student. The average score is 18.3, which is not satisfactory score. Around 49.97% of the students are above the average and about 50.03% of the students are below the average.

It clearly shows that the class consists of mixed ability groups. Some of them are very weak and scores are medium on writing proficiency. As a result, I seek the alternative ways to normal teaching for writing.

3.2.2 Analysis of the Scores of Progressive Tests

Progressive tests are administered to find out the students' progress. In my research, I have carried out three progressive tests in the interval of five days. It helps me to find out the students' problems and strengths and makes my work easier.

3.2.2.1 Analysis and Interpretation of the First Progressive Test Score

After observing the pre-test scores of the students, I found that their scores were distributed around the average score of 18.3 (out of 50 as full marks). After the interval of the first five classes, I administered the first progressive test to get an insight into the effectiveness of the intervention (i.e. teaching through CL method). The aim was to find out how the classes are in progress and what further improvement in teaching strategies were necessary. After conducting a test the score was calculated and kept the record. The following table clearly shows the scores of the students on first progressive test.

Table No. 3

Individual Scores on the First-Progress Test

S.N.	F.M.	Marks obtained in frequency	Percentage	No. of students	Percentage
1	15	10.5	70%	4	13.33%
2	15	10	66.66%	3	10%
3	15	9	60%	5	16.66%
4	15	8.5	56.66%	2	6.66%
5	15	8	53.33%	5	16.66%
6	15	7.5	50%	3	10%
7	15	7	46.66%	5	16.66%
8	15	6.5	43.33%	2	6.66%
9	15	6	40%	1	3.33%
Total	450	249.9	55.33%	30	100%
Average score : 8.35					

The above table reveals the fact that the total full marks of the first- progress test is 450. Out of 450, total obtained score is 249.9 i.e. 55.33%. Similarly, the total average score is 250. And the individual average score is 8.35.

The highest score is 10.5 marks out of 15 i.e. 70% which is got by 13.33% of the students and 3.33% of the student has scored 40% i.e. 6 out of 15 full marks which is the lowest marks in this test. The average marks obtained by the students is 8.35 which is 55.66% of full marks. What the table reveals is 46.65% students have obtained above the average score and about 53.35% students have obtained below the average marks.

3.2.2.2 Analysis and Interpretation of the Second Progress Test Score

When the first-progress test was administered and kept the record. Other five lessons were taught on writing skill through co-operative method. After teaching those ten lessons i.e. 10 class days in total, again another progress test was administered. The scores of the students on second progress-test were recorded and tabulated as follows:

Table No. 4
Individual Scores on Second-Progress Test

S.N.	F.M.	Marks obtained in frequency	Percentage	No. of students	Percentage
1	15	12	80%	6	20%
2	15	10.5	70%	4	13.33%
3	15	10	66.66%	5	16.66%
4	15	9.5	63.33%	1	3.33%
5	15	9	60%	8	26.66%
6	15	8.5	56.66%	2	6.66%
7	15	7.5	50%	4	13.33%
Total	450	292.5	65.00%	30	100%
Average score : 9.75					

It is obvious in the above table that the total full marks of second-progress test is also 450. Out of 450, 292.5 i.e. 65.00% is the total score of the second-progress test. In the same way, total average score is 292.5 and the individual average score is 9.75.

The highest score is 12 which is obtained by 20% of the students and the lowest score is 7.5 which is obtained by 13.33% of the students. More than 49.99% of the students have scored above the average score and about 50% students have obtained below the average score.

3.2.2.3 Analysis and Interpretation of Third-Progress Test Score

Third-progress test was administered after the completion of 15 period and teaching more than seven items. The following table records the scores of the students on third-progress test.

Table No. 5
Individual Scores on the Third-Progress Test

S.N.	F.M.	Marks obtained in frequency	Percentage	No. of students	Percentage
1	15	13.5	90%	8	26.66%
2	15	12	80%	10	33.33%
3	15	11	73.33%	5	16.66%
4	15	10.5	70%	1	3.33%
5	15	10	66.66%	1	3.33%
6	15	9	60%	5	16.66%
Total	450	348.5	77.44%	30	100%
Average score : 11.61					

The above table reveals the fact that the total full marks of the third-progress test is 450. Out of 450, total obtained score is 348.5 i.e. 77.44%. Similarly, the total average score is 384.3 and the individual average score is 11.61.

It shows 80% marks is obtained by 33.33% of the students. The highest score is 13.5 which is obtained by 26.66% of the students and the lowest score is 9 which is obtained by 16.66% of the students. More than 60% of the students have scored above the average score and 40% of the students have obtained below the average score.

3.2.3 Analysis and Interpretation of Post-test Score

When fifteen lessons were taught and first-progress, second-progress and third-progress test were conducted and record was kept, other five lessons were taught on writing through co-operative learning method. After teaching those five lessons (altogether twenty lessons), post test was administered. The question items of post-test were the same questions which were administered in the pre-test i.e. the questions of the pre-test and the post-test cover the all lessons which were set from the topics taught during the field study. The following table clearly shows the score of the students in post-test.

Table No. 6
Individual Scores on the Post-test

S.N.	F.M.	Marks obtained in frequency	Percentage	No. of students	Percentage
1	50	40	80%	2	6.66%
2	50	39	78%	1	3.33%
3	50	37	74%	1	3.33%
4	50	35	70%	1	3.33%
5	50	32	64%	2	6.60%
6	50	31	62%	1	3.33%
7	50	30	60%	5	16.6%
8	50	28	56%	1	3.33%
9	50	27	54%	1	3.33%
10	50	26	52%	2	6.66%
11	50	25	50%	3	10%
12	50	24	48%	1	3.33%
13	50	22	44%	3	10%
14	50	18	36%	2	6.66%
15	50	16	32%	4	13.33%
Total	1500	808	53.86%	30	100%
Average score : 26.93					

Observation of the above table shows the fact that 1500 is the total full-marks of the post-test out of 1500, total secured mark is 808 or 53.86%. Similarly, total average score is 807.9 and individual average score is 26.98.

The highest score is 40 or 80% which is got only by 6.66% of the students and the lowest score is 16 i.e. 32% which is obtained by 13.33% of the students. Similarly, 26.93 is the average score which is got by more than 49% of the students and 51% of the students have obtained lower score than the average score. Therefore, from the analysis and interpretation, it is proved that the result of the post-test is good. And if we compare the score of the post-test with the score of the pre-test, the result of the post-test is very good than the pre-test.

3.3 Item-wise Analysis and Interpretation of the Test Results (Individual Item Based Comparison)

Individual item based comparison consists of a table where the results of pre-test and post-test for 10 items are presented. It consists of picture description, writing leaflet, writing paragraph, short story writing, Dialogue, writing letter, writing opinion, writing letter of condolence and job application letter writing. For analyzing the data, the individual scores of both tests (pre-test and pos-test) have been taken and tabulated. The difference between the average score of the two sets is determined. The result is also converted into percentage. The marks of each student in the pre-test were subtracted from the marks of post-test to find out the difference between them.

The group which has got higher average marks and the percentage is thought to be better than the one which got a lower average marks and percentage. To claim whether the difference is significant t-test will be calculated.

Table No. 7

Differences in Pre-test and Post-test

S.N.	Type of test item	P1	P2	D	I%
1	Picture description	89	99.5	10.5	7%
2	Writing leaflet	55.5	75.5	20	13.33%
3	Writing paragraph	48	79	31	20.67%
4	Writing short story	79	98.5	19.5	13%
5	Writing dialogue	96.5	100.5	4	2.67%
6	Writing letter	54.5	84.5	30	20%
7	Giving opinion	34.5	65	30.5	20.34%
8	Writing essays	26	66.5	40.5	27%
9	Writing letter of condolence	41	74.5	33.5	22.34%
10	Writing job application letter	32.5	66.5	34	44.34%

The above table clearly reveals that all the items in post-test is higher than in pre-test. Therefore, it can be claimed that CL method is effective method to develop students' writing.

3.3.1 Individual Item Based Comparison In terms of Average Score in Pre-test and Post-test

3.3.1.1 Picture Description

This test item consists of one item carrying five full marks.

Table No. 8

Describing Pictures

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
2.97	3.32	0.35	7

Out of 5, students have scored 2.97 in pre-test and 3.32 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 0.35.

3.3.1.2 Writing Leaflet

This test item consists of one item carrying five full marks.

Table No. 9
Writing Leaflet

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
1.85	2.51	0.66	13.2

Out of 5, students have scored 1.85 in pre-test and 2.51 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 0.66.

3.3.1.3 Writing Paragraph

This test item consists of one items carrying five full marks.

Table No. 10
Writing Paragraph

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
1.6	2.63	1.03	20.6

Out of 5, students have scored 1.6 in pre-test and 2.63 in post-test in average which shows that students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 1.03.

3.3.1.4 Writing Short Story

This test item also consists of one item carrying five full marks.

Table No. 11
Writing Short Story

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
2.63	3.28	0.65	13

The above table shows that, out of 5, students have scored 2.63 in pre-test and 3.28 in the post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 0.65.

3.3.1.5 Writing Dialogue

This test item consists of one item carrying five full marks.

Table No. 12
Writing Dialogue

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
3.21	3.35	0.14	2.8

The above table shows the fact that out of five, students have scored 3.21 in pre-test and 3.35 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 0.14.

3.3.1.6 Writing Letter

This test item also consists of 1 item carrying 5 full marks.

Table No. 13
Writing Letter

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
1.81	2.81	1	20

Out of 5, students have scored 1.81 in pre-test and 2.81 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 1.

3.3.1.7 Giving Opinion

This test item consists of one item carrying five full marks.

Table No. 14
Giving Opinion

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
1.15	2.16	1.01	20.2

Out of 5, students have scored 1.15 in pre-test and 2.16 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 1.01.

3.3.1.8 Writing Essay

This test item consists of one item carrying 5 full marks.

Table No.15
Writing Essay

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
0.86	2.21	1.35	27

This table shows, out of 5, students have scored 0.86 in pre-test and 2.21 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 1.35.

3.3.1.9 Writing Letter of Condolence

This test item also consists of 1 item carrying 5 full marks.

Table No.16
Writing Letter of Condolence

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
1.36	2.48	1.12	22.4

Out of 5, students have scored 1.36 in pre-test and 2.48 in post-test in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 1.12.

3.3.1.10 Writing Job Application Letter

This test item consists of one item carrying 5 full marks

Table No. 17

Writing Job Application Letter

Av. scores in pre-test	Av. score in post-test	D	D%
1.08	2.21	1.13	22.6

Observation of the above table shows the fact that out of 5, students have scored 1.08 in pre-test and 2.21 in post-test-in average which shows that the students have obtained more in post-test. The difference between pre-test and post-test is 1.13.

3.4 Comparative Analysis and Interpretation of Test Scores

3.4.1 Comparative Analysis of Pre-test and the First-Progress Tests Score

After observing the pre-test scores of the students, I found that their scores were distributed around the average score of 18.3 (out of 50 as full marks). In the interval of five days, I administered the first progressive test. The question items were different of the pre-test and the first-progress test. Full marks of pre-test was fifty but full mark of first-progress test was fifteen (15). The comparison of the scores of the both test is clearly shown in the table below:

Table No. 18

Comparison of Pre-test and First Progress Test Score

Test	Students No.	Total marks	Obtained marks	Percentage	Increased Percentage
Pre-test	30	1500	549	36.6%	-
First-progress test	30	450	249.9	55.33%	18.73%

The above table indicates that the total obtained mark of pre-test was 549 i.e. 36.6%. And the total obtained mark of the first-progress test was 249.9 or 55.33%. Thus, the mark in first progress test increased by 18.73%.

So, the difference between the percentage of the two tests proved that grade ten students' level on writing was improved through co-operative learning method.

3.4.2 Comparative Analysis of the First-Progress Test and the Second-Progress Test Score

In this comparison, the scores of the first-progress test and the second-progress tests are analyzed and compared. The comparison of both tests is presented in the table below:

Table No. 19
Comparison of the First-Progress Test and Second-Progress Test Score

Test	Students No.	Total marks	Obtained marks	Percentage	Increased Marks	Increased Percentage
First-Progress test	30	450	249.9	55.33%	-	-
Second-Progress test	30	450	292.5	65.00%	42.6	9.67%

It is obvious from the above table that 249.9 is the total mark of the first-progress test. In other words, the total percentage of first-progress test was 55.33%. Similarly, 292.5 is the total mark of second-progress test or the total percentage of the second-progress test was 65.00%. Second-progress test score increased by the 42.6 or 9.67%. Thus, increased percentage of second-progress test proved that grade ten students' proficiency level on writing was increased through CL method. The pace of development is faster than that of first-progress test.

3.4.3 Comparative Analysis of the Second-progress Test and Third-Progress Test Score

The scores of the both tests i.e. second-progress test and the third-progress test are also analyzed and compared with each other which is shown in the following table:

Table No.20

Comparison of the Second-Progress Test and Third-Progress Test Score

Test	Students No.	Total marks	Obtained marks	Percentage	Increased Marks	Increased Percentage
Second-Progress test	30	450	292.5	65.00%	-	-
Third-Progress test	30	450	348.5	77.44%	56	12.44%

The above table shows that total mark of the second-progress test is 296.5 or 65.00% and the total mark of third-progress test was 348.5 or 77.44%. Thus, the third-progress test score is increased by 56 or 12.44%. There seems the vast difference between percentage of second-progress test and third-progress test score. So, it is proved that students' level on writing was dramatically increased through cooperative learning method.

3.4.4 Comparative Analysis of Third-Progress Test and Post-Test Score

In this comparison, the score of the third-progress test is analyzed and compared with the score of the post-test. The comparison of these both test is presented in the table below:

Table No. 21

Comparison of the Third-Progress tests and the Post-test Score

Test	Students No.	Total marks	Obtained marks	Percentage	Increased Percentage
Third-Progress test	30	450	348.5	77.44%	24.11%
Post-test	30	1500	808	53.33%	-

This shown in the above table that 348.5 or 77.44% was the total mark of the third-progress test and the 808 on 53.83% was the total mark of the post-test. At this time, scores were distributed more heterogeneously and percentage has also been decreased. In the post-test, test item consists of 10 items carrying 50 full marks but in third progress test, test item consists of 3 items carrying 15 full marks. Therefore, scores were distributed more heterogeneously. However, the overall performance exhibited in their scores have again shown the significant evidence supporting the effectiveness of CL.

This remarkable progress in writing is the result of cooperative strategy used while teaching the writing skill. Therefore, it can be claimed that CL method is an effective method to develop students' writing.

CHAPTER - FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the major findings of the study. It also deals with some recommendations made on the basis of the major findings of the study.

Introducing CL method in teaching writing to High School students who were habituated to listen to their teachers silently without taking part in any pair or group work has been an insightful experience for me. Before I started the experimental teaching through the method. I had doubt of its usefulness and success particularly in teaching writing, which is a major challenge for a second language learner. However, from the day, I first stepped in the class with my lesson plan that required students started to write with the principle of "Write for ten minutes. Try to express yourself as well as you can. Don't worry about mistakes share your writing cooperatively in the groups and pairs.", it continued to work well. Even in the heterogeneous class created by varying degree of proficiency level, its effectiveness was considerable. When they had to teach their counter parts they were more motivated and learned the assigned materials with full exuberance. They liked to be a teacher most and for it they learnt more in short period of time. The analysis of the scores on a pre-test, progressive tests and post-test further support my experiences as mentioned above.

It has been found that CL method plays an effective role in teaching writing skill in second language classroom. I administered pre-test before I started experimental teaching, three progressive tests during the teaching, and finally a post-test. At the end, I analyzed and compared the scores of these tests. In each and every point I found the students having better performance after they attained the co-operative class.

4.1 Findings

On the basis of presentation, analysis and interpretation of data, the major findings of the study are summarized and presented as follows:

- (a) From an analysis and interpretation of score obtained by students in pre-test and post-test, it can be concluded that the CL method is effective in teaching writing skill. The scores of the students were distributed around the average score of 18.3 in pre-test where as in post-test their score were distributed around the average score 26.93 which is nearly two times greater. Similarly, 31 was the highest score in pre-test but in post-test it was 40. These facts proved the effectiveness of the co-operative method in teaching writing skill.
- (b) Analyzing the scores on progressive tests, it can be said that CL method is effective in teaching writing skills. When the score of the first progress test was analyzed and interpreted it was found that total score of the all students in first progressive test was 249.9 i.e. 55.33%. The highest score was 10.5 i.e. 70%, lowest score was 6 i.e. 40%, individual average score was 8.35 and total average score was 249.9. Similarly, total mark of second progressive test was 292.5 i.e. 65%. The highest score was 12 i.e. 80%, lowest score was 7.5 i.e. 50% individual average score was 9.75. In the same way, the total mark of third-progress test was 348.5 i.e. 77.44%. The highest score was 13.5% i.e. 90%, lowest score was 19 i.e. 60% and individual average score was 11.61.
- (c) The students' performance in specified items in pre-test, progressive tests and post-test was impressive. In most of the items their number of average scores were greater in post-test than that of pre-test. In pre-test, their average scores were 2.97 in describing pictures, 1.85 in writing leaflet, 1.6 in writing paragraph, 2.63 in writing short story, 3.21 in writing dialogue, 1.81 in writing letter, 1.15 in giving opinion, 0.86 in

writing essay, 1.36 in writing letter of condolence and 1.08 in writing job application letter. However, in post-test their average scores were 3.32 in describing pictures, 2.51 in writing leaflet, 2.63 in writing paragraph, 3.28 in writing short story, 3.35 in writing dialogue, 2.81 in writing letter, 2.16 in giving opinion, 2.21 in writing essay, 2.48 in writing letter of condolence and 2.21 in writing job application letters. Their progress in all the specified items Proved the effective contribution of the CL method.

- (d) The students' average scores on the first progressive test (55.66%) compared to the pre-test scores (36.6%) showed a considerable progress made by the students in writing with the help of cooperative method.
- (e) The students' average scores on the second progress test (65%) compared to the first progressive test scores (55.66%) showed that the students have again shown satisfactory progress in writing using cooperative learning method.
- (f) The students' average scores on the third progressive test (11.61 i.e. 77.4%) compared to the second progressive test scores (65%) showed that the students have again shown satisfactory progress in writing with help of cooperative method.

4.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made on the basis of the above mentioned findings of the study.

- (a) Since the students have shown the progressive result in the different tests i.e. pre-test, progressive-tests and post-test, it can be inferred that the cooperative learning proved an effective method in teaching writing skill. Here, the teachers are advised to use cooperative learning method in teaching writing skill.

- (b) Co-operative learning is an effective method for developing confidence, cooperation, positive interdependence and decreasing the competition, conflict, individualistic and shyness in the students. Therefore, it should be used by all the teachers.
- (c) Qualities like positive attitude towards each others, trust upon each other, respect to each other mutual understanding, frankness, curiosity to learn and collaborating should be possessed by the learners, as these are the essence to cooperative learning among the learners. Therefore, teachers should aware of these qualities while creating friendly classroom environment.
- (d) As two heads are better than one, individualized environment of classroom should be discouraged and culture of sharing among the students should be developed.
- (e) In order to make the students more active, move participant, face to face interaction in the classroom cooperative learning method should be applied in teaching writing.
- (f) Text book writers should provide enough materials related to guided and free writing, which requires the pairs as well as groups cooperation to complete them. Guided and free writing in textbooks should offer more room for pairs and groups discussion. Moreover, they should be provided enough stories, novels and drama than they would be able to write own stories, novels and drama.
- (g) The present study proved that CL is an effective method in teaching writing. However, its effectiveness in other skills and aspects of language apart from writing can still not be granted. Therefore, more researches focusing on teaching speaking, reading and grammar are desired.

- (h) The present study which was carried out in a government added secondary school situated in an urban area. The result of the single study is insufficient to decide the effectiveness of CL in all situations. Thus, more action research in other situation i.e. rural schools and different levels should be carried out.
- (i) This study was limited to the academic achievement of the students in the English language. So, further researches can be carried out to find out the effectiveness of cooperative language learning regarding academic motivation, social skills and group relation.
- (j) Teachers need to be trained for effective implementation of cooperative learning in developing academic achievement of the students.

References

- Baral, L. (2006). *Effectiveness of co-operative learning in achievement of lower secondary studies in English*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis T.U., Kirtipur.
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (1992). *Research in Education*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bhattarai, A. (2005). Action research a reflective cycle. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol. 10.
- Bhattarai, J. (2009). *Effectiveness of co-operative learning in developing vocabulary*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis T.U., Kirtipur.
- Biebler and Snowman (1997). *Psychology applied to teaching*. Houghton Mifflinco.
- Brown, H.D. (1991). *Principle of language learning and teaching*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching writing skills*. London : Longman.
- Chapagain, P. (2008). *Effectiveness of communication approach in teaching writing in class six*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, T.U., Kirtipur.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1985). *Research methods in education* (2nd ed.). London: Croomhelm.
- Corey, S.M. (1953). *Action research to improve school practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Corey, S.M. (1953). *Action research to improve school practices*. New York: Teachers college press.

- Kagan, S. and High, J. (2002). Kagan structure for English language learners. *Kagan online magazine*. Summer 2002. Retrieved December 9, 2005, From <http://www.kaganonline.com>.
- Kessler, C. (1992). *Co-operative language learning: A teacher's resource book*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice hall regents.
- Khaniya, T.R. (2005). *Examination for enhanced learning*. Aurthor.
- Krashen (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practise in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Peragmon.
- Kumar, R. (2006). *Research methodology*. Delhi: Pearson education.
- Larsen-Freman, D. (2009). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Mariam and Napisah (2005). *The use of cooperative tasks in ESL composition by from one ESL wrting students*. Tanjung Malim: University Pendiidi Kan Sultan Indris.
- McCaffetry et al. 2006). *Co-operative learning and second language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mentero, A. (2005). What a felling motivating EFL students through collaborative. *English teaching forum*. Vol. 43. No. 3.
- Mills, G. (2003). *Action research : A guide for the teacher researcher* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Niraula, G. (2008). *Upgraded nonstop writing as a tool to improvement writing skills*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis T.U., Kirtipur.

- Niure, B.R. (2008). *A study on written communication skills*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, T.U., Kirtipur.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- _____. (1993). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pandey, S. (2010). *Effectiveness of co-operative learning on achievement of secondary level students in English*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis T.U., Kirtipur.
- Rai, V.S. et al. (2010). *Test book of English grades 10*. Bhaktapur: CDC and JEMC.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford: OUP.
- Regmi, C.R. (2004). *A study on the effectiveness of group work technique in teaching English tense*. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, T.U., Kirtipur.
- Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and method in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rivers, W.M. (1968). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: The university of Chicago press.
- Sanford, N. (1981). *A model for action research*. In P. Reason and J. Rawan (ed.), *Human Inquiry: A source book of new paradigm research*. Chichester: John Wiley: 173-81.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. New York: CUP.
- Sharma, B.K. and Phyak, P.B. (2009). *Teaching English Language*. Kirtipur: Sunlight.

Sinha, R.S. (2008). Understanding essence of action research in teaching profession. *Journal of EPMAN*.

Slavin, R. (1987). *Co-operative learning strategies*. Retrieved from www.worksheetlibrary.com.

White, R. and Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. London: Longman.

Wollac, M.J. (1998). *Action research for language teachers*. Cambridge : CUP.

Yang, Y. (2008). *Co-operative learning and second language acquisition*.
(Electron Version) English language teachers journal, 61 (2), p. 130.

APPENDIX-1

PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST ITEMS

Name:.....

Full Marks: 50

Class:.....

Time: 1 hr

Symbol No.:.....

Date:

Note: Write answer of all questions:-

Q.N.1. Look at the pictures given below and describe what is happening in these pictures. While describing use simple past or past continuous use the clues next to the pictures. 5



Man/ swim / river



go/drown/man/walk



drown/show/money



jump/river/save

Q.N. 2. Write a leaflet about a place of interest near you village or town including the following points. 5

Location, area it covers, interes

features accessibility

Q.N. 3. Write a couple of paragraph describing about what would do if you passed SLC with a distinction division. 5

Q.N. 4. Write a short story and give it's suitable title using the following hints. 5

A hungry fox _____ sees a branch of ripe grapes _____ jumps but cannot reach _____ jumps but cannot reach ____ tries several times _____ give up the attempt and goes away _____ says. I am very glad I could not reach these grapes. They are quite sour and make me ill if I take them."

Q.N. 5. The following is conversation between two school friends. Use your imagination to write Gita's side of conversation. 5

Sita: Why didn't you come to school yesterday ?

Gita :

Sita: Why did you have to go to the hospital ?

Gita :

Sita: How did she break her ankle ?

Gita :

Sita: Did you have to pay for the ambulance ?

Gita :

Sita: Will you please tell her I'll can to see her tomorrow evening ?

Gita :

Q.N.6. Write a letter to your pen friend describing any one of the following festivals. 5

Guru	Christmas	Ramjan	Gaijatra
Chhatha	Losar	Holi	Bhaitika

Q.N. 7. People thought it disgraceful for educated person to work in the field's or "Mobile Phone is a fashion for teenage Youths". Do you agree or disagree with these quotations above ? Give specific reasons and examples to explain your opinion in about 50 words: 5

Q.N. 8. Write an essay on the topic "Computers have become a part of our life". Consider the following questions: 5

- How do computer help people ?
- In what areas do they help people ?
- Are they only helpful for scientists or for ordinary people as well ?
- How do they help us to communicate and find out information (e-mail and internet) ?
- What would happen if there were no computers today ?

Q.N. 9. Imagine that your friend died in bus accident. Write a letter of condolence to his /her parents using the following clues in the box. 5

Very intimate classmate ____ studied together from the primary level
____ very intelligent and popular among the students ____ very helpful
and sociable ____ impressed both teachers and students ____ a great
loss.

Q.N. 10. Suppose you are Akash Giri from Kathmandu having all the required qualification and experience. Read the following advertisement carefully and write an application for the post of District Education supervisor.

5

Vacancy Announcement

Save the children fund SCF invites application from qualified candidates for the following post:

Post: District Education Supervisor

The qualified candidate should have

- Bachelor in Education.
- At least 2 years teaching experience.
- A good command of oral and written communication skills in English and Nepali

Applications, CV with a passport size photo attached should be sent to the "Director, save the children fund, post box 6309 Kathmandu" before 10th February 2011.

QUESTIONS FOR FIRST PROGRESSIVE TEST

Class : 10

F.M.: 15

Subject: English

Q. 1. Look at the pictures below and describe what is happening in these pictures. While describing use simple past and past continuous tenses.

5



Q.2 Write a leaflet about 'Kirtipur'. Get ideas from clues given below. 5

Location areas it covers, interesting features, accessibility

Q.3. Write a couple of paragraphs about a festival which is celebrated in your village or town or by your community. 5

QUESTIONS FOR SECOND PROGRESSIVE TEST

Class : 10

F.M.: 15

Subject: English

Q.1. Write a short story and give its suitable title using the following hints.

5

It is a hot summer day ___ a thirsty crow wants water ___ sees on earthen pot ___ water is too low to reach ___ makes ___ way ___ brings pieces of stones ___ puts them ___ water comes up ___ quenches its thirsty ___ moral.

Q.2. You are in Gopal's house when the telephone rings. You can only hear Gopal's side of the conversation which follows. Use your imagination to write Hari's side of the telephone conversation. 5

Gopal : Hello, who is calling, please ?

Hari : (a)

Gopal: Oh, hello, Hari, How are you ?

Hari : (b)

Gopal: I haven't planned anything for tonight. What had you in mind ?

Hari : (c)

Gopal : No, I haven't. What's it called ?

Hari : (d)

Gopal : It sounds good. I will come. Where shall I meet you ?

Hari : (e)

Gopal : Who are the stars ?

Hari : (f)

Gopal : All right, I will see you then. Good bye !

How : (g)

Q.3. Write a letter to your friend. Describe what you did in your holiday.

5

QUESTIONS FOR THIRD PROGRESSIVE TEST

Class : Ten

F.M. :15

Subject: English

1. Write an essay on English Education in Nepal or 'Tourism in Nepal'.

5

2. Imagine that your friend died in motorcycle accident. Write a letter of condolence to his parents using the clues in the box. 5

Your best friends ___ studied together ___ very helpful _____ always cracked jokes _____ popular with both teachers and students ___ miss him very much never forget.

3. Read the following advertisement and apply for the advertised post.5.

WANTED URGENTLY

A reputed Higher Secondary School is looking for a qualified teacher with two years experience in the following post to teach in High school.

1. English

Qualification: B.Ed. or equivalent in related subject.

Interested and qualified candidates are requested to send their application with detail CV and recent pp size photograph by 30th

February 2011.

The Principal

Janasewa H.S.S. School, Kathmandu

APPENDIX-2

Table No. 1

Rank of the Students according to Pre-test Result

Test Item: 10

Rank	Name of the students	Obtained marks	Remark
1	Sani Lama	31	
2	Krishna Gautam	31	
3	Himal Basnet	30	
4	Ranjita Gurung	26	
5	Sabitree Kunwar	25	
6	Sanjaya Acharya	24	
7	Sapana Thapa Magar	24	
8	Surya Prasad Ojha	24	
9	Bibek Bhattarai	23	
10	Amrita Laxmi Mali	21	
11	Anita Rana Magar	20	
12	Barsha Dhakal	20	
13	Krishna Maharjan	20	
14	Nabina Maharjan	19	
15	Ninu Khatri	19	
16	Krishna Mukhiya	18	
17	Manoj Chaudhari	18	
18	Sangita Shah Sonar	18	
19	Pabitra K.C.	18	
20	Khagendra Thapa	16	
21	Kalpana Chaudhari	15	
22	Sajina Maharjan	15	
23	Kabita Rai	12	
24	Asmita Maharjan	12	

25	Unik Lama	11	
26	Uma Maharjan	10	
27	Shila Deula	08	
28	Shanti Kumari Shrestha	07	
29	Sharmila Maharjan	07	
30	Shristhi Khanal	05	

Table No. 2
Differences between First Progressive Test
and Second Progressive Test

Rank	Name of the students	Marks obtained 1 st progressive test	Marks obtained the 2 nd progressive test	Difference	Difference in %
1	Himal Basnet	10.5	12	1.5	10%
2	Sani Lama	10.5	12	1.5	10%
3	Ranjita Gurung	10.5	12	1.5	10%
4	Pabitra K.C.	10.5	12	1.5	10%
5	Krishna Gautam	10	12	2	13.33%
6	Surya Prasad Ojha	10	12	2	13.33%
7	Sapana Thapa Magar	10	10.5	0.5	3.33%
8	Sabitree Kunwar	9	10.5	0.5	3.33%
9	Sangita Shah Sonar	9	10.5	0.5	3.33%
10	Sanjaya Acharya	9	10.5	0.5	3.33%
11	Barsha Dhakal	9	10	1	6.66%
12	Amrita Laxmi Mali	9	10	1	6.66%
13	Bibek Bhattarai	8.5	10	1.5	10%
14	Krishna Mukhiya	8.5	10	1.5	10%
15	Anita Rana Magar	8	10	2	13.33%
16	Krishna Maharjan	8	9.5	1.5	10%
17	Nabina Maharjan	8	9	1	6.66%
18	Ninu Khatri	8	9	1	6.66%
19	Manoj Chaudhari	8	9	1	6.66%
20	Kabita Rai	7.5	9	1.5	10%

21	Khagendra Thapa	7.5	9	1.5	10%
22	Kalpana Chaudhari	7.5	9	1.5	10%
23	Sajina Maharjan	7	9	2	13.33%
24	Unik Lama	7	9	2	13.33%
25	Asmita Maharjan	7	8.5	1.5	10%
26	Uma Maharjan	7	8.5	1.5	10%
27	Shila Deula	7	4	3	26.60%
28	Shanti Kumari Shrestha	6.5	4	2.5	16.66%
29	Shristhi Khanal	6.5	4	2.5	16.66%
30	Sharmila Maharjan	6	4	2	13.33%

Table No. 3
Differences between Second Progressive Test
and Third Progressive Test

Rank	Name of the students	Marks obtained in 2 nd progressive test	Marks obtained in 3 rd progressive test	Difference	Difference in %
1	Sani Lama	12	13.5	1.5	10%
2	Unik Lama	7	13.5	6.5	43.33%
3	Surya Prasad Ojha	10	13.5	3.5	23.33%
4	Krishna Gautam	10.5	13.5	3	20%
5	Amrita Laxmi Mali	9	13.5	4.5	30%
6	Barsha Dhakal	9	13.5	4.5	30%
7	Pabitra K.C.	10.5	13.5	3	20%
8	Bibek Bhattarai	9	13.5	4.5	30%
9	Himal Basnet	10.5	12	1.5	10%
10	Ranjita Gurung	10.5	12	1.5	10%
11	Sapana Thapa Magar	10	12	2	13.33%
12	Sangita Shah Sonar	9	12	3	20%
13	Sabitree Kunwar	9	12	3	20%
14	Sanjaya Acharya	9	12	3	20%
15	Krishna Mukhiya	8.5	12	3.5	23.33%
16	Anita Rana Magar	8.5	12	3.5	23.33%
17	Krishna Maharjan	8	12	4	26.66%
18	Nabina Maharjan	8	12	4	26.66%
19	Ninu Khatri	8	11	3	20%
20	Manoj Chaudhari	8	11	3	20%

21	Kabita Rai	8	11	3	20%
22	Khagendra Thapa	7.5	11	3.5	23.33%
23	Kalpana Chaudhari	7.5	11	3.5	23.33%
24	Sajina Maharjan	7.5	10.5	3	20%
25	Asmita Maharjan	7	10	3	20%
26	Uma Maharjan	7	9	2	13.33%
27	Shila Deula	7	9	2	13.33%
28	Shanti Kumari Shrestha	6.5	9	2.5	16.66%
29	Shristhi Khanal	6.5	9	2.5	16.66%
30	Sharmila Maharjan	6	9	3	20%

Table No. 4**Differences between Pre-Test Result and Post-test Result**

Rank	Name of the students	Marks obtained in pre-test	Marks obtained in post-test	Difference	Difference in %
1	Sani Lama	31	40	9	18%
2	Krishna Gautam	31	40	9	18%
3	Himal Basnet	30	39	9	18%
4	Unik Lama	11	37	26	52%
5	Ranjita Gurung	28	35	7	14%
6	Sapana Thapa Magar	24	32	8	16%
7	Surya Prasad Ojha	24	32	8	16%
8	Sanjaya Acharya	24	31	7	14%
9	Krishna Maharjan	20	30	10	20%
10	Ninu Khatri	19	30	11	22%
11	Nabina Maharjan	19	30	11	22%
12	Sabitree Kunwar	25	30	5	10%
13	Amrita Laxmi Mali	21	30	9	18%
14	Bibek Bhattarai	23	28	5	10%
15	Barsha Dhakal	20	27	7	14%
16	Manoj Chaudhari	18	26	8	16%
17	Khagendra Thapa	16	26	10	20%
18	Anita Rana Magar	20	25	5	10%
19	Sajina Maharjan	18	25	7	14%
20	Pabitra K.C.	18	25	7	14%
21	Kalpana Chaudhari	15	24	9	18%
22	Krishna Mukhiya	18	22	4	8%

23	Asmita Maharjan	12	22	10	20%
24	Sangita Shah Sonar	18	22	4	8%
25	Sharmila Maharjan	07	18	11	22%
26	Uma Maharjan	10	18	8	16%
27	Shila Deula	08	16	8	16%
28	Shanti Kumari Shrestha	07	16	9	18%
29	Kabita Rai	12	16	4	8%
30	Shristhi Khanal	05	16	11	22%

Table No. 5**Item-wise Individual Scores in the Pre-test**

Roll No.	Writing story from picture	Writing leaflet	Writing paragraph	Short story writing	Writing dialogue	Writing letter	Giving opinion	Writing essay	Writing letter of condolence	Applying for a job	Total
1	4	0	0	3	4	0	0		0	0	11
2	4	0	3	4	4.5	0	0			4.5	20
3	4	3	2	3	4	2	3			0	21
4	2	.5	4.5	3	4	0	0			4	18
5	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	1		0	20
6	3	2	2	2	2	2	2			1	16
7	4	4	2	3	4	3	2		2	0	24
8	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	8
9	4	2	4	4	3	4	1	0	3	0	25
10	4	3.5	3.5	3	4	3.5	3.5	03	3	0	31
11	3	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	3	0	15
12	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	0	4	0	24
13	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	2		10

14	3	3	3	3	4	3	1	0	3		23
15	2	3	2	2	4	2	0	2	0	2	19
16	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	15
17	4	4	0	4	4	3	4	0	2	3	28
18	3	0	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	0	24
19	4	0	2	3	4	1	3	0	1	2	20
20	3	3	3	4	4	3	0	3	3	4	30
21	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	7
22	3	0	3	3	3	2	3	2	0	0	19
23	3	0	0	3	4	4	0	3	1	0	18
24	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	31
25	2	3	0	2	3	2	0	4	0	2	18
26	2	2	0	2	4	0	0	0	2	0	12
27	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	7
28	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	12
29	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	5
30	4	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	3	2	18
Total	89	55.5	48	79	96.5	54.5	34.5	26	41	32.5	549
Average	2.968	1.85	1.6	2.63	3.216	1.816	1.15	0.866	1.366	1.083	18.3

Table No. 6
Item-wise Individual Scores in the Post-test

Roll No.	Writing story from picture	Writing leaflet	Writing paragraph	Short story writing	Writing dialogue	Writing letter	Giving opinion	Writing essay	Writing letter of condolence	Applying for a job	Total
1	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	37
2	4	0	3	3	4	4.5	0	4.5	4	0	27
3	0	4.5	4.5	4	4	4.5	0	4.5	0	4	30
4	4	4	0	4	4.5	4.5	0	0	4	0	25
5	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	2	3	25
6	4	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	3	2	26
7	4	1	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	31
8	2		2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	16
9	3	3	3	4	4	1	4	2	2	4	30
10	4.5	3	3.5	4.5	4	4.5	3	4.5	4	4.5	40
11	4	4	3	4	2	4	0	1	1	2	25
12	4	4	4	4	4	4.5	4	0	3.5	0	32
13	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	18

14	4	3	4	2	4	2	4	2	1	2	26
15	4	3	4	4	3	3	2	2	2	3	30
16	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	2	24
17	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	35
18	4	3	2	4	4	2	3	3	3	4	32
19	3	3	3	4	4	3	1	1	4	4	30
20	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	39
21	4	1	2	3	3	1	1	0	0	1	16
22	3	3	3	4	4	3	2	2	3	3	30
23	4	0	0	3	4	4	0	3	4	0	22
24	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	40
25	4	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	3	1	22
26	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	16
27	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	18
28	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	22
29	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	16
30	4	2	2	4	4	2	2	1	1	4	26
Total	99.5	75.5	79	98.5	100.5	84.5	65	66.5	74.5	66.5	808
Average	3.31	2.516	2.633	3.283	3.35	2.81	2.16	2.21	2.43	2.21	26.93

APPENDIX-3
MODEL LESSON PLAN - I

School Name: Janasewa Higher Secondary School

Subject : English

Date: 2067/10/20

Unit: One (Before you begin)

No. of the students: 30

Topic: Writing

Time: 45 minutes

Teaching item: Writing picture story

Period: 2nd

1. Specific objectives

On completion of this lesson, the students will be able to.

(a) Write a complete story from the given pictures.

2. Teaching materials

(a) Usual classroom materials

(b) Pictures cards

(c) Clue cards.

3. Teaching learning activities

(a) Motivation: Teacher will ask a funny question to motivate the students.

- What is the end of 'Everything' ?

(b) Revision: The teacher asks "How do you make a polite request, if you want to go out from the classroom now ?

(c) Presentation and practice:

i. At first, the teacher attaches newspaper cut out picture on the board and writes a sentence under it. For example, it was early in the morning..... One student comes in front and continues writing sentences that are told by his friends.

ii. After that, he will make them clear about purpose of this lesson.

- iii. Then, the class is divided into teams six. Each team is formed heterogeneous team: higher achievers, average achievers and low achievers.
- iv. Each member of the group is assigned to gather information on a particular picture. Students brainstorm on their topic and discuss on the home group.
- v. Teacher tells each group to write the complete story.
- vi. During the writing class, each member of the team discusses the picture with other members of other teams who have to acquire the same information using round Robin, Rally robin techniques. This group is called the expert group.
- vii. After discussion members of each team comes back to their original groups (home teams) and share the information. The students are required to brainstorm and discuss on the given pictures based on the information that they have gathered and shared in their expert groups and their assigned group using Round robin, Rally robin and so on.
- viii. Then, the teacher asks each group to elect a presenter, a recorder, a quiet master and checker (positive interdependence and individual accountability).
- ix. Then each group writes a complete story chronologically or sequentially.
- x. After finishing the writing task, they exchange their piece of writing and discuss to other groups and get feedback from other groups.
- xi. Then, the teachers ask a presenter to present the group work. The teacher gives feedback after each presentation.

xii. At last, each group reviews, how they are produced precise story.

(d) Evaluation

At the end of presentation and practice section, the teacher asks all the members write a complete story from the given pictures.

(e) Homework

Write description of the pictures given in page no. 6 of the textbook to develop a complete story.

MODEL LESSON PLAN - II

School Name: Janasewa Higher Secondary School

Subject : English

Date: 2067/10/25

Unit: Two

No. of the students: 30

Topic: Writing

Time: 45 minutes

Teaching item: Writing a leaflet

Period: 2nd

1. Specific objectives

On completion of this lesson, the students will be able to.

(a) Write a leaflet about the given topic.

2. Teaching materials

Model leaflet, flannel board, leaflet cards etc.

3. Teaching learning activities

(a) Motivation: Teacher will tell jokes to motivate the students.

(b) Revision: The teacher reminds the students about wall-display of their picture-story.

(c) Presentation and practice. (i) The teacher selects the students and asks to come in front. He asks following questions to elicit answer.

- Where is your school located ?
- What are the facilities available in your school ?
- What is the total area of your school ?
- Why do you think your school is good ?

ii. The students read the leaflet of Parsa wildlife reserve which is given in the book (p.10).

iii. Then, teacher demonstrates the model of leaflet.

iv. After that, the class is divided into teams of six. Each team is formed heterogeneous.

- v. Each member will be assigned with a blank format leaflet to gather the information on a particular topic such as areas it covers, location, features. Students brainstorm on their topic and discuss on the home group.
- vi. Teacher tells each group to write a leaflet on the given topic such as school, Kathmandu, Pokhara, Kirtipur and so on.
- vii. During the writing, each member of the team discusses with other members of other teams who have to acquire the same information using Round Robin technique. This group is called the expert group.
- viii. After discussion the members of each team come back to their original groups (home teams) and share their information. The students are required to brainstorm and discuss on the given topic based on the information that they have gathered and shared in their expert groups.
- ix. Then, the teacher asks each group to elect a leader, recorder a secretary and checker.
- x. Then each group writes a leaflet about the given topic such as school, Kirtipur.
- xi. After finishing the writing task, they exchange their piece of writing and discuss to other groups.
- xii. Then, the teacher asks a presenter to present the group's work. The teacher announces the group with the best presentation as extrinsic motivation. Grades are not awarded for the group's work.
- xiii. At last, each group reviews, how they have produced a precise leaflet.

(d) Evaluation

At last the teacher will evaluate the teaching learning activities asking the following questions.

- i. Why do you think people or institution write leaflets ?
- ii. Write a leaflet about their school.

(E) Homework: Write a leaflet about a place of interest near your own village or town.

(e) Homework

Write description of the pictures given in page no. 6 of the textbook to develop a complete story.

APPENDIX-4

RESPONSE OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST