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ABSTRACT

English Language speaking practices in Kenyan secondary schools are insufficient to improve students’ progress in speaking skills. The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of Cooperative Learning (CL) on secondary school learners’ English-speaking skills in Nandi central sub-county. Objectives of this study were to establish the effect of individual accountability in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills, to determine the effect of interpersonal and social skills in cooperative learning on learners English language speaking skills, to assess the effect of face to face promotive interaction in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills and to find out the effect of positive interdependence in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills. The study adopted a conceptual framework and used the quasi experimental with a non-equivalent control group pre-test post-test design under the mixed methods approach. The sample size was all the form three learners from the two classrooms of the selected schools. The instruments of the study included learners’ questionnaire administered to the experimental group, Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test which was administered as a pre-test and as a post-test to both the groups and an observation guide used by the researcher to monitor activities of the learners in cooperative groups. These instruments were validated by experts from the faculty of education in the university and a Pilot test was done prior to the study whereby a Cronbach coefficient of 0.7 was computed. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, and presented in tabular form while analysis from the observation guide was used for triangulation. The study revealed that there is a statistically significant effect of individual accountability (t=2.888; df=66), interpersonal and social skills (t=2.953; df=66), face to face promotive interactive (t=4.640; df=66) and positive interdependence (t=4.322; df=66) on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. It was concluded that, individual accountability, interpersonal and social skills, face to face promotive interactive and positive interdependence positively affect learners’ achievement in English language speaking. The findings of this study are beneficial to the learners of English language and their teachers in the teaching and learning of speaking skills. They are also important to teacher educators, curriculum developers and the ministry of Education on decision making. The researcher recommends that teachers of English should consider incooperating Cooperative Learning in their teaching of English language speaking skills. The government, education policy makers and curriculum developers should also ensure the implementation of cooperative Learning in the teaching of English language at the secondary school level.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

In the recent years, one of the changes in the English language pedagogy has been the shift from a teacher centered learning model to a learner centered learning model. The shift signals a new era in which English speaking teaching should give room to students to express themselves in speaking the language. Speaking is one of the most important skills to be developed and enhanced as a means of communication (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017). The modern job market requires good command of English and especially of the spoken English. Everybody wishing to get the benefits of modern education, research, science, trade and technology knows that it is impossible without the working knowledge of English language and good communication skills (Crystal, 2010). A learner may have memorized endless lists of vocabulary but cannot speak fluently. A person who speaks effectively is able to receive and respond to information appropriately. He or she is likely to create a favorable impression of oneself and therefore interact with others effectively and confidently (Gorjian, 2015).

English as a second language is taught and used as an official language of in Kenya as well as a medium of instruction in schools and other learning institutions. It is also a language used for international communication hence those who master and speak it well; reap many academic, social and professional benefits (Efrizal, 2012). In a school set up, proficiency of English will make the learning of other subjects much easier. Bashir; Azeem & Dogar (2011) have proposed ways of enhancing learners’ speaking
skills with the help of different methods of teaching, use of appropriate exercises and a learner centered approach to teaching and learning. By use of the teacher centered approach to teaching and learning, teachers seem to do most of the talking and act as the only source of knowledge to students while students are treated as passive recipients in the learning process (Ning, 2011). These types of methods according to Gomleksiz (2007) has negatively affected students and produced incompetent users of the English language who are unable to improve their speaking skills. On the other hand, in the learner centered approaches, students are given the opportunity to express themselves in speaking the language. English classes are mainly taught using the teacher centered methods (Murrey & Christison, 2010). The available communication and interaction in the classroom are insufficient to enhance learners’ speaking skills which should be developed along other skills (listening, reading and writing). This is because the integration of the skills will enhance the students’ ability to communicate.

Teachers need to apply methods and strategies for learner centered instruction and a promising method to traditional speaking instruction is the Cooperative Learning Approach (Hall Haley, & Ferro, 2011). This method serves as the alternative way of teaching for promoting speaking and social interaction among the students (Ning, 2011). Cooperative learning as per the available research suggestions is of great influence on the development of learners’ speaking skills (Al-Sohbani, 2013).

Over the past decade, Cooperative Learning has emerged as the leading new approach to classroom instruction. One important reason for its advocacy is that numerous research studies in various school settings and across a wide range of content areas, have revealed that students completing Cooperative group tasks tend to have higher
academic test scores, higher self-esteem, greater comprehension of content and better speaking skills (Alam, 2013).

The Cooperative Learning Approach is reached through interdependence among all group members rather than working individually. This makes CL produce greater student achievement as opposed to the traditional methodologies (Kim, 2005). Students who work individually must compete against their peers to gain praise or other forms of rewards and reinforcement unlike in CL where the success of an achievement is beneficial to all members. There is also competition among groups in CL and hence is a solution to a myriad of problems (Schweisfurth, 2011).

Schools have the opportunity to help English Second Language Learners (ESL) develop socially by using appropriate instructional strategies and implementing social skill instruction in the curriculum (Aydar, 2013). CL is one of the instructional strategies that can be used to create a non-threatening environment which encourages participation and promotes positive social interactions. CL provides more opportunities for students to listen and produce language, create strong friendship connections, support first language skills, improve classroom environment and student attitude. Students placed in a CL group feel a sense of belonging and learn to ask for and receive help (Chan, 2011). They learn that their success is linked to the success of others. Group participation is learned along with other social skills necessary for working together (Baker & Clark, 2010).

Cooperative small group instruction provides students with opportunities to explore clarify and internalize ideas among their peers. This kind of classroom conversation helps students develop higher level thinking through the analysis, evaluation synthesis and application of new information (Lynch, 2013). CL has a number of positive
outcomes which include academic gain, positive relationship amongst students and improved social and affective development (Alam, 2013). Weak students working individually are likely to get stuck hence working cooperatively, they keep going. Strong students faced with the task of explaining and clarifying material to weaker students often find gaps in their own speaking skills and try to improve on them.

According to Al-Tamimi & Pandian (2008) CLA requires active involvement of learners through small group interaction. High achievers interact with low achievers and in the process the speaking skills of the two groups is improved. The learners are each expectant as they handle the subject under study. Al-Sohbani, (2013) states that CL as an instructional procedure depends on students helping each other to learn in small groups. This is likely to enhance students’ motivation hence improve their speaking as well as academic performance.

English language learners are not usually provided with content classes taught in their primary language and they often struggle with the difficult academic material. CL groups enable them to work in a team with other students who have already gained proficiency with the language (Chan, 2011). This group dynamic does not only provide a supportive environment for learning new content but acquiring English language speaking skills. Learners in CL work with classmates who have different learning skills and they end up learning from each other. Social interaction improves speaking which enhances communication skills which are necessary to working in society. Students gain more speaking skills through peer tutoring in CL setting. Students who work cooperatively have a natural tendency to help their peers even without suggestion by the teacher. English language learners in Nandi central have a problem in their pronunciation, grammar, use of tonal variation and turn taking skills.
This study therefore investigated the influence of CL on students’ English-speaking skills.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

English classes in Kenya are traditionally teacher centered (Ndiku & Metto, 2014) and this probably may impede learners’ speaking skills. There is little communication and interaction between the teachers and the learners in the classroom which is therefore insufficient in enhancing learners’ speaking skills (Gathumbi, & Masembe, 2005). Insufficient speaking exercises in Kenyan secondary schools fail to improve learners’ progress in speaking skills (Sure & Ogechi, 2009). Learning in most of the schools is based on the teacher (Majanga, Nasongo, & Sylvia, 2010) who is seen as the authority of the classroom and learners have a limited chance to practice their speaking skills and hence find it difficult most of the time to express their thoughts in English.

The use of Cooperative Learning Approach has been extensively researched on (Siltala, et al., 2007). Most of the studies indicate that the use of Cooperative Learning which differ from the traditional learning methods, has some benefits resulting from the social interaction amongst the learners (Kim, 2005). According to Efrizal (2012) and Gilakjani (2016), speaking is beneficial to overall language development. It is true that students who interact and speak achieve better in oral skills in most cases than those who always keep silent.

Speaking is an important skill to be developed and enhanced in language learners. There is need therefore, to improve the current level of speaking skills among Kenyan secondary school learners. The effects of Cooperative Learning (CL) on learners’
speaking has been repeatedly demonstrated and confirmed by studies conducted in first and second language learning classrooms (Ning & Hornby, 2010; Ning, 2011; Pattanpichet, 2011; Bengu, 2014). There is however, very little research done on this area with English language students speaking in Nandi central, Nandi County, Kenya. This study therefore investigated the effects of Cooperative Learning on secondary school learners English speaking skills.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out the effects of Cooperative Learning on learners’ English language speaking skills in day mixed sub county secondary schools in Nandi central sub-county, Nandi County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

i. To establish the effects of individual accountability in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking.

ii. To determine the effects of interpersonal and social skills in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking.

iii. To assess the effects of face to face promotive interaction in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking.

iv. To find out the effects of positive interdependence in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The study was based on the following hypotheses:
**H0₁:** There is no statistically significant difference of individual accountability in cooperative learning on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

**H0₂:** There is no statistically significant difference of interpersonal and social skills in cooperative learning on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

**H0₃:** There is no statistically significant difference of face to face promotive interaction in cooperative learning on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

**H0₄:** There is no statistically significant difference of positive interdependence in cooperative learning on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

### 1.6 Justification of the Study

English language speaking is one of the most important skills that need to be developed and enhanced amongst the language learners (Morozova, 2013). Improper pronunciation and inaccurate construction of sentences have caused learners from day mixed public secondary schools to have a lot of difficulty in English speaking. The general standards of instruction are enhanced with an improved performance in English (Ministry of Education, 2006). This however was not achieved in the 2010 KCSE results whereby there was no A. The overall performance of learners is particularly dependent on English except Kiswahili as subject. These subjects’ examinations are also set in English. The achievement of the Kenyan vision 2030 and SDG is also dependent on quality learning in schools which can only be achieved through effective learning of English language (Article 55 of the Kenyan constitution, 2010). English speaking skills are important since people need it for their day to day communication. In Kenya English is associated with the advancement of technology, trade, tourism, research etc. This view makes English an important language in
different aspects of life. Studies conducted in L1 and L2 learning indicate positive effects of CL on learners’ English language speaking skills (Pittanpichet, 2011; Bengu, 2014). As revealed from the various studies that CL improves learners’ English language speaking skills, this study aimed at finding out if the same would be achieved on English language speaking skills of secondary school learners in Nandi Central Sub-County, Nandi County Kenya.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The importance of this study comes from the view that CL Plays a major role on learners’ oral skills in English language learning. The researcher here looked at the validity of the view that CL increases social interaction among learners and consequently leads to improving their speaking skills. English language learning classrooms in Kenya need to no longer be dominated by teacher centered approaches but learner centered ones for learners to easily and quickly improve their speaking skills (Kim, 2005). In CL learners do most of the work in their learning while the teacher acts as a facilitator or a guide. CL therefore is a learner centered approach that needed to be researched on. It brings fun to teaching and learning and also improves learners’ English language speaking skills as they are given more opportunities to speak/interact with their colleagues. Its findings may be significant to teachers of English who may have to reevaluate their teaching methods and improve on them.

It may also be beneficial to the learners of English language as they learn speaking in English. Teacher educators may also benefit from this study as they prepare teachers of English and harmonize their programmes with the changing trends in teaching. It will also help curriculum developers and the ministry of Education as they make decisions based on the teaching of English language in schools. This research will
promote the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) since through CL, learners may improve their speaking skills hence promote quality education. Kenya intents to create a globally adaptive human resource base which meets the obligations of a fast industrializing economy so as to achieve the vision 2030. Use of CL in the teaching and learning of English language speaking skills could enhance the achievement of the same amongst learners therefore producing a human resource with the communication skills expected of them. Through CL therefore, learners achieve more in English language speaking skills and in their general academics. This research has also formed a basis for more studies on other learner centered approaches to the teaching of English language speaking skills.

1.8 Assumptions of the Study

This study was based on the following assumptions:

i. That the learners would be willing to participate in the study.

ii. That the teachers of English language already had an idea on Cooperative Learning Approach.

iii. That data collected from the study would give accurate information on the variables investigated on.

iv. That the researcher would be granted permission to conduct the study by the relevant authorities.

1.9 Scope of the Study

This study was conducted amongst F3 students of English language from mixed public day sub-county secondary schools in Nandi Central Sub-County to find out if the CL had any effects on their speaking skills. The objectives of the study included
establishing whether cooperative learning individual accountability had any effect on learners’ English language speaking, determining the effect of cooperative learning interpersonal and social skills on learners’ English language speaking, assessing the effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ English language speaking and finding out the effect of positive interdependence on learners’ English language speaking. Since randomization was not feasible two intact classes were purposively selected from the 27 mixed public day sub-county secondary schools in Nandi central. Purposive sampling was also employed in selecting of specific classes where there was more than one stream in F3. A quasi experimental with a non-equivalent control group pre-test post-test design was used in the study. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics included percentages, mean scores and standard deviation while inferential statistics involved the use of a paired t-test. Speaking skills were limited to conversations, debates, stress and intonation in sentences and persuasive speeches as per the secondary school English syllabus. The study period was five weeks, one week was meant for the setting of the pre-test examination and sensitization of the experimental group teacher. Instruments of the study included a Learners’ Speaking Skills Achievement Test used as a pre-test and a post-test, learners’ questionnaire which was administered to the learners of the experimental class at the end of the treatment. There was also an observation guide that was used by the researcher to monitor all the activities in the cooperative groups.

1.10 Limitations of the Study

Despite the fact that the findings of the study validated the hypotheses presented, some limitations were realized. The first limitation was the time of the study. Future research should be done within a longer period of time to allow use of a number of
research instruments which is advantageous since it will give results from different dimensions. Longer time would also allow the future researcher to narrow down his study to a particular speaking skill. The participants were limited to only one class of form three learners and was also limited to mixed day sub-county secondary school. This small sample size of the sampling population may have influenced the representatives of the study. Future investigation on a bigger sample of learners is needed in order to gain reliable information on the effects of cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills.

1.11 Conceptual Framework of the Study

A conceptual framework is a visual or written product, one that `explains, either graphically or in narrative form, the main things to be studied the key factors, concepts, or variables and the presumed relationships among them (Miles & Huberman, 2004). In this study the researcher looked at the English-speaking skills in secondary school and more specifically in Nandi central sub county Nandi County. The Cooperative Learning Approach (independent variable) is learner centered hence gives more opportunities to the learners to speak. The constituents of the independent variable were interpersonal and social skills; individual accountability, face to face promotive interaction and positive interdependence Learners taught using this approach improve their speaking skills. Cooperative learning was therefore the independent variable in this study while learners’ English language speaking skills was the dependent variable. There are other factors separate from CLA which could influence learners’ speaking skills during the time of the study and these included media and technology for instance radio, television and mobile phones, role models,
books on speaking skills and the school policy on language use. These were the intervening variables of the study (Figure 1.1)
**Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework**

**Independent variable**

Cooperative learning

**Individual Accountability**
- Grammar in Sentences
- Construction of correct and clear sentences
- Use of the Right tenses
- Polite interruption
- Careful listening

**Interpersonal and social skills**
- Use of turn taking
- Polite interruptions
- Careful listening

**Face to face promotive interaction**
- Pronunciation of words
- Taking note of silent letters
- Separation of homophones
- Use of long and short vowels

**Positive interdependence**
- Word stress
- Sentence stress
- Falling intonation
- Rising intonation

**Dependent variable**

English Speaking Skills

Improved English language speaking skills

**Intervening variables**
- Media and technology
- Books
- Role models
- School policy on language
1.12 Operational Definition Of Terms

**Approach:** It is a way of dealing with learners’ problems in English language speaking by use of CLA.

**Cooperative Learning:** It is an instructional method which students work together in small heterogeneous groups to solve a problem, complete a project or achieve other instructional goals, while teachers act as guides or facilitators (Slavin, 1996). The problem in this case is the learners’ English language speaking skills.

**Effect:** This is the change that cooperative learning causes on learners’ English language speaking skills when CL is used in the teaching of these skills.

**English Speaking skills:** Communicating or tending to communicate in English. These skills herein this study include grammar, turn-taking, pronunciation and tonal-variation.

**Individual accountability:** Each member in the cooperative learning group must contribute in order to improve the performance of both the member and the group. In this case improve their English-speaking skills.

**Positive interdependence:** Learners depend on each other’s contribution for the success of the group in cooperative learning.

**Promotive face to face interaction:** The thinking, talking and acting of each member towards the group in cooperative learning.

**Skill:** The ability to do something well especially because of training or practice. In this case, the ability to speak English fluently and accurately after learning English language speaking through cooperative learning groups.

**Social skills:** The interpersonal skills required in order to work effectively in CL groups.
1.13 Summary

This chapter has outlined the background, statement, purpose, justification, significance and the scope of the study. It has also presented the research objectives of this investigation, its hypotheses, conceptual framework, limitations of the study and the definitions of terms used in the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides review of literature which exists concerning CL and English-speaking skills of the secondary school learners. There are also basic theoretical concepts of CL and speaking performance that were presented in this section. Previous studies carried out on the influence of CL on learners’ speaking skills were also reviewed. Sources of this information included books, journals, periodicals, magazine and the internet. This chapter is divided into sections which include elements of CL, speaking skills, characteristics of CL and previous studies on the influence of CL on learners’ speaking skills.

2.2 Strategies of Teaching

A teaching strategy is defined as the overall way in which the process of instruction is organized and executed (Twoli, 2007). It is therefore the overall plan or design in which the process of instruction is organized and implemented. There are two main strategies of teaching which are expository and heuristic strategies. Teachers using expository strategy do most of the work while learners sit and listen. This therefore is a teacher centered method. The teacher here is seen as the authority of the class and the custodian of all the knowledge. The teaching methods that fall under this strategy include lecture, teacher demonstration, narration (story telling), text reading and audio-visual presentation.
Heuristic one is a strategy which involves indirect instruction where the teacher acts as a facilitator or guide while the learner is an active participant in the learning process. The learners find out information on their own while the teacher assumes a non-directive role (Najib, 2003). This strategy is categorized as learner centered and one of its methods of teaching is Cooperative Learning.

2.3 Cooperative Learning

The Cooperative Learning (CL in this study) is defined as an instructional method which students work together in small heterogeneous groups to solve a problem, complete a project or achieve other instructional goals, while teachers act as guides or facilitators. As an educational approach, it aims at organizing classroom activities into academic and social learning experiences (Siltala, 2010). It is a situation where students work together in small groups to help themselves and others to learn (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). The CL is an alternative method to lecture based paradigm in the teaching and learning process. It is a learner centered paradigm which has gained popularity. CL according to Kim, (2005) produces higher learning achievement and motivation. Schweisfurth (2011) states that a learner centered approach is a solution to a myriad of problems.

The role of teachers using CL shifts from transmission of knowledge to facilitators of student learning (Brown & Ciuffeteli, 2009). This role involves facilitating, modeling and coaching. Teachers who adopt this role should maintain a safe non-threatening and learner centered environment. This environment of teaching will help students contribute positively in the cooperative activities assigned to their group (Ning, 2011). For the activities to be genuinely cooperative, each type of activity requires the
presence of five basic components of CL (Johnson et al, 2009). Since these components are important in this study, they are discussed below.

2.4 Components of CL

There are five components involved in CL. These five elements distinguish CL from other forms of group learning. When these elements are present in a learning situation, the result is a cooperative learning group (Johnson et al., 2009). They include; positive interdependence, individual accountability, face to face promotive interaction, interpersonal and social skills and group processing.

2.4.1 Positive Interdependence

Team members are required to rely on one another to achieve a common goal. Learners must be made aware of their likelihood to succeed or fail together. Learners need each other for guidance, explanations and support. If learners don’t support each other, the group will not achieve the desired objectives and hence they all suffer the consequences. Instructors may structure this element by establishing mutual goals, joint rewards, shared resources and assigned roles (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). Positive interdependence requires learners to work in groups to complete tasks collectively towards an academic goal. According to Siltala (2010), learning individually can be competitive in nature but learners learning in cooperative groups can share one another’s resources and skills. They can consult each other, evaluate one another’s ideas and monitor one another’s work. The success of the group is therefore the success of everybody. Learners are responsible for their learning as well as that of the group. They help support, encourage and praise each other’s efforts to learn. To ensure positive interdependence (Johnson & Johnson, 2009), the
instructor ensures that the group has only one kind of each material required e.g. a pen, a paper or a book. The task is then divided among the group members the instructor who in this case is a facilitator ensures that each member contributes or help before the task is finished. In this study therefore, learners were given a conversation to role play whereby each member was given a section to handle, they also given debate topics and each of them had an opportunity debate, they also had topics to discuss on. The instructor lastly offers a reward to the group if they achieve their goal.

2.4.2 Individual Accountability

Members of the group are held responsible for their share of the work and for the success of the group. The group must therefore know the strength or weakness of each member in handling the task. It is also vital that group members know they cannot depend on the work of others (Brown & Ciuffetelli, 2009) and learner therefore are required to have a personal responsibility to learn and help other members of the group learn. Each learner in the group must demonstrate mastery of the content being discussed. The learner is accountable to the work and learning of the group. Accountability helps reduce out of topic stories in the group (Lynch, 2013). According to Johnson & Johnson (2009), there are ways of ensuring accountability in cooperative learning groups and these include learners being given tasks to look at prior to working in cooperative groups. Learners are each assigned a section to work on then they present it to the group which certifies its accuracy with the guidance of the instructor who eventually rewards all of them. The instructor observes learners’ oral skills. For the sake of the study, this was done by the researcher who observed English speaking skills like turn-taking, pronunciation of words, word and sentence intonation and grammatical structures.
2.4.3  Face to face Promotive Interaction

Group work must be done interactively with group members providing one another with feedback and also teaching and encouraging others. The interaction enables the learners to complete a given task and the groups’ shared goals. Learners are required to interact verbally with one another on learning tasks. Members explain, discuss and teach what they know to team mates. Instructors structure teams so that they sit and talk through each aspect of the tasks they are working to complete (Scheurell, 2010). Learners must promote each other’s success in the group. They explain to one another what they have or are learning and assist one another with understanding and completion of assignment (Siltala, et al., 2007).

To ensure face to face promotive interaction, learners are asked to solve given problems orally (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). One learner can discuss a concept with others allowing each member to speak. Learners help each other to correct the presented items like grammar, intonation and pronunciation of words or sentences in English language learning (Lynch, 2010).

2.4.4  Interpersonal and Social Skills

This refers to skills such as giving constructive feedback, reaching consensus, communicating accurately and unambiguously and involving each member in the learning process. Learners must be taught these skills before they tackle the problem to ensure the success of the group in cooperative learning (Baker & Clark, 2010). Teachers should carefully teach their learners the required skills which include instructorship, decision making, trust building, communication and conflict management skills. The teacher is not someone who measures learners’ capacities in
terms of the final product but someone who acts as a friend, coordinator, director, guide, counselor and facilitator (Fahraeus, 2013). These skills make learners more responsible in their work hence won’t depend on their group members to handle their group tasks.

2.4.5 Group Processing

This is another important aspect of CL which requires group members to set goals and periodically assess their functions and contribution to the success of all the group tasks and identify changes they will make to function more effectively in the future (Scheurell, 2010). Group processing focuses on positive behaviors and actions of team members and not on the negative ones. The teacher may choose to spend time focusing on improving a skill like in this case speaking. The teacher can then monitor the groups during the learning activities and provide feedback on what has been observed. Learners must fully participate and put forth effort within their cooperative groups. Each member in the group has a task or a role to play in the group hence is responsible for their learning as well as that of the group (Aldrich & Shimazoe, 2010). They then reflect on which member actions were helpful and make decisions on which actions to continue or change.

The purpose of group processing is to clarify and improve the effectiveness with which members carry out the processes necessary to achieve the group’s goals. Group members need to be free to communicate openly with each other to express concerns and celebrate achievements. They discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintaining effective working relationships (Sitala, 2010). To ensure the success of group processing group members describe each other’s helpful or unhelpful
behaviours and as a group agree on which behaviours to change (Johnson & Johnson, 2009).

2.5 Global Perspective of Cooperative Learning Approach

Cooperative learning is a promising method in relation to the traditional speaking teaching method (Bashir, Azeem & Dogar, 2011). It serves as alternative way of teaching for promoting speaking and social interaction among learners (Ning, 2011). Research done by scholars from various parts of the world indicate that CL is of great effect on developing learners’ speaking skills (Pattanpichet, 2011). The effects of CL on learners’ speaking skills have been repeatedly demonstrated and confirmed by studies conducted in L1 and L2 learning (Ning, 2011; Ning & Hornby, 2010; Talebi & Sobhani, 2012; Pattanpichet, 2011; Suhendan & Bengu, 2014). Many of these studies indicate that the use of CLA in the teaching of language skills can lead to increased speaking skills (Suhendan & Bengu, 2014; Ning & Hornby, 2010; Ning, 2011). It has also been noted that most studies on the effects of CL have consistently shown that CLA improves learners’ English-speaking skills (Pattanpitchet, 2011) and English reading skills (Bolukbas; Keskin & Polat, 2011; Meng, 2010; Law, 2011). English competence in skills and vocabulary in CL classes are superior to whole class instruction particularly in speaking, listening and reading (Ning, 2011). Ning and Hornby (2010) conducted a study to investigate the effects of CL on Chinese EFL learners’ competencies in listening, speaking, reading, writing and vocabulary. The findings revealed clear improvement in CLA in the teaching of listening, speaking and reading but no differences were found between the two approaches in the areas of writing and vocabulary.
A study conducted among the Taiwanese college students in terms of English oral performance and motivation when teaching is done using CLA showed an improvement of the learners’ oral skills and motivation (Yang, 2005). Omer and Ahmed (2014) conducted another study amongst Yemeni university students and the findings revealed that there was a remarkable development in the students’ speaking and attitudes after the introduction of CL techniques. These and other studies not mentioned herein indicate that there is a significant effect of CL on learners’ speaking skills. The researcher herein therefore investigated whether there was a positive effect of CL on learners’ speaking skills in Nandi central sub-county.

2.6 Kenyan Perspective of Cooperative Learning Approach

Chemwei and Somba (2014) studied on the use of CL on poetry teaching which indicated that there was a great improvement on poetry learning and attitude among learners. Another research conducted by Sonoi, (2014) on the effects of CLA on students’ achievement and attitude towards oral literature genres revealed that CLA was an effective method which English and literature teachers needed to be encouraged to use in the instruction of English and literature. Orato, et al (2013) also researched on the effectiveness of computer based CL on students’ English grammar and the results indicated that computer based CL method helped learners improve their achievement in English grammar. There is little literature on the study of CLA in Kenya since few researchers have studied it so there is need for scholars to work on this field.
2.7 Speaking Skills

Fulcher (2003) defines speaking as the verbal uses of language as a medium through which human beings communicate. It is an important skill which people need for their day to day communication. Speaking is one of the four related skills in English which are listening, speaking, reading and writing. English speaking skills should therefore be developed alongside these skills so that these integrated skills will enhance communication competence of the learners (Morozova, 2013). Learners can improve their speaking skills through listening and repeating. Teachers can use short questions or dialogue or develop their learners’ speaking skills while in CL groups (Bashir, Azeem & Dogar, 2011). Additionally, Efrizal (2012) and Gilakjani (2016) expressed that speaking is of great significance for the people’s interaction when they speak everywhere and every day. If need to encourage students to communicate in English, we should use the language in real communication and ask them to do the same process. Speaking helps learners develop their vocabulary and grammar skills and then better their writing skills to express their thoughts.

In Kenya today, English is associated with the advancement of technology, trade, tourism, research etc. This therefore makes English an important language in different aspects of life. Most ESL learners in Kenya especially in Nandi County have got difficulty in English language speaking skills. They are troubled in grammar, pronunciation, use of tonal variation and turn-taking skills. English language teachers should train learners to attain their oral communication. Brown (2007) states that oral communication can be maintained by having three components which include; accuracy, fluency, pronunciation and intonation,
2.7.1 Accuracy

This is the mastery of phonological elements, grammar and discourse. It is also the linguistic competence that deals with the correction of utterances to get the correct communication. Thornbury (2005) cited in Latha (2012) says speaking English accurately means doing without or with few errors in both grammar and pronunciation. Building up learners’ confidence to eliminate their fear of making errors is a priority that a teacher should consider in order to make learners feel comfortable with their language use (Patil, 2008). Teachers should emphasize on accuracy in their teaching process. Learners too need to pay close attention to the exactness and the completeness of language form when speaking such as focusing on grammatical structures, vocabulary and pronunciation (Mazouzi, 2013).

2.7.2 Fluency

This is the ability to speak eloquently without pausing with no hesitation markers. It also refers to some aspects like responding coherently within the turns of the conversation, using linking words and phrases, keeping in mind a comprehensible pronunciation and adequate intonation without too much hesitation (Richards, 2006). Learners often fail to speak fluently due to lack of confidence and having anxiety about making errors (Trent, 2009). Learners should be fluent in speaking a foreign language (Mazouzi, 2013). Grammatical competence can help learners perceive the structures of English language correctly which eventually leads to their fluency (Latha, 2012).
2.7.3 Pronunciation and Intonation

It is the production and perception of the significant sounds of a particular language in order to achieve meaning in the context of language use (Carter & Nunan, 2004 cited in Morozova, 2013) say that pronunciation is the production and perception of segmental sounds of stressed and unstressed syllables and of the speech melody or intonation. Listeners only understand what a speaker says when there is a proper pronunciation and this makes communication easy. Pronunciation is therefore important in both academic and social interaction in the way students are able to participate and interact in their community. Native speakers of a language may make mistakes but these mistakes may not change the meaning of the sentences they want to express (Mahripah, 2014). Mistakes made by non-native speakers, in these case ESL are those which change the meaning of utterances they wish to convey do create problems for their listeners to understand them. CL gives learners an opportunity to practice speaking and pronunciation of words like the native speakers. There is a relationship between pronunciation and intonation in English language speaking.

Learners need to know the stress, intonation and pitch of the structures they are using in their English language speaking. According to Mahripah (2014), pronunciations of English words are not similar to their spellings. Words with similar spellings are sometimes pronounced differently because of their surrounding contexts like tenses and phonemes that come after them.

Pronunciation includes attention to the particular sounds of a language, aspects of speech beyond the level of the individual sound, such as intonation, phrasing, stress, timing, rhythm, how the voice is projected in its broadest definition, attention to gestures and expressions that are closely related to the way we speak a language.
Pronunciation includes both supra-segmental and segmental features and they all work in combination when we speak therefore, they are usually best learned as an integral part of the spoken language (Gilakjani, 2012).

Pronunciation is a global construct which consists of segmental and supra-segmental over the past decade and a number of studies have variably investigated the area of speaking skills, including speaking assessment (Ning, 2011; Morozova, 2013; Bengu, 2014), phonology language acquisition (Leong, et al, 2017). Amongst these studies focusing on speaking skills, pronunciation is receiving more attention in many ESL classrooms since it is recognized that students should primarily acquire as a fundamental skill because it can affect accuracy and comprehension (Gilakjani, 2016). Although some researchers believe that all learners have the same capacity to learn a second or foreign language because they have learned their first language, a number of ESL teachers have difficulties in improving the students’ pronunciation problems. In this research therefore, CLA was investigated as a method for improving learners’ pronunciation skills in English language speaking.

Mahripah (2014), states that it should be noteworthy that interference or negative transfer from the first language is likely to cause errors in aspiration, intonation, rhythm, and melody in the target language. Efrizal (2012) indicated that language experience had an effect on pronunciation ability and learners should therefore be encouraged to always communicate in English. Based on the various studies, language experience provides the opportunities to use English language in daily lives. The studies suggested that students with poor pronunciation, who were regarded as less experienced, had more language transfer problems than the students with good pronunciation. For this reason, the students with good pronunciation would improve
better than the poor ones. Their findings were witnessed by (Bashir; Azeem & Dogar, 2011) pointing out that learners living in an English-speaking country or community where English is the second language would have many opportunities to listen to and to use the target language. Also, the success in learning and teaching English depended on students’ ability and exposure. Teaching a conversation or a dialogue was, therefore, not enough to help students improve speaking skills.

Students could also pronounce well if they spent time on pronunciation with full attention and interest (Gilakjani, 2016). In short, students could simply improve the development of pronunciation competence if they were motivated and had a strong will to expose to the target language. The study suggested that language learning experience and the exposure language could help the learners to learn a foreign language and have a constant of their language ability. While speaking a foreign language, pronunciation is of great importance. If a student cannot pronounce correctly, he will not be able to make himself understood. A language is a tool of communication but poor pronunciation can never be a good tool of communication. Intonation is used to show a speaker's attitude. To learn to speak good English, one has to learn to speak with the correct intonation. The key to speaking a second language lies in a good mastery of its intonation, to which a priority always be given in our teaching and learning (Mahripah, 2014). Use of cooperative learning (CL) strategies has been shown to successfully improve second language learning in many cases for its focus on individual accountability and positive interdependence (Bashir et al., 2011). Pronunciation and intonation from the literature above are important skills in English speaking. They were studied in this research to find out if they have any influence on English speaking with secondary school language learners.
A second language learner in most cases has extra ordinary problems in understanding pronunciation and intonation patterns of their L2. Pronunciation is a serious problem associated with learning the second language for both teachers and pupils. Pronunciation of English words is affected when pupils turn back to the villages and use their first language as a means of communication. Teachers also face difficult moments on establishing the systematic way of deciding what to teach and how to do it. Lack of proper guidance on how to teach L2 make teachers experience many difficulties in ensuring L1 learners pronounce certain English words correctly (Levis & Levelle, 2012).

2.8 Turn-Taking

Turn-taking is a process by which people in a conversation decide who is to speak next (Gorrjian, 2015). According to Tuan (2010) researchers have identified two sections of social skills. Group related skills which denote the way team members take-turns, encouragement, praise each other and mediate an end to the conflicts they face. Collaborative and CL groups require the teacher to supervise indirectly, communication is mainly among group mates. Group mates should discuss work together and help each other to understand it. This is achieved gradually through a clear teaching program of small group and interpersonal skills in addition to teaching techniques and tasks that stimulate interdependence. CL promotes spontaneous conversations among them and provides more opportunities in English. Students participation to discussions in classes has also increased. CL provides opportunities for interaction among students and increases their participation to discussions in class.

Ning (2010) assumes that working cooperatively provides students opportunities to discuss the content with their peers who are very close to their level of understanding.
Anxiety can be reduced in CL situations which provide a more comfortable social context and promote learning with understanding and foster conceptual change. This occurs when students engage in situations of dissatisfaction with the existing information which leads to questioning, criticizing, and evaluating of the information in turns. Students are required to explain, elaborate, and defend their position. While exchanging information, students share ideas and use each other’s resources and coordinate their efforts to maximize their productivity and achievement. Richard (2011) states that for learners in CL classes to achieve turn taking skills there are cooperative and interpersonal skills in which some students may already be, to differing degrees, proficient in some of these skills. It is through monitoring and observing that you will see which skills students lack and need to develop. Learners quietly come together as a group, to stay with the group, to quickly attend to the task, use quiet voices, and take turns.

According to Tuan (2010), Researchers have identified two sections of social skills. Group related skills which denote the way team members take-turns, encouragement, praise each other and mediate an end to the conflicts they face. In CL learners are involved in sharing ideas and opinions, asking each other and the teacher for facts and reasoning, giving direction to stay on task, encouraging participation of other group members, expressing support and acceptance of other group members’ ideas and contributions, offering to explain one’s ideas, and paraphrasing one’s own and others’ ideas (Gorjian, 2015).

Students need to learn to: criticize ideas while expressing respect for the person with the idea, differentiate between group members’ ideas and reasoning, ask for rationalization of ideas, extend other members’ ideas by adding one’s own
information, integrate differing ideas into a single position, generate more than one possible answer, and check the group’s work against the original instructions and timelines. Through this they turn-take and learn to listen to other people’s opinions.

2.9 Grammar

Richards & Schmidt (2010) define grammar as a description of different ways in which bits of linguistic value are or can be combined so that longer linguistic units by the name of sentences are made. Duang et al., (2015), defines grammar as a system of regular patterns which make up a language and allows language students to create an infinite number of sentences and make sense of what they are learning. In the traditional classroom, students do not demonstrate reasonable understanding of concepts while only a few of them dominate the instructional process because significant interaction is absent (Assma, 2012).

Incomplete grammar has always been the topic of several debates and its significance has always been confirmed. It is considered to be a determinant factor in the mastery of any language being learnt. Students’ grammar competence has been enhanced after working cooperatively with peers. Kenzoui (2015) insisted that grammar instruction is inevitable and necessary to language acquisition. Many teachers of English as a second language are more concerned about teaching the grammatical system, without regard to how learners can transfer that grammatical knowledge to meet the real-life situation language-needs (Shamim, 2011). Grammatical competence enables speakers to use and understand English language structures accurately and unhesitatingly which contributes to their fluency and in turn develops confidence in communication (Morozova, 2013). Furthermore, Anderson (2012) concluded that extensive grammar instruction over a long period of time would lead to the construction of implicit
knowledge in individuals. Therefore, as teaching grammar is useful and necessary, there should be a search for the most appropriate way of performing it.

Ahmadi (2017) reiterates that if teachers provide learners with interactive opportunities in schools, then quality of second language learning would improve. Thus, CL has been chosen by the researcher as the method under experiment as an alternative to the traditional instruction. Grammar is a problem faced by non-native English speakers in their learning of English. English grammar is different from the grammar of the ethnic languages spoken in Kenya and this makes learners have no understanding of how the English language really works. Learners who are used to speaking in their native language may lack confidence of speaking the English language and have a tendency of making mistakes. This makes both non-native teachers of English and learners afraid of talking in English (Rosman, 2012). Speaking helps learners develop their vocabulary and grammar skills and then better their writing skills. Learners can express their thoughts or ideas freely (Efrizal, 2012).

2.10 Related Studies

Numerous researchers have investigated on the use of CL in developing learners’ speaking skills. Yang (2005) compared the effectiveness of CL and traditional teaching methods on Taiwanese college students’ English oral performance and motivation towards learning. A quasi experimental with a non-equivalent control group pre-test post-test design was used. The total experimental period was eight weeks of instruction. The subjects were administered a pre-test and post-test using the intermediate level speaking component of the general English speaking proficiency Test(GEPT) as well as the motivational intensity questionnaire (MIQ). One-way ANCOVA was used to analyze the speaking component of the GEPT scores and MIQ.
results. Data collection and analyses explored the effects of CL on the Taiwanese college students in terms of English oral performance and motivation to learn in favor of the Cooperative Learning. The current study is unique from Yang’s in terms of the topic, method, the study area and population.

Ning and Hornby (2010) conducted a study to investigate the effects of CL on Chinese English second language learners’ competencies in listening, speaking, reading writing and vocabulary. The subjects were 100 first year college English learners from a university in the north of China. A pre-test post-test quasi experimental design was employed to study the effects of the CLA on students’ language competencies in comparison to traditional instruction. Findings revealed clear differences in favor of the CLA in the teaching of listening, speaking and reading but no differences were found between the two approaches in the areas of writing and vocabulary. Theirs is unique from this study basing on the topic, target population, study area and the research design used.

Patternpitchet (2011) conducted an experimental study to investigate the effects of using CL in promoting students’ speaking achievement. Thirty-five undergraduate students participated in the study. The students were enrolled in a main English course in Bangkok University to examine their speaking achievement on an English oral test before and after they had participated in the provided instructional tasks based on CLA. Data were analyzed by frequency, means, standard deviation, t-test, effect size and content analysis. The findings revealed the improvement of students’ speaking performance. The study provides suggestions and recommendations on further research and therefore this study was different from Al-Sohbani, 2013’s which was
conducted at the university level in Bangkok while this was done at the secondary school level in Kenya.

Ning (2011) also carried out an experimental study to find out the effect of cooperative learning in enhancing tertiary students’ fluency and communication. It aimed to offer students more opportunities for language production and thus enhancing fluency and effectiveness in communication. The test result showed students’ English competence in speaking skills and vocabulary in CL classes was superior to whole class instruction, particularly in speaking, listening and reading. Ning examined the effect of CL in enhancing tertiary students’ fluency and communication while this study investigated the influence of CL on learners’ English speaking skills. There was a bit of relationship between Ning’s study and this study in that fluency is considered in both studies only that this study was based mainly on Learners’ speaking skills and not their fluency in communication.

Talebi and Sobhani (2012) conducted a study on the impact of CL on English language learners’ speaking proficiency. Experimental design was used with the male and female students as a sample enrolled in a speaking course at an IELTS center in Mashhad; Iran was involved in the study. They were assigned randomly to control and experimental groups. The two groups were homogeneous in terms of their oral proficiency before the study. An oral interview was conducted to collect data of the study. The control group received instructions in speaking; three sessions per week for one month while the experimental group was taught speaking skills through CL. The results of the study showed that the performance of the experimental group on an oral interview held at the end of the course out performed that of the control group. The mean score of the experimental group was significantly higher than that of the
control group. Its uniqueness to current study is based on the topic, target population, study area and the research design used.

Ahmed and Omer (2014) conducted a study on the effectiveness of CL in enhancing speaking skills and attitudes towards learning English as a second language. The study was conducted amongst Yemeni students. A quasi experimental interrupted time series was used with sixty undergraduates enrolled for the foundation English program at Hadhramout University, Yemen. Data were gathered at multiple points of time before and after the end of the experiment to determine the effectiveness of CL on samples’ speaking skills and attitudes. The samples’ speaking skills were first examined through an English oral test prior to and after some CL instructional activities were provided. The data were analyzed using basic and inferential statistical methods including mean scores, standard deviations, paired t-test and effect size. The results showed a remarkable development in the students’ speaking skills and attitudes after the introduction of CL techniques. This study was unique from the current one in terms of its topic, research design, the study area and the data analysis procedures. Their study is unique from this one in that they based their study on college students while this one was based on secondary school learners.

In Kenya however, limited research has been done in this area and the few done are not on learners’ speaking skills. Orato et al (2013) looked at the effects of computer based cooperative learning method on students’ achievement in English grammar in secondary schools in Njoro, Nakuru County in Kenya. They used the Solomon four non-equivalent control group design and the target population was all the form two students from co-educational schools in the county. Purposive sampling technique was used and an English Achievement test was used to collect data. Data was
analyzed by the use of T-test, ANOVA (Analysis of variance) and ANCOVA (Analysis of covariance). The results indicated that computer based cooperative learning method helped the students to improve their achievement in English grammar. The topic of this research is unique from the current one and also its design, study area, the target population and its methods of data analysis.

Another research conducted by Sonoi (2014) looked at the effects of cooperative learning on students' achievement and attitude towards oral literature genres in selected secondary schools in Kisii District in Kenya. The study used quasi experimental Solomon four group designs. Data was collected using oral literature genres achievement test and student attitude questionnaire. Analysis was done using ANOVA and ANCOVA to adjust for existing differences in the post-test retention test. The results indicated that learners exposed to cooperative learning had a superior achievement and attitude than those exposed to conventional methods. Sonoi’s topic is unique from the current one and the study was done in Kisii while this one was conducted in Nandi.

Chemwei & Somba (2014) conducted another research on teacher-student perspectives and experiences with the use of CL in poetry classroom setting in Baringo District of Rift-valley province of Kenya. The study employed the use of quasi-experimental design with a pre-test-post-test control group. Subjects were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. Selected teachers and students were interviewed and data analyzed using qualitative data analysis methods. The results indicated that there was a significant improvement in students’ understanding and attitudes towards poetry. Teachers’ views also indicated that CL
has the potential of enhancing poetry learning. The current research is unique in terms of its topic, study area, target population and data analysis procedures.

The researchers recommended that further research should be conducted on the same. There is need to investigate the use of CL and its influence on learners’ speaking skills in Kenyan classrooms (Nandi central sub-county). Learners need to be skilled speakers so as to express their thoughts in and outside their schools. Most researchers in this area have used the quasi experimental design with a pre-test-post-test. This study therefore employed the use of the quasi experimental design under the mixed methods aproach. Researchers from Kenya like Sonoi (2014) and Chemwei (2014) did their studies to find out the influence of CL in the learning of oral literature and poetry respectively. None of these researchers looked at CL and its influence on learners’ speaking skills. The researcher in this study was set to find out the effects of CL on secondary school learners’ English speaking skills.

2.11 Gaps of the Study

Cooperative learning approach as can be seen from the various studies that have been conducted, can improve not only learners’ speaking skills but also their attitudes, writing, reading and grammar. Many researchers have investigated on CLA and learners’ speaking skills but the target population for most of them (Ning, 2010; Al-Sohbani, 2013) are college or university students. Secondary school learners and teachers face a lot of problems in the teaching and learning of English speaking skills (Ahmadi, 2017). There was need therefore to investigate the effects of CL on secondary school learners’ English language speaking skills.
The study designs used by the researchers who have studied on CLA on learners speaking skills include the quasi experimental interrupted time series (Ahmed & Omer, 2014), other experimental designs (Ning, 2011; Talebi & Sobhani; 2012). The researcher in this study saw a gap in the use of the Quasi experimental with a non-equivalent control group pre-test post-test design in the investigation of the effects of CLA on secondary school learners’ English language speaking skills.

These researchers who have studied CLA on learners’ English language speaking employed different types of sampling techniques like purposive sampling, randomly assigning to pre-test post-test groups (Ahmed & Omer, 2014; Talebi & Sobhani, 2012). The researcher in this study found a gap from the fact that none of these studies had been done with secondary school learners using these techniques and chose to employ purposive sampling in this study.

From the few studies done in Kenya, Orato; et al (2013) studied on the effects of computer based cooperative learning on students’ achievement in English grammar. Their study was done in Njoro in Nakuru county. The gaps here in were on the research topic in that as they were interested on learners’ English language grammar, this study investigated on the effect of CL on learners’ English-speaking skills. The study was also done in an area other than Njoro There study used the Solomon four nonequivalent control group design and the target population was all the form two students’ co-educational schools in the county. The researcher in this study employed a quasi-experimental with a non-equivalent control group design to see if it would deliver similar results with theirs. In this study also, the researcher involved all the form three learners from the mixed sub-county secondary schools in Nandi central, Nandi county.
Other studies conducted on effects of CL in Kenyan schools didn’t investigate on learners’ English-speaking skills but other components including oral literature genres (Sonoi, 2014) and poetry (Chemwei & Somba, 2014). The researcher decided to find out the effects of CL on learners’ English-speaking skills which had not been investigated in Nandi central sub-county; Kenya.

2.12 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the literature review of the study both Kenyan and global perspective. It has highlighted what other researchers have done based on the CLA and learners’ speaking skills in English language and on other learning components like poetry, oral literature and English grammar. The studies that are related to this have been also discussed here. These discussions helped the researcher to identify the available gaps of study and these have also been presented in this chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter looked at the study area, research design, target population, sampling procedures, sample size, data collection procedures, methods of analysis and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design

This study used the quasi experimental with a non-equivalent control group pre-test and post-test design under the mixed methods approach. This was because the study required a comparison between the learners’ English speaking skills the pre-test and that of the post-test. Following Borg and Gall’s (1989) cited in Sonoi, (2014) observation that administrators do not allow their classes to be broken up for research purposes. This design enables the researcher to identify the effect of the experimental treatment relative to the control treatment, assess the effect of the pre-test and the interaction between the pre-test and treatment condition. It also allows for adequate control on moderator variables that might affect the internal and external validity of the study. This design also allows easy control of the relative effects of experimentation (Koul, 1993). One intact class was selected as the control group and another as the experimental group. The dependent variable was measured by comparing the learners’ speaking skills in the pre-test with the learners’ speaking skills based on CL. The learners of the control group were not exposed to treatment but to regular ways of teaching followed in Kenyan secondary schools. Both groups
were given equal opportunities in sharing the same learning materials, schedule and tests Figure 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Pre-test and Post-test Research Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>POST TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>O₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: **E1** Experimental Group, **E2** Control Group


### 3.3 Study Area

This study was conducted in mixed public day sub-county secondary schools in Nandi central sub county, Nandi County, Kenya. This area was selected because learners here are faced with a lot of difficulty when it comes to speaking in English as heard and observed by the researcher as they try to communicate or convey information in English. These learners had difficulty in pronunciation, tonal variation, turn-taking and grammar which influenced their speaking skills. These learners were also performing poorly in KCSE paper one which tests on oral skills in its question three. There is little investigation of this kind that has been conducted in Nandi central and therefore the findings of this study would be beneficial to the teachers of ESL in their teaching.

### 3.4 Target Population

A population is defined as the total collection of elements about which we wish to make some inferences (Oso & Onen, 2008). The target population in this study therefore were all the form three students from the 27 day mixed public sub-county
secondary schools from Nandi central; Nandi County. Form threes were appropriate in this study because they were seen to have been in school a little longer hence had studied English speaking skills for at least two years in secondary school and could therefore be used to establish the relationship between the dependent and the independent variable. The form three syllabus also was the most appropriate since it entailed the English speaking skills which were being investigated on.

3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques

Sampling is a careful selection of sub-group from the accessible population so as to be a representative of the whole population with relevant characteristics. Form threes were chosen for this study. The two intact classrooms were identified through purposive sampling since only a limited number of subjects would serve as a primary source in this study due to the research design used. Purposive sampling was also important because the researcher needed to select participants with diverse characteristics to ensure the presence of maximum variability within the primary data. One was assigned as the control group and the other as the experimental group. This sample was appropriate since all the learners in the sub-county schools are normally admitted with similar entry behavior meaning their performance is expected to be at the same level. The sample size in this study therefore were all the form threes from the two sub-county mixed day public secondary schools selected in Nandi Central Sub-County who had been noticed to mostly communicate poorly in English and also performed poorly in KCSE paper one which had some questions on oral skills.
Table 3.2: Sample size and Sampling Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample population</th>
<th>Number of streams per school</th>
<th>Sampling technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county</td>
<td>27 schools</td>
<td>2 schools</td>
<td>1 stream per school</td>
<td>Purposive sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

According to Orodho (2004), in education and social sciences research, the most commonly used instruments are questionnaire, interview schedule and observation forms. A questionnaire is therefore used to collect important information about the population. The study mainly used three instruments discussed below:

3.6.1 Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test

This was used to measure students’ English speaking skills. It was given to learners from one control and one experimental group as a pre-test just before the experiment and then to both the two groups again as a post-test after the experiment. The pre-test was administered to the learners from both the control and the experimental groups to assess their ability in English speaking before treatment so as to be in a position to compare the results of the groups at the end of the experiment. A post-test was later on administered to find out whether there was any significant change in learners’ English speaking skills for both the groups after treatment of the experimental group.

These tests covered all the speaking skills which were being investigated (sentence construction, tenses, grammar, vocabulary, polite interruptions, turn-taking, intonation
and pronunciation). The researcher in collaboration with the control group teacher set the tests by lifting relevant questions from past Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) papers. The tests were then given to the learners by their respective teachers as normal series examinations. The tests were marked and the marks handed over to the researcher.

3.6.2 Observation Guide

This was used by the researcher during the experiment to monitor learners’ activities as they work cooperatively on their tasks. The researcher observed the experimental class every time they had their CL classes to check on learners’ involvement in CL activities as she facilitated on the lessons. The total number of observations made were four. Through observation the researcher was able to assess how frequent learners used English speaking skills which were being studied here in and whether there was any improvement on the same or not as time progressed on.

3.6.3 Student Questionnaire

A three scale Likert questionnaire was administered to learners of the experimental group at the end of the experiment to find out their views on the use of Cooperative Learning in their learning of English speaking skills. The questionnaire had both closed and open-ended questions to enable the researcher collect learners’ background information and their own views on the general use of CLA in their learning of English language speaking skills. A questionnaire was appropriate in this study because it permitted for analysis of a large sample of information in a short time and with a smaller degree of effort (Seliger & Schohamy, 2000).
3.7 Validity and Reliability of Instruments

This section presents information on the validity and reliability of instruments.

3.7.1 Validity

Validity of a test is an important feature for a research instrument (Wiersma, 2000). An instrument is said to have validity if it measures exactly what it is supposed to measure. Validity, therefore, has to do with how accurately the data obtained in the study represents the variables in the study. There are different types of validity; construct validity, content validity and criterion validity. The researcher’s supervisors and Professionals from the department of education in Kisii university were involved in the validation of the instruments. The instruments were prepared by the researcher with the guidance of the supervisors then taken to the experts from the department of education in the university. They checked on them and gave positive corrections which were incorporated into the document by the researcher. Tests were prepared following the Kenya National Examination Council set standards by using KCSE past papers.

3.7.2 Reliability

Reliability on the other hand refers to the extent to which a measuring instrument measures what it is purported to measure. According to Babbie (2010), reliability is a matter of where a particular technique applied repeatedly to the same object, yields the same results each time. Reliability of the questionnaires was done through a test retest method whereby it was administered to learners from two sub-county day mixed secondary schools in Nandi central sub-county then re-administered again after
a period of two weeks. The two schools were separate from the ones involved in the study. The result obtained is as shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2: Reliability Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual accountability</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal and social skills</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face promotive interaction</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive interdependence</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3.2, individual accountability had four items whose Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.771, interpersonal and social skills had four items with the Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.794, face to face promotive interaction had four items with the Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.814 and positive interdependence had four items whose Cronbach alpha coefficient was 0.822. As a rule of thumb, acceptable alpha should be 0.70 or above (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The Cronbach alpha coefficients were higher than the minimum acceptable value, hence, the items were considered reliable.

### 3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher sought for authorization from The National Commission of Science and Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) then sought clearance from the County Director Ministry of Education Nandi county office. Permission was also sought from the principals of the two selected schools. Having then obtained permission from relevant authorities, the identified secondary schools were visited for familiarization with the teachers of English language. The researcher took over the experimental group and one teacher was assigned to the control group. The researcher sought for
guidelines on the material to use in the experiment from the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (K.I.C.D) then the experimental group teacher was sensitized on how to employ the CL instruction before the start of the treatment.

The teacher of the control group teacher was asked to follow the regular teaching methods of teaching speaking adopted in the Kenyan secondary school curriculum. The two teachers selected had similar qualifications in the teaching of speaking skills since they both were graduate teachers of English. All the classes were taught as per the school English lessons time- table. A pre-test (Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test) was administered to the Experimental group (E1) and the control group (E2) before treatment. The experiment then began whereby the (E1) group received treatment for one month. At the end of the study a learner’s English speaking skills achievement test was administered as a post-test to both the control and the experimental groups. English language learners from the experimental class were given a questionnaire to fill in at the end of the study to determine their views on the use of CL. The researcher observed learners’ activities during the experimentation. The total number of observations made were four.

3.9 Data Analysis Procedures

Data collected from this study was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics including mean scores, standard deviations, and inferential statistics in this case one tailed t-test of the English-speaking achievement test. The results were tabulated with the results of the experimental against that of the control group to determine the influence of CL On learners’ speaking skills. A test for significance was at the significance level of 0.05. Quantitative data has been presented using tables while the qualitative data is presented through reporting and narration.
3.10 Ethical Consideration

The researcher visited the two selected schools prior to the study for familiarization with the English language teachers and to seek permission from the principals of the schools. The learners of the experimental group were consulted on the importance of the research before the commencement of CL treatment. No part of this work was taken from another person’s work without recognizing the writer through citations and quotations. The results obtained from the English-speaking achievement test were kept with a lot of confidentiality and learners were consulted before any observations made. Learners were also informed before the beginning of the study on their rights and freedom to participate or withdraw from the study if they felt inconvenienced. They were also asked neither to write their names nor admission numbers anywhere in the questionnaires. Learner’s examinations were marked and scripts given back to them and no ranking was openly displayed to learners during comparison of the two schools’ results. The participants were also informed that the outcome of the study would be beneficial to English language teachers, learners themselves, K.I.C.D and other education stakeholders working to improve the English language speaking skills.

3.11 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented research design and methodology used in the study. It has highlighted the pre-test and post-test research design, study area, target population, sample and sampling techniques, data collection instruments, validity and reliability of instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures used in the study and also the ethical consideration.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of data analysis. The study assessed the effects of Cooperative Learning on English language speaking skills of secondary school learners in Nandi Central Sub-County, Nandi County. The chapter is divided into various sections namely response rate, the demographic information of the participants and the study objectives specifically; to establish the effect of individual accountability in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills, to determine the effect of social skills in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills, to assess the effect of face to face promotive interaction in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills, to find out the effect of positive interdependence in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills in Nandi Central Sub-County, Nandi County. The chapter opens with the response rate and then demographic information of the participants.

4.2 Questionnaire Response Rate

A total of 34 questionnaires were sent out to the respondents to fill and of these, 33 were returned for analysis. The returned 33 questionnaires accounted for 97.1% response rate. A response rate of 70% and above is adequate (Peytchev, 2013; Massey & Tourangeau, 2013) and thus a response rate of 97.1% was acceptable for data analysis. Table 4.1 shows the response rate.
**Table 4.1: **Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administered</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Among the demographic information sought were; gender and age of the respondents. These variables were considered to have an effect on the relationship between Cooperative Learning Approach and learners’ English language speaking skills in secondary school. The results of data analysis are presented in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: **Demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>14-15 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-17 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 and above years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that the majority 18(54.5%) of the learners were boys and 15(45.5%) were girls. Moreover, on the age of the learners, majority 17(51.5%) were between 16-17 years old, 9(27.3%) were 18 years and above old and 7(21.2%) were between 14-15 years old. This implies that the group was heterogeneous in terms of age and sex as expected in CL which is being investigated in this study.

### 4.4 Effect of Individual Accountability in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

For objective one, independent sample t test was the preferred inferential statistic for analysis of data from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test.
4.4.1. Descriptive Statistics on the Effect of Individual Accountability in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

For the purpose of analysis, the mean and the standard deviation from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) were determined and summarized in Table 4.3 and 4.4. Moreover, frequency and percentages ratings of learners’ (experimental group) perceptions for each item in the questionnaire were determined and summarized in Table 4.3. The analysis, thus, begin with the mean and standard deviation on the effect of individual accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual accountability pre-test</td>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>10.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>6.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.3 show the pre-test mean scores of LESSAT E= (M = 38.56, SD = 10.276) which was greater than C = (M = 37.82, SD = 6.464). Since these were raw scores, a t-test was undertaken to determine whether the difference between the sets of scores for experimental and control groups were statistically significant. Moreover, to determine the effect of CL individual accountability on learners’ English Speaking Skills, the mean and standard deviation from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) and frequency and percentages from the questionnaire for the level of agreement on a three-point Likert scale was the most preferred technique for the descriptive statistics. This statistics helped to determine the effect of CL individual accountability on learners’ English language Speaking skills. The analysis, thus, began with the descriptive statistics of the variable individual accountability.
language speaking skills, a mean gain analysis was done on pre and post-test means as shown in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4:** Descriptive statistic for mean gain analysis on CL individual accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-test means</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test mean</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>37.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gain</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.2 Mean Gain Analysis on Effect of Individual Accountability in CL on Learner’s English Speaking Skills

Table 4.4 shows the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group. These results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (6.82) for individual accountability is more than that of Control group (2.62). This may have been as a result of the treatment that was given to the Experimental group. This is also supported by what was observed by the researcher and recorded in the observation guide as the learners worked in their cooperative groups. At the beginning of the study learners were not able to construct clear and grammatical sentences. They were heard uttering sentences such as `Mary eated all the food she was gived' instead of `Mary ate all the food she was given’. The learners also code switched and code mixed most of the time as they spoke for example one of the learners was heard saying `the teacher said tu-note down hizi points’ instead of `the teacher said we note down these points. In the last week of the experiment, however, learners were noticed to have improved so much and could construct clear, correct and grammatical sentences as they spoke. This is in line with Brown & Parker (2009) and Lynch, (2016) who stated that group member’s work harder when they know they can’t
depend on others and due to being responsible; they achieve better and help others learn.

4.4.3 Learners’ Perceptions on the Effect of Individual Accountability in CL on Learners’ English language Speaking Skills

These descriptive statistics from the Learners’ English Speaking Skills were followed by analysis of data from questionnaire to test the experimental group perception on the effect of individual accountability on Learners’ English Speaking Skills. This was analyzed and presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistic on the effect of individual accountability in CL on Learners English Speaking Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning has helped me construct correct and clear sentences in English speaking.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use the right tenses when speaking in English.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use the common English vocabulary correctly in speaking.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use correct English grammar in speaking.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that from the questionnaires, majority 24(72.7%) of the learners stated that, it was true that cooperative learning helped students construct correct sentences in English, 5(15.2%) learners were undecided on the statement and 4(12.1%) learners indicated that the statement was false. In addition, most 25(75.8%) of the learners believed that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to use the right tenses when speaking English, 5(15.2%) learners were undecided, while 3(9.1%) of the learners indicated that the statement was false. The findings were
supported by what was observed that: always, through cooperative learning, learners were able to construct correct sentences in English and could also use the right tenses when speaking English towards the end of the study. This implies that for improved learners English speaking skills, teachers should adopt individual accountability in cooperative learning to enable learners construct correct sentences in English, use the right tenses when speaking in English, use common English vocabulary correctly in speaking and use correct English grammar in speaking.

Similarly, majority 19(57.6%) of the learners believed that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to use common English vocabulary correctly in speaking, 8(24.2%) learners indicated that the statement was false and 6(18.2%) learners were undecided on the statement. Lastly, most 20(60.6%) learners felt that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to use correct English grammar in speaking, 9(27.3%) learners indicated that the statement was false and 4(12.1%) learners were undecided on the statement. The findings were supported by what was observed that: always, through cooperative groups, students learnt to use common English vocabulary correctly in speaking and correct English grammar in speaking. At the beginning of the study these skills were rarely used appropriately in that learners had a lot of difficulty in separating homophones for example, `desert and dessert, principal and principle’ and others. CL activities could have helped the learners improve on these skills.

The results confirm the findings of Jolliffe (2007) and Ning (2011) that, individual accountability is important as through it, each member of the group is held for doing his/her share of the work and for the success of the group. Besides, it is important that the group knows the strength or weakness of each member in handling the task. It is
also vital that group members know they cannot depend on the work of other. Each learner in the group is therefore, required to have a personal responsibility to learn and help other members of the group learn (Brown & Parke; 2009). This descriptive statistics analysis of objective one was followed by an independent sample t-test to determine the effect of individual accountability in CL on learners’ achievement in English language speaking skills. This was analyzed under the following sub-section.

### 4.4.4 Independent sample t test for the effect of individual accountability in CL on learners’ achievement in English speaking skills

The hypothesis which was tested here is: There is no statistically significant difference of CL individual accountability on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

The independent sample t test at $p \leq 0.05$ significance level illustrating statistically significant effect of individual accountability on learners’ achievement are as summarized in Table 4.6.

#### Table 4.6: Independent sample t test of the Pre-test Mean Scores on LESSAT for individual accountability pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual accountability pretest</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>9.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Table 4.6 indicate that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for individual accountability in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level of confidence. It shows that the calculated t-value was .353 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is higher than the calculated t, the findings are not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This further shows that the groups were similar therefore suitable for the study.

Therefore, the independent sample t test at $p \leq 0.05$ significance level depicting statistically significant difference of individual accountability in CL on learners’ achievement in English language speaking was done on pre and post-test means and as summarized in Table 4.7. To achieve this, the hypothesis below was tested;

**H0:** There is no statistically significant difference of CL individual accountability on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

**H1:** There is statistically significant difference of CL individual accountability on learners’ achievement in English language speaking
Table 4.7: LESSAT t test for post and pre-test mean gain analysis on individual accountability in CL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. .006</td>
<td>2.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df 66</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference 4.206</td>
<td>1.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error Difference 1.290</td>
<td>7.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower</td>
<td>1.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.880 .49082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. .006</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Difference 4.206</td>
<td>1.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error Difference 1.271</td>
<td>7.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 shows that the calculated t-value was 2.888 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is less than the calculated t, the difference between the mean gain score on LESSAT for individual accountability in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis ‘there is no statistically significant effect of individual accountability on learners’ achievement in English language speaking’ was rejected. This implies that there is a statistically significant effect of individual accountability on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. This is in line with the findings of Ning (2011) that there is a significant difference of individual accountability component on learners’ English speaking skills. This is also supported by Scheurell, (2010) who said that individual accountability enables learners to assist one another in understanding and completing assignments hence improving their speaking skills. Blumberg (2008) also indicates in his study that individual accountability in CL has some benefits resulting from social interaction amongst the learners.
4.5 Effect of interpersonal and social skills in CL on Learners English Speaking Skills

For objective two, independent sample t test was the preferred inferential statistic for analysis of data from Learners English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT). Besides, mean and standard deviation from Learners English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) and frequency and percentages from the questionnaire for the level of agreement on a three-point Likert scale was the most preferred techniques for the descriptive statistics. This statistics helped to establish the effect of CL interpersonal and social skills on learners’ English language Speaking skills. The analysis, therefore, began with the descriptive statistics of the variable interpersonal and social skills.

4.5.1. Descriptive statistics on the effect of interpersonal and social skills in CL on Learners’ English Speaking Skills

For the purpose of analysis, mean and standard deviation from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) were established and summarized in Table 4.8 and 4.9. Moreover, frequency and percentages ratings of students’ (experimental group) perceptions for each item in the questionnaire were established and summarized in Table 10. The analysis, therefore, began with the mean and standard deviation of the variable interpersonal and social skills effect (Table 4.8).
Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistics for Interpersonal and Social Skills in CL Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal and social</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>7.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>7.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.32</td>
<td>6.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.8 show the pre-test mean scores of LESSAT E = (M = 35.62, SD = 7.471) which was greater than C = (M = 35.32, SD = 6.270). Since these were raw scores, a t-test was undertaken to establish whether the difference between the sets of scores for experimental and control groups were statistically significant. Moreover, to establish the effect of CL interpersonal and social skills on learners’ English language speaking skills, a mean gain analysis was done on pre and post-test means as shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Descriptive statistics for mean gain analysis on interpersonal and social skills in CL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-test means</td>
<td>44.85</td>
<td>39.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test mean</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>35.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gain</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Mean Gain Analysis on the Effect of Interpersonal and Social Skills in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

Table 4.9 shows the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group. These results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (9.23) for interpersonal and social skills is more than that of Control group (4.36). This may have been as a result of the treatment that was given to the Experimental group. Learners may have had
enough time to practice their speaking while in cooperative learning groups leading to the improvement of the English-speaking skills. A progressive improvement on learners’ use of turn taking, polite interruption and careful listening to other people’s opinions was observed. The skill was rarely observed at the beginning of the study but by the second week it was noticed more often. This is in agreement with Scheurell, (2010) who explains that interpersonal and social skills in CL brings about a great improvement in learners’ English language speaking skills since members feel free to openly communicate with each other as they express concerns. It is also supported by Talebi and Sobhani (2012) and Ning (2011) who agree that social skills in CL lead to improved English speaking skills.

### 4.5.3 Learners Perception on the Effect of interpersonal and Social Skills Sin CL on Learners English Language Speaking Skills

These descriptive statistics from the Learners’ English Speaking Skills were followed by analysis of data from questionnaire to test the experimental group perception on the effect of interpersonal and social skills on Learners English Speaking Skills. This was analyzed and presented in Table 4.10.

**Table 4.10: Descriptive statistics for effect of interpersonal and social skills in CL on Learners English Speaking Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I have learnt to apply the skill of turn-taking in English speaking.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to listen carefully to other people’s opinions.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt how to predict when my turn to speak comes by to speak.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to apply</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60
the skill of polite interruption in speaking.

Table 4.10 shows that majority 23(69.7%) of the learners stated that, it was true that through cooperative learning, students had learnt to apply the skill of turn taking in English speaking, 7(21.2%) learners were undecided on the statement and 3(9.1%) learners indicated that the statement was false. In addition, most 20(60.6%) of the learners believed that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to listen carefully to other people’s opinions, 9(27.3%) learners indicated that the statement was false, while 4(12.1%) of the learners were undecided on the statement. The findings were supported by what was observed that: always, through cooperative groups, students had learnt to apply the skill of turn taking in English speaking and could also listen carefully to other people’s opinions. This implies that for improved learners English speaking skills, teachers should adopt interpersonal and social skills to enable learners apply the skill of turn taking in English speaking, listen carefully to other people’s opinions, predict when their turn to speak comes by and apply the skill of polite interruption in speaking.

Similarly, majority 18(54.5%) of the learners believed that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt how to predict when their turn to speak comes by, 10(30.3%) learners were undecided and 5(15.2%) of the learners indicated that the statement was false. Lastly, most 24(72.7%) learners were of the opinion that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to apply the skill of polite interruption in speaking, 6(18.2%) learners indicated that the statement was false and 3(9.1%) learners were undecided on the statement. The findings were supported by what was observed that: through cooperative groups students learnt how to predict when their turn to speak comes by and could also apply the skill of polite interruption in speaking. Learners
could all want to speak at ago as the study began such that the conversation could transform into a quarrel. They also were observed to interrupt others as they spoke and could rarely pay attention to other members’ contributions. All these were seen to have progressively improved as learners worked in their cooperative groups. By the end of the study learners took turns in speaking, politely interrupted their colleagues and closely paid attention to their group members as they spoke which is in line with Ning (2011) who argues that CL provides opportunities for interaction among students and increases their participation to discussion in class.

The results are in line with the findings of Carmichael (2009) that, learners must be taught these skills before they tackle the problem. Teachers should carefully teach their learners the required skills. The teacher is not someone who measures learners’ capacities in terms of the final product but someone who acts as a friend, coordinator, director, guide, counselor and facilitator. Kothandabang and Bagarathi (2011) too support this when they state that students placed in CL group feel a sense of belonging and learn to ask for and receive help hence learn to speak in English language and improve on the same. This descriptive statistics analysis of objective two was followed by an independent sample t test to establish the effect of interpersonal and social skills on students’ achievement in Learners’ English Speaking skills. This was analyzed under the following sub-section.

4.5.4 Effect of interpersonal and social skills in CL on students’ achievement in Learners’ English speaking skills

This was to test the hypothesis; H0: There is no statistically significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on students’ achievement in Learners English language speaking
The independent sample t test at \( p \leq 0.05 \) significance level illustrating statistically significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on students’ achievement are as summarized in Table 4.11.

**Table 4.11:** Independent sample t test of the Pre-test Mean Scores on LESSAT for interpersonal and social skills pre-test

|                          | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------
|                          | F  | Sig. | t  | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error | Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Interpersonal and social skills pretest | .982 | .325 | .176 | 66 | .861 | .294 | 1.673 | -3.046 | 3.634 |
|                          | .176 | 64.072 | .861 | .294 | 1.673 | -3.048 | 3.636 |

The results of Table 4.11 indicate that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for interpersonal and social skills in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. It shows that the calculated t-value was .176 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is higher than the calculated t, the findings are not statistically significant at \( \alpha = 0.05 \). This further shows that the groups were similar therefore suitable for the study.

Therefore, the independent sample t test at \( p \leq 0.05 \) significance level depicting statistically significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on students’ achievement in Learners’ English language speaking was done on pre and post-test means and as summarized in Table 4.12. To achieve this, the hypothesis below was tested;
**H0**: There is no statistically significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on students’ achievement in Learners English language speaking

**H1**: There is statistically significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on students’ achievement in Learners’ English language speaking

**Table 4.12**: LESSAT t-test for the post and pre-test mean gain analysis on interpersonal and social skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 shows that the calculated t-value was 2.953 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is less than the calculated t, the difference between the mean gain score on LESSAT for interpersonal and social skills in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis ‘there is no statistically significant effect of interpersonal skills on students’ achievement in English language speaking’ was rejected. This implies that there is a statistically significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. This supports the findings of Patternpitchet (2011) that there is a significant effect of interpersonal and social skills on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. Students while exchanging information share ideas and use each other’s resources and coordinate their efforts to
maximize their productivity and achievement (Richards, 2011). He states that for learners in CL classes to achieve in turn-taking skills, there are cooperative and interpersonal skills in which some students may already be, to different degrees proficient in some of these skills.

4.6 Effect of face to face promotive interaction in CL on Learners English Speaking Skills

For objective three, independent sample t test was the preferred inferential statistic for analysis of data from Learners English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT). Besides, mean and standard deviation from Learners English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) and frequency and percentages from the questionnaire for the level of agreement on a three-point Likert scale was the most preferred techniques for the descriptive statistics. This statistic helped assess the effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ English language speaking skills. The analysis, hence, began with the descriptive statistics of the variable face to face promotive interaction.

4.6.1. Descriptive statistics on the effect face to face promotive interaction in CL on Learners’ English Speaking Skills

For the purpose of analysis, mean and standard deviation from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) were assessed and summarized in Table 4.13 and 4.14. Moreover, frequency and percentages ratings of students’ (experimental group) perceptions for each item in the questionnaire were assessed and summarized in Table 4.15. The analysis, therefore, began with the mean and standard deviation of the variable face to face promotive interaction effect (Table 4.13).
Table 4.13: Descriptive statistics for face to face promotive interaction pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face to face promotive interaction pretest</td>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>7.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.79</td>
<td>6.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.13 show the pre-test mean scores of LESSAT \( E = (M = 37.47, SD = 7.378) \) which was greater than \( C = (M = 35.79, SD = 6.079) \). Since these were raw scores, a t-test was undertaken to assess whether the difference between the sets of scores for experimental and control groups were statistically significant. Moreover, to establish the effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ English-Speaking Skills, a mean gain analysis was done on pre and post-test means as shown in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14: Descriptive statistic for mean gain analysis on face to face promotive interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-test means</td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>37.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test mean</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>35.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gain</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Mean Gain Analysis on the Effect of Face to Face Promotive Interaction on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

Table 4.14 shows the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group. These results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (9.38) for face to face promotive interaction is more than that of Control group (2.15). This may have been as a result of the CL activities in which learners from the experimental group were engaged in. At the beginning of the study, learners were observed and recorded in the observation guide, to have a lot of difficulty in pronouncing English language words.
They could not differentiate words with sounds like /p/ from those with /b/ for example 'lamp and 'lamb'. They also seemed to mispronounce words with silent letters for example debt, hour, psalms and those with long and short vowels like in the words cot and court. This was noticed to improve as learners went on with their CL tasks and these skills had improved positively by the end of the study. Johnson and Johnson (2009) and Suhendan & Bengu (2014) agree to this when they state that through the use of face to face interaction in CL learners solve given problems and questions orally which lead to the improvement of their speaking skills.

4.6.3 Learners Perception on the Effect of Face to Face Promotive Interaction in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

These descriptive statistics from the Learners’ English Speaking Skills were followed by analysis of data from questionnaire to test the experimental group perception on the effect of face to face promotive interaction on Learners English Speaking Skills. This was analyzed and presented in Table 4.15

Table 4.15: Descriptive statistics on the effect of CL face to face promotive interaction on Learners' English Speaking Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I have learnt to take note of silent letters in English speaking.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify and separate homophones in English speaking as I interacted in cooperative groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I learnt to pronounce English words correctly in speaking.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to separate English long vowels from short vowels in speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15 shows that majority 20(60.6%) of the learners optioned that, it was true that through cooperative learning, students had learnt to take note of silent letters in English speaking, 11(33.3%) learners indicated that the statement was false and 2(6.1%) learners were undecided on the statement. In addition, most 20(60.6%) of the learners believed that, it was true they could identify and separate homophones in English speaking after they interacted in cooperative groups, 9(27.3%) learners indicated the statement was false, while 4(12.1%) of the learners were undecided on the statement. The findings were supported by what was observed that: through cooperative groups, students learnt progressively from the beginning of the study to take note of silent letters in English speaking and could also identify and separate homophones in English speaking after they interacted in cooperative groups. This implies that for improved learners English speaking skills’, teachers should adopt face to face promotive interaction to enable students take note of silent letters in English speaking, identify and separate homophones in English speaking, pronounce English words correctly in speaking and separate long vowels from short vowels in speaking.

Similarly, majority 26(78.8%) of the learners believed that, it was true through cooperative learning, they learnt to pronounce English words correctly in speaking, 5(15.2%) learners were undecided and 2(6.1%) of the learners indicated that the statement was false. Lastly, most 25(75.8%) learners felt that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to separate long vowels from short vowels in speaking, 5(15.2%) learners were undecided and 3(9.1%) of learners indicated that the statement was false. The findings were supported by what was observed that: through cooperative groups, students slowly learnt to pronounce English words correctly in speaking and could also separate long vowels from short vowels in speaking by the end of the study.
The results are in line with the findings of Talebi and Sobhani (2012) that, group work must be done interactively with group members providing one another with feedback and also teaching and encouraging others. The interaction enables the learners to complete a given task and the groups’ shared goals. Learners are required to interact verbally with one another on learning tasks. This descriptive statistics analysis of objective three was followed by an independent sample t-test to assess the effect of face to face promotive interaction on students’ achievement in Learners’ English Speaking skills. This was analyzed under the following sub-section. This also supports Yang (2005) who says that with the use of face to face promotive interaction, there is an improvement of the learners oral skills and motivation. Ahmed and Omer (2014) revealed that there was a remarkable development of learners’ speaking skills and attitude after the introduction of the elements of CL.

4.6.4. Independent sample t test for the effect of face to face promotive interaction in CL on learners’ achievement in English language speaking skills

To find out this, the hypothesis which was tested is; $H_0$: There is no statistically significant effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

The independent sample t-test at $p \leq 0.05$ significance level illustrating statistically significant effect of face to face promotive interaction on students’ achievement are as summarized in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Independent sample t test of the Pre-test Mean Scores on LESSAT for face to face promotive interactive Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face promotive interaction pretest</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.16 indicate that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for face to face promotive interactive in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. It shows that the calculated t-value was 1.023 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is higher than the calculated t, the findings are not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This further shows that the groups were similar therefore suitable for the study.

Therefore, the independent sample t test at $p \leq 0.05$ significance level depicting statistically significant difference of face to face promotive interaction on students’ achievement in Learners’ English language speaking was done on pre and post-test means and as summarized in Table 4.17. To achieve this, the hypothesis below was tested;

**H0**: There is no statistically significant difference of CL face to face promotive interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

**H1**: There is statistically significant difference of CL face to face promotive
interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

Table 4.17: LESSAT t test for post and pre-test mean gain analysis on CL face to face promotive interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face promotive interaction</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>21.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 shows that the calculated t-value was 4.640 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is less than the calculated t, the difference between the mean gain score on LESSAT for face to face promotive interaction in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis ‘there is no statistically significant difference of CL face to face promotive interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking’ was rejected. This implies that there is a statistically significant difference of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. This is in agreement with the findings of Talebi and Sobhani (2012) that there is a significant difference of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. Ahmed & Omer (2014) noted a remarkable improvement of learners’ English language speaking skills after introducing CL elements in the teaching of English language.
4.7 Effect of positive interdependence in CL on Learners English Language Speaking Skills

For objective four, independent sample t test was the preferred inferential statistic for analysis of data from Learners English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT). Moreover, mean and standard deviation from Learners English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) and frequency and percentages from the questionnaire for the level of agreement on a three-point Likert scale was the most preferred techniques for the descriptive statistics. This statistics helped to examine the effect of positive interdependence on learners’ English Speaking skills. The analysis, hence, began with the descriptive statistics of the variable positive interdependence.

4.7.1. Descriptive statistics for effect of positive interdependence in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

For the purpose of analysis, mean and standard deviation from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) were examined and summarized in Table 4.18 and 4.19. Moreover, frequency and percentages ratings of students’ (experimental group) perceptions for each item in the questionnaire were examined and summarized in Table 20. The analysis, therefore, began with the mean and standard deviation of the variable face to face promotive interaction effect (Table 4.18).
Table 4.18: Descriptive statistics for positive interdependence pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive interdependence pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>8.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>6.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.18 show the pre-test mean scores of LESSAT E= (M = 38.71, SD = 8.329) which was greater than C = (M = 35.62, SD = 6.518). Since these were raw scores, a t-test was undertaken to examine whether the difference between the sets of scores for experimental and control groups were statistically significant. Besides, to establish the effect of positive interdependence on learners’ English Speaking Skills, a mean gain analysis was done on pre and post-test means as shown in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: Descriptive statistics for mean gain analysis on positive interdependence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-test means</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>37.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test mean</td>
<td>38.71</td>
<td>35.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gain</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.2 Mean Gain Analysis on the Effect of Positive Interdependence on Learners English Language Speaking Skills

Table 4.19 shows the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group. These results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (9.14) for positive interdependence is more than that of Control group (1.85). This might have been as a result of the treatment that was given to the Experimental group on how to use word and sentence stress, rising intonation and falling intonation in English language.
speaking. At the beginning of the study learners seemed to have been influenced by their own L1 in the use of stress and intonation. A student for example used a rising intonation for a statement: She is reading a book (rising intonation). Learners also were not able to separate nouns from verbs by stressing the relevant syllables for example in the words compound, reject, import and others. They were observed to improve on this gradually so that at the end of the study they were able to use stress and intonation appropriately which supports Johnson & Johnson (2009) when he observes that team members need to rely on each other to achieve a common goal. Learners succeed or fail together if they don’t support each other, learners must therefore work in groups to complete tasks collectively towards an academic goal in this case improvement of their English speaking skills The achievement of the group is the achievement of an individual since learners are responsible for their learning and that of others (Siltala; 2010). Each learner has to therefore put more effort in the task given to the group and eventually each of them benefits more.

4.7.3 Learners’ Perception on the Effect of Positive Interdependence on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

These descriptive statistics from the Learners’ English Speaking Skills were followed by analysis of data from questionnaire to test the experimental group perception on the effect of positive interdependence on Learners English Speaking Skills. This was analyzed and presented in Table 4.20.
Table 4.20: Descriptive statistics on the effect of positive interdependence in CL on Learners English Speaking Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have learnt through my team members to identify and use word stress in English speaking.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative learning I learnt from my friends to use falling intonation in English.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I learnt to use rising intonation in English speaking.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use sentence stress in English speaking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 shows that majority 23(69.7%) of the learners thought that, it was true that they had learnt through their team members to identify and use word stress in English speaking, 6(18.2%) learners indicated that the statement was false and 4(12.1%) learners were undecided on the statement. In addition, most 19(57.6%) of the learners believed that, it was true in cooperative learning students learnt from their friends to use falling intonation in English, 8(24.2%) learners indicated the statement was false, while 6(18.2%) of the learners were undecided on the statement. The findings were supported by what was observed that: through cooperative learning groups, students learnt gradually to identify and use word and sentence stress in English language speaking and could also use rising and falling intonation where applicable in English language speaking. This implies that for improved learners English speaking skills’, teachers should adopt CL positive interdependence to enable students identify and use word stress in English speaking, use falling intonation in English, use rising intonation in English language speaking and use sentence stress in English language speaking.
Similarly, majority 22(66.7%) of the learners believed that, it was true through cooperative learning, students learnt to use rising intonation English speaking, 6(18.2%) of the learners indicated that the statement was false and 5(15.2%) of the learners were undecided on the statement. Lastly, most 21(63.6%) learners believed that, it was true in cooperative groups, students learnt to use sentence stress in English speaking, 7(21.2%) learners indicated that the statement was false and 5(15.2%) learners were undecided on the statement. The findings were supported by what was observed that: in cooperative groups, students learnt to use rising intonation in English language speaking and could also use sentence stress in English language speaking. When the instructor divides tasks among members and ensures that each member contributes before the task is completed, each learner ends up speaking and improves his speaking skills (Johnson & Johnson; 2009).

The results are in line with the findings of Senel (2006) that, it should be noteworthy that interference or negative transfer from the first language is likely to cause errors in aspiration, intonation, rhythm, and melody in the target language but in CL these errors can be eliminated. This descriptive statistics analysis of objective four was followed by an independent sample t test to assess the effect of positive interdependence on students’ achievement in Learners’ English Speaking skills. This was analyzed under the following sub-section.

4.7.4. Independent sample t test on the effect of positive interdependence in CL on learners’ achievement in English language speaking skills

To achieve this, the hypothesis tested was: **H04**: There is no statistically significant effect of positive interdependence on students’ achievement in Learners English language speaking.
The independent sample t test at $p \leq 0.05$ significance level illustrating statistically significant difference of positive interdependence on students’ achievement are as summarized in Table 4.21.

**Table 4.21: Independent sample t test of the Pre-test Mean Scores on LESSAT for positive interdependence pre-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive interdependence pretest</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>.6239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.21 indicate that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for positive interdependence in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. It shows that the calculated t-value was 1.703 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is higher than the calculated t, the findings are not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This further shows that the groups were similar therefore, suitable for the study.

Therefore, the independent sample t test at $p \leq 0.05$ significance level depicting statistically significant difference of positive interdependence on learners’ achievement in English language speaking was done on pre and post-test means and as summarized in Table 4.22. To achieve this, the hypothesis below was tested:

**H04:** There is no statistically significant difference of positive interdependence on
learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

**H1a:** There is statistically significant difference of positive interdependence on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.

Table 4.22: LESSAT t test for post and pre-test mean gain analysis on positive interdependence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive interdependence</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>42.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 shows that the calculated t-value was 4.156 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is less than the calculated t, the difference between the mean gain score on LESSAT for positive interdependence in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis ‘there is no statistically significant difference of positive interdependence on learners’ achievement in English language speaking’ was rejected. This implies that there is a statistically significant difference of positive interdependence on students’ achievement in Learners’ English language speaking. This supports the findings of Ahmed and Omer (2014) that there is a significant difference of CL positive interdependence on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. It is also in agreement with Ning (2011) and Morozova (2013) who argue that
pronunciation is a global construct which has received more attention in many ESL classrooms and its improvement has been achieved mainly through positive interdependence in CL.

4.8 Effect of cooperative learning on Learners’ English language speaking skills

4.8.1. Descriptive statistics for the effect of cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills

For analysis purposes, mean and standard deviation from Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test (LESSAT) were assessed and summarized in Table 4.23 and 4.24. The analysis, thus, began with the mean and standard deviation of the variable cooperative learning effect (Table 4.23).

Table 4.23: Descriptive statistics for Cooperative Learning Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>7.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>4.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Researcher, 2017)

The results in Table 4.23 show the pre-test mean scores of ESAT, E= (M = 37.07, SD = 7.189) which was greater than C = (M = 36.14, SD = 4.855). Since these were raw scores, a t-test was undertaken to assess whether the difference between the sets of scores for experimental and control groups were statistically significant. Besides, to assess the effect of cooperative learning on learners’ English-speaking skills, a mean gain analysis was done on pre and post-test means as shown in Table 4.24.
Table 4.24: Descriptive statistics for mean gain analysis on cooperative learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-test means</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test mean</td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>36.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gain</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8.2 Mean Gain Analysis on the Effect of Cooperative Learning on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

Table 4.24 shows the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group. These results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (8.54) for cooperative learning is more than that of Control group (2.74). This may have been as a result of the treatment that was given to the Experimental group. The researcher observed that at the beginning of the study learners were faced with a lot of problems when communicating in English. This was evidenced by their frequent code switching from English to Kiswahili and also code mixing of English and Kiswahili words. They constructed ungrammatical sentences most of the time and could pronounce given English words correctly. Word and sentence stress and intonation used were so much under the influence of L1 as noticed from their accent. Learners improved on their use of these skills progressively from the beginning of the study and by the end of the study it was observed that they had improved a great deal. This descriptive statistics analysis of cooperative learning was followed by an independent sample t test to establish the effect of cooperative learning on students’ achievement in Learners’ English Speaking skills. This was analyzed under the following sub-section.
4.8.3. Independent sample t test for the effect of cooperative learning on learners’ achievement in English language speaking

The independent sample t test at \( p \leq 0.05 \) significance level illustrating statistically significant difference of cooperative learning on students’ achievement are as summarized in Table 4.25.

**Table 4.25: Independent sample t test of the Pre-test Mean Scores on LESSAT for cooperative learning pre-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variances</td>
<td>5.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4.25 indicate that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for cooperative learning in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. It shows that the calculated t-value was .628 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is higher than the calculated t, the findings are not statistically significant at \( \alpha = 0.05 \). This further shows that the groups were similar therefore, suitable for the study.

Therefore, the independent sample t test at \( p \leq 0.05 \) significance level depicting statistically significant difference of cooperative learning on students’ achievement in
Learners’ English language speaking was done on pre and post-test means and as summarized in Table 4.26.

**Table 4.26: LESSAT t test for post and pre-test mean gain analysis on cooperative learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate learning mean</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>17.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.26 shows that the calculated t-value was 4.322 with a degree of freedom of 66. Since the critical t is less than the calculated t, the difference between the mean gain score on LESSAT for cooperative learning in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Therefore, it implies that there is a statistically significant effect of cooperative learning on learners’ achievement in English language speaking.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the major findings of the study, conclusion and recommendation of the study.

5.2 Summary of the major Findings

The summary is divided as per the study objectives, specifically; determine the effect of individual accountability on learners’ English-speaking skills, establish the effect of interpersonal and social skills on learners’ English-speaking skills, assess the effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ English-speaking skills, examine the influence of positive interdependence on learners’ English-speaking skills in Nandi Central Sub-County, Nandi County.

5.2.1 Effect of individual accountability in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

The study determined the effect of individual accountability on Learners’ English Speaking Skills. The findings revealed a pre-test mean scores of LESSAT E= (M = 38.56, SD = 10.276) which was greater than C = (M = 37.82, SD = 6.464). On the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group, the results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (6.82) for individual accountability is more than that of Control group (2.62).
Moreover, the study determined the perception of the experimental group on the effect of individual accountability on Learners’ English Speaking Skills using questionnaire. Thus, majority of the learners revealed that; it was true that cooperative learning helped students construct correct sentences in English; cooperative groups, students learnt to use the right tenses when speaking English, cooperative groups, students learnt to use common English vocabulary correctly in speaking and cooperative groups, students learnt to use correct English grammar in speaking at 24(72.7%), 25(75.8%), 19(57.6%) and 20(60.6%) respectively.

On the inferential statistics, the independent sample t test for the individual accountability pre-test revealed that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for individual accountability in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This is because the calculated t-value (.353) with a degree of freedom of 66 was less than the critical t. Besides, to test the hypothesis, the independent sample t test for the individual accountability mean gain analysis revealed that the difference between the mean gains score on LESSAT for individual accountability in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This is because the calculated t (2.888) with a degree of freedom of 66 was higher than the critical t. This is supported by Ning,(2011) that there is a significant effect of individual accountability component on learners’ English speaking skills.

5.2.2 Effect of interpersonal and social skills in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

The study established the effect of interpersonal and social skills on Learners’ English Speaking Skills. The findings revealed a pre-test mean scores of LESSAT E= (M =
35.62, SD = 7.471) which was greater than C = (M = 35.32, SD = 6.270). On the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group, the results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (9.23) for interpersonal and social skills is more than that of Control group (4.36).

In addition, the study established the perception of the experimental group on the effect of interpersonal and social skills on Learners’ English Speaking Skills using questionnaire. Thus, majority of the learners established that; it was true that through cooperative learning, students had learnt to apply the skill of turn taking in English speaking; in cooperative groups, students learnt to listen carefully to other people’s opinions; in cooperative groups, students learnt how to predict when their turn to speak comes by and in cooperative groups, students learnt to apply the skill of polite interruption in speaking at 23(69.7%), 20(60.6%), 18(54.5%) and 24(72.7%) respectively.

On the inferential statistics, the independent sample t test for the interpersonal and social skills pre-test revealed that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for interpersonal and social skills in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at α = 0.05. This is because the calculated t-value (.176) with a degree of freedom of 66 was less than the critical t. This implies that the groups were similar therefore, suitable for the study. Besides, to test the hypothesis, the independent sample t test for the interpersonal and social skills mean gain analysis revealed that the difference between the mean gains score on LESSAT for interpersonal and social skills in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This is because; the calculated t (2.953) with a degree of freedom of 66 was higher than the critical t. This confirms
Scheurell,(2010) who explains that interpersonal and social skills in CL brings about a great improvement in learners’ English language speaking skills since members feel free to openly communicate with each other. Talebi and Sobhani(2012)and Ning (2011) also agree that social skills in CLA lead to improved English speaking skills.

5.2.3 Effect of face to face promotive interaction in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

The study assessed the effect of face to face promotive interaction on Learners’ English Speaking Skills. The findings revealed a pre-test mean scores of LESSAT E= (M = 37.47, SD = 7.378) which was greater than C = (M = 35.79, SD = 6.079). On the mean gain analysis for Experimental and Control group, the results show that the mean gain for Experimental group (9.38) for face to face promotive interaction is more than that of Control group (2.15). This may have been as a result of the treatment that was given to the Experimental group.

Moreover, the study assessed the perception of the experimental group on the effect of face to face promotive interaction on Learners’ English Speaking Skills using questionnaire. Thus, majority of the learners established that; it was true that through cooperative learning, students had learnt to take note of silent letters in English speaking; they could identify and separate homophones in English speaking after they interacted in cooperative groups; through cooperative learning, they learnt to pronounce English words correctly in speaking and in cooperative groups, students learnt to separate long vowels from short vowels in speaking at 20(60.6%), 20(60.6%), 26(78.8%) and 25(75.8%) respectively.
On the inferential statistics, the independent sample t test for the face to face promotive interaction pre-test revealed that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for face to face promotive interaction in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This is because the calculated $t$-value (1.023) with a degree of freedom of 66 was less than the critical $t$. This implies that the groups were similar therefore, suitable for the study. Besides, to test the hypothesis, the independent sample t test for the face to face promotive interaction mean gain analysis revealed that the difference between the mean gains score on LESSAT for face to face promotive interaction in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This is because, the calculated $t$ (4.640) with a degree of freedom of 66 was higher than the critical $t$. This supports Talebi and Sobhani,(2012) who agree that there is a positive significant effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. Ahmed and Omer(2014) noted a remarkable improvement of learners English speaking skills after introducing CL components in the teaching of English.

5.2.4 Effect of positive interdependence in CL on Learners’ English Language Speaking Skills

The study examined the effect of positive interdependence on Learners’ English Speaking Skills. The findings revealed a pre-test mean scores of LESSAT $E$= (M = 38.71, SD = 8.329) which was greater than $C$ = (M = 35.62, SD = 6.518). On the mean gain for Experimental group (9.14) for positive interdependence is more than that of Control group (1.85).
In addition, the study examined the perception of the experimental group on the effect of positive interdependence on Learners’ English Speaking Skills using questionnaire. Thus, majority of the learners revealed that; it was true that they had learnt through their team members to identify and use word stress in English speaking; in corporative learning students learnt from their friends to use falling intonation in English; through cooperative learning, students learnt to use rising intonation English speaking and students learnt to use sentence stress in English speaking at 23(69.7%), 19(57.6%), 22(66.7%) and 21(63.6%) respectively.

On the inferential statistics, the independent sample t test for the positive interdependence pre-test revealed that the difference between the mean score on LESSAT for positive interdependence in the experimental group and in the control group were not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. This is because the calculated t-value (1.703) with a degree of freedom of 66 was less than the critical t. This implies that the groups were similar therefore, suitable for the study. Besides, to test the hypothesis, the independent sample t test for the positive interdependence mean gain analysis revealed that the difference between the mean gains score on LESSAT for positive interdependence in the experimental group and in the control group were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This is because; the calculated t (4.156) with a degree of freedom of 66 was higher than the critical t. Siltala,(2010), states that the achievement of an individual is the achievement of the group since learners are responsible for their learning and that of others.

5.3 Conclusions

From the findings, the researcher concludes that, Cooperative Learning Approach has a significant positive effect on learners’ speaking skills in secondary schools in Nandi
Central Sub-County, Nandi County. Consequently, individual accountability has a statistically significant positive effect on learners English Speaking Skills. That is, individual accountability enables students to construct correct sentences in English, use the right tenses when speaking English, use common English vocabulary correctly in speaking and use correct English grammar in speaking.

On the effect of interpersonal and social skills on learners English Speaking Skills, the study concludes that, interpersonal and social skills have a statistically significant positive effect on learners English Speaking Skills. That is, interpersonal and social skills help students to apply the skill of turn taking in English speaking, listen carefully to other people’s opinions, predict when their turn to speak comes by and apply the skill of polite interruption in speaking. Moreover, face to face promotive interaction has a statistically significant positive effect on learners English Speaking Skills. That is face to face promotive interactive helps students to identify and separate homophones in English speaking, pronounce English words correctly in speaking and separate long vowels from short vowels in speaking.

Lastly, on the effect of positive interdependence on learners English Speaking Skills, the study concludes that positive interdependence has a statistically significant positive effect on learners English Speaking Skills. That is positive interdependence helps students to identify and use word stress in English speaking, use of falling intonation in English, use of rising intonation in English speaking and use of sentence stress in English speaking.
5.4 Recommendations

From the findings, conclusions and the direction from the literature review, the study makes the following recommendations to enhance students’ English-Speaking Skills;

i. Teachers to consider and use cooperative learning as one of the new methods that can help to improve learners English Speaking Skills.

ii. The government, policy makers, school management and QASO should encourage and ensure implementation of cooperative learning by in servicing English language teachers as this is the best method to ensure students improvement in English Speaking Skills.

iii. The curriculum developers should consider incorporating cooperative learning as one of the important teaching methods which can help in acquisition of knowledge in English Speaking by mobilizing both teachers of English language and other stakeholders through workshops.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

The researcher suggests the following for further areas of research;

i. The study was limited to four variables; individual accountability, interpersonal and social skills, face to face promotive interaction and positive interdependence, thus, a further study should also be carried out to assess the effect of other cooperative learning components on English Speaking Skills.

ii. To gain an ample understanding on this subject, future research should be narrowed down to the effect of each indicator (individual accountability,
interpersonal and social skills, face to face promotive interaction and positive interdependence) on students’ English reading, writing and listening Skills.

iii. Future studies should be done within a little longer period of time to be able to use more research instruments to give results from many dimensions.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Kisii University
P.O Box 6434
Eldoret
05/01/2017.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

RE: EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

I am Elizabeth Jepkosgei a student undertaking a Master in Education, at Kisii University, Eldoret. In order to complete this program, I am required to research and present a Thesis on the “Effects of cooperative learning on English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary School Learners in Nandi Central Sub-County, Kenya”. This research is purely for academic purposes and the information you give will be treated with confidentiality. Do not indicate your name anywhere on this questionnaire. I kindly request you to participate in my study and your responses to the items in the questionnaire will be kept with utmost confidentiality. The results will not be used for any other purposes except this study. This study will enable you to positively improve your English language speaking skills. You are free to withdraw from participating in the study at any time you feel inconvenienced.

Thank you
Yours faithfully

Elizabeth Jepkosgey
APPENDIX II- STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Introduction
This questionnaire is purely meant for academic research. Please fill in responses as truthfully as you can.

SECTION A:
Indicate your answer by putting a tick (✓) in the appropriate space provided.

1. The student answering this questionnaire is a
   (a) Boy
   (b) Girl

2. What is your age?
   (a) 14-15 years
   (b) 16-17 years
   (c) 18-above years

SECTION B
Effect of individual accountability on learners’ English speaking skills
Rate yourself by marking with a tick inside the box containing the extent of your agreement following each of the given statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence of individual accountability on English speaking</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning has helped me construct correct and clear sentences in English speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use the right tenses when speaking in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use the common English vocabulary correctly in speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use correct English grammar in speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In your own view do you think by being accountable for your group tasks in cooperative learning you got access to many opportunities to speak in English?
Explain........................................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................................................

100
SECTION C

Effect of interpersonal and social skills on learners’ English speaking language skills

Rate yourself by marking with a tick inside the box indicating the extent of your agreement following each of the given statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of interpersonal and social skills on learners’ English speaking.</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I have learnt to apply the skill of turn-taking in English speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to listen carefully to other people’s opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt how to predict when my turn to speak comes by to speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to apply the skill of polite interruption in speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What was your experience as you exchanged ideas while in cooperative groups? Did it have any impact on your English speaking?

SECTION D

Effect of CL face to face promotive interaction on learners’ English language speaking skills

Rate yourself by marking with a tick inside the box containing the extent of your agreement following each of the given statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of face to face promotive interaction on learners’ English speaking skills</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I have learnt to take note of silent letters in English speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify and separate homophones in English speaking as I interacted in cooperative groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I learnt to pronounce English words correctly in speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to separate English long vowels from short vowels in speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you think the pronunciation of words employed in cooperative learning interaction had an influence on your English speaking? Explain

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
SECTION E

Effect of CL positive interdependence on learners’ English language speaking skills

Rate yourself by marking with a tick inside the box containing the extent of your agreement following each of the given statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of positive interdependence on learners’ English speaking skills</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have learnt through my team members to identify and use word stress in English speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative learning I learnt from my friends to use falling intonation in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through cooperative learning I learnt to use rising intonation in English speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative groups I learnt to use sentence stress in English speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In your own view, do you think your team members impacted on your English speaking skills? Explain

..................................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX III: AN OBSERVATION GUIDE

Participants’ observation guide to be used by the researcher in monitoring learners’ activities in cooperative groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners speaking skills observed in cooperative learning groups</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Correct structuring of sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. correct use of common English vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. correct use of tenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. correct use of grammar in sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>interpersonal and social skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. polite interruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. careful listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Turn-taking in speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face to Face promotive interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. taking note of silent letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. separation of homophones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. separation of short vowels from long vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>positive interdependence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. use of word stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. use of sentence stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. use of falling intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. use of rising intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant observation guide to be used by the researchers in monitoring of learners activities in cooperative groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners speaking skills observed in cooperative learning groups</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Individual accountability</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Correct structuring of sentences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. correct use of common English vocabulary</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. correct use of tenses</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. correct use of grammar in sentences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>interpersonal and social skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. polite interruption</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. careful listening</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Turn-taking in speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Face to Face promotive interaction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. taking note of silent letters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. separation of homophones</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. separation of short vowels from long vowels</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cooperative learning</strong></th>
<th><strong>positive interdependence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. use of word stress</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. use of sentence stress</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. use of falling intonation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. use of rising intonation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: LEARNERS’ ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS ACHIEVEMENT
TEST (LESSAT)

Pre-test

1. Fill the blank spaces below using the correct form of the word in brackets. (3mks)

   I bought the book due to its …………………………. (unique)

   That country was said to be leading in ………………………. (corrupt)

   In some schools, students with ………………………. (able) are discriminated

2. Construct two sentences from the words below to show their meaning. (5mks)

   a) Desert
   b) Pupil
   c) Bank
   d) Compound
   e) Produce

3. Change the following sentences into the past tense (5mks)

   i. I am reading a book

   ii. They are walking to the bus stage

   iii. Mr. Kamau is working on his farm

   iv. The teacher is teaching tense in class

   v. We are going home

4. Correct the mistakes from the following sentences to make them grammatically correct

   a) Ocol in love is with Tina
   b) To end is the lesson about

5. Explain what has gone wrong in the conversation between Sidi and Sumra below (5mks)

   Sidi: Road safety in Kenya has tremendously improved the introduction of the new traffic regulations. Actually, I am reliably informed that there is a 99% drop in the rate of ………………………..

   Sumra: (Laughing loudly) Stop lying. Those statistics only exist in your head and not ………………………..
Sidi: What will a semi illiterate like you know about statistics, anyway? As I was saying………………………………………..

Sumra: I wonder how come the central bureau of statistics has not employed a genius like you. You would be such an asset!

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

6. You are stranded in a bus stop. You decide to ring your head teacher to report that you cannot arrive in school in time for classes.

   Below is part of the telephone conversation. Fill in the other part.
   
   You: ……………………………………………………………………………
   
   School secretary: I am sorry to inform you that the head teacher is in a meeting and cannot speak to you at the moment.
   
   You:…………………………………………………………………………(2mks)
   
   School secretary: may I know who your class teacher is please?
   
   You: ……………………………………………………………………..(1mk)
   
   School secretary: I am sorry Mrs Mwangi is already in class. Can you please leave a message?
   
   You: ……………………………………………………………………..(1mk)
   
   School secretary: Oh! Mrs Muli is your house mistress? Just hold on as I connect you to her.
   
   Mrs Muli: Hello. What can I do for you?
   
   You: ……………………………………………………………………..(3mks)
   
   Mrs Muli: I see, I’ll inform your classteacher about your predicament. Do your best to be here for your next class. Bye for now.
   
   You: ……………………………………………………………………..(1mk)

7. In each case give another word pronounced the same as the one below (5mks)
   
   a) Knew  
   b) Passed  
   c) Bear  
   d) Pair  
   e) Pail

8. Pick the odd word out in each set according to the pronunciation of the letters in bold (2mks)
   
   Gist, gesture, garage
   
   Sugar, sure, pleasure
9. Identify silent letters from the following words (5mks)
   a) Psalms
   b) Tomb
   c) Knew
   d) Debt
   e) Pneumonia

10. In each of the following sets of words, identify the odd one
    a) Fool, pool, full
    b) Lone, loan, lorn
    c) Hard, heard, herd

11. Write besides each of the following sentences indicating whether they are read with rising or falling intonation (10mks)
    a) I am reading a book
    b) Are you going home?
    c) What is the name of your school?
    d) One, two, three ..............................................
    e) He failed in English?
    f) Mother: have you had something to eat?
    g) Daughter: No.
    h) Mother: You must be very hungry then
    i) Daughter: Not just hungry; I’m starving
    j) Mother: Well, lunch will be ready in a few minutes.

12. Underline the syllable you would like to stress in the following words in bold to bring out the intended meaning (3mks)
    a) The students are likely to rebel if there are more restrictions.
    b) The farmers could not sell their produce
    c) Mr. Nicholas will conduct the choir

13. Underline the words you would stress from the following sentences (2mks)
    a) Omolo is a gentleman
    b) We all work hard for success
APPENDIX VI: LEARNERS’ ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS

ACHIEVEMENT TEST (LESSAT)

POST-TEST

1. You are the secretary of a company and someone calls requesting to speak to the manager. The manager is not in the office. What would you remember to say and do? (5mks)

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

2. Use the following pair of words in sentences to bring out their different meanings (5mks)

i). Aisle
Isle

ii). Council
Counsel

iii). Principle
Principal

iv). Compliment
Complement

v). Stationary
Stationery

3. Correct the mistakes from the following sentences (3mks)

a) What is the address for your school?
b) Please excuse me delay in replying to your letter
c) The visitors eats mangoes and bananas.

4. Construct two sentences one in the past tense and one in the future tense (2mks)

…………………………………………………………………………………………
5. Imagine you are asked by your English teacher to hold a discussion on the topic “Boarding schools are better than day schools”. List five things you would do to ensure the success of the debate (5mks)

6. Write down five negotiation skills you would apply when resolving conflict (5mks)

7. You are invited as a motivational speaker to give a talk to a group of people.
State two indicators of your turn to speak after being introduced to the audience (2mks)

8. State three factors the listener ought to observe in order to gain from the speech (3mks)

9. Provide a word that is pronounced the same way for each of the words below (5mks)
   i. Bean
   ii. Kernel
   iii. Mere
   iv. Cue
   v. You

10. Write down two words that have the vowel [ii] and three with the vowel [i] (5mks)

11. Identify the silent letters from the following words (5mks)
   (a) Coup
   (b) Rapport
   (c) Plumber
   (d) Rendezvous
   (e) Honest

12. Underline the syllable that makes the difference in the following word (6mks)
    Noun verb
    Compound Compound
    Mandate Mandate
    Process Produce
13. For each of these two words, make two sentences of each to bring out the difference in their meaning (4mks)

Beat
........................................................................................................................................

Produce.................................................................................................................................

14. Give the various meanings expressed in the following sentences when the underlined words are stressed. (2mks)

a) I will send you to your father (I is underlined)
   b) I will send you to your father (father is underlined)

15. Indicate the right intonation to be used in each of the following sentences (3mks)

a) Are you sick?
   b) What were you told?
   c) They are all students
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ABSTRACT

English Language speaking practices in Kenyan secondary schools are insufficient to improve students’ progress in speaking skills. The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of Cooperative Learning (CL) on secondary school learners’ English-speaking skills in Nandi central sub-county. Objectives of this study were to establish the effect of individual accountability in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills, to determine the effect of interpersonal and social skills in cooperative learning on learners English language speaking skills, to assess the effect of face to face promotive interaction in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills and to find out the effect of positive interdependence in cooperative learning on learners’ English language speaking skills. The study used the quasi experimental with a non-equivalent control group pre-test post-test design under the mixed methods approach. The sample size was all the form three learners from the two classrooms of the selected schools. The instruments of the study included learners’ questionnaire administered to the experimental group, Learners’ English Speaking Skills Achievement Test which was administered as a pre-test and as a post-test to both the groups and an observation guide used by the researcher to monitor activities of the learners in cooperative groups. These instruments were validated by experts from the faculty of education in the university and a Pilot test was done prior to the study whereby a Cronbach coefficient of 0.7 was computed. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, and presented in tabular form while analysis from the observation guide was used for triangulation. The study revealed that there is a statistically significant effect of individual accountability (t=2.888; df=66), interpersonal and social skills (t=2.953; df=66), face to face promotive interactive (t=4.640; df=66) and positive interdependence (t=4.322; df=66) on learners’ achievement in English language speaking. It was concluded that, individual accountability, interpersonal and social skills, face to face promotive interactive and positive interdependence positively affect learners’ achievement in English language speaking. The findings of this study are beneficial to the learners of English language and their teachers in the teaching and learning of speaking skills. They are also important to teacher educators, curriculum developers and the ministry of Education on decision making. The researcher recommends that teachers of English should consider in cooperating Cooperative Learning in their teaching of English language speaking skills. The government, education policy makers and curriculum developers should also ensure the implementation of cooperative Learning in the teaching of English language at the secondary school level.
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1.0 Introduction

English classes in Kenya are traditionally teacher centered (Ndiku & Metto, 2014) and this probably may impede learners’ speaking skills. There is little communication and interaction between the teachers and the learners in the classroom which is therefore insufficient in enhancing learners’ speaking skills (Gathumbi, & Masembe, 2005). Insufficient speaking exercises in Kenyan secondary schools fail to improve learners’ progress in speaking skills (Sure & Ogechi, 2009). Learning in most of the schools is based on the teacher (Majanga, Nasongo, & Sylvia, 2010) who is seen as the authority of the classroom and learners have a limited chance to practice their speaking skills and hence find it difficult most of the time to express their thoughts in English.

The use of Cooperative Learning Approach has been extensively researched on (Siltala, et al., 2007). Most of the studies indicate that the use of Cooperative Learning which differ from the traditional learning methods, has some benefits resulting from the social interaction amongst the learners (Kim, 2005). According to Efrizal (2012) and Gilakjani (2016), speaking is beneficial to overall language development. It is true that students who interact and speak achieve better in oral skills in most cases than those who always keep silent.

Speaking is an important skill to be developed and enhanced in language learners. There is need therefore, to improve the current level of speaking skills among Kenyan secondary school learners. The effects of Cooperative Learning (CL) on learners’ speaking has been repeatedly demonstrated and confirmed by studies conducted in first and second language learning classrooms (Ning & Hornby, 2010; Ning, 2011;
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