

FAMILIARITY AND PREVALENCE OF COOPERATIVE WRITING IN ETHIOPIAN PREPARATORY HIGH SCHOOLS

*Assefa Chekol (Principal researcher) , ** Simeneh Wassie (Co- researcher)

*Lecturer, Department of English language Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

**Lecturer, Department of English language & literature, University of Debre Markos, Debre Markos, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing in Ethiopian preparatory EFL instruction. To this end, it employed mixed methods design. The participants of the study were grade 11 and 12 students and their EFL teachers at Debre Markos and Burie Shikudad Preparatory schools in Ethiopia. Using stratified random sampling, 292 students and all EFL teachers in Ethiopia Debre Markos and Burie Shikudad Preparatory high schools were selected to the study. The data were collected through questionnaire, interview and observation, and qualitative and statistical analyses were employed. Accordingly, the study found out that EFL teachers and preparatory students were slightly familiar to the characteristics, reasons and basic principles of cooperative writing, and the basic elements, positive interdependence, face to face interaction and social skills were less prevalent. On the other hand; two basic elements, individual accountability and group processing were not prevalent. It was also found that students' interests and experiences to work in groups writing, large class size, nature of writing activities, the volume of text book and, time for writing lesson were some major factors that can impede familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing. Therefore, syllabus designers, EFL teachers and academics experts should exert their efforts to familiarize cooperative writing in Ethiopian preparatory secondary schools to bring learners the center of learning.

Keywords: Familiarity, prevalence, cooperative, writing

INTRODUCTION

Cooperative writing was relatively unknown and largely ignored by educators in the mid-1960s throughout the world. Elementary, secondary, and colleges teaching was dominated by competitive and individualistic writing in the EFL classroom instruction; however, it is now an accepted and often the preferred instructional procedure at all levels of education (Johnson and Johnson 2001). Cooperative writing is presently used in schools and universities in every part of the world, in every EFL instruction, and with every age student.

In the ideal writing classroom, all students would learn how to work together with others, compete for fun and enjoyment, and work autonomously on their own. The teacher decides which goal structure to implement within each writing lesson (Richards and Rodgers 1986). The most important learning goal structure, and the one that should be used the majority of the time in learning writing, is cooperation. Cooperative writing is writing together to accomplish shared goals. Within cooperative spirit, individuals seek outcomes that are beneficial to themselves and beneficial to all other group members. It is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning. Not all groups are cooperative (Johnson & F. Johnson, 2009). To be cooperative, to

reach the full potential of the group, five basic elements need to be carefully structured into the situation such as positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, appropriate use of social skills, and group processing (Richards and Rodgers 2001).

The first and most important element is positive interdependence. Teachers must give a clear task and a group goal so students believe they “sink or swim together.” Positive interdependence exists when group members perceive that they are linked with each other in a way that one cannot succeed unless everyone succeeds. If one fails, all fail. Group members realize, therefore, that each person’s efforts benefit not only him- or herself, but all other group members as well. Positive interdependence creates a commitment to other people’s success as well as one’s own and is the heart of cooperative learning. If there is no positive interdependence, there is no cooperation.

The second basic element of cooperative writing is individual and group accountability. The group must be accountable for achieving its goals. Each member must be accountable for contributing his or her share of the work. The group has to be clear about its goals and be able to measure its progress in achieving them and the individual efforts of each of its members. The purpose of cooperative learning groups is to make each member a stronger individual in his or her right. Students learn together so that they can subsequently perform higher as individuals.

The third basic component of cooperative writing is promotive interaction, preferably face-to face. Promotive interaction occurs when members share resources and help, support, encourage, and praise each other’s efforts to learn. This includes orally explaining how to solve problems, discussing the nature of the concepts being learned, teaching one’s knowledge to classmates, and connecting present with past learning. It is through promoting each other’s learning face-to-face that members become personally committed to each other as well as to their mutual goals.

The fourth basic element of cooperative writing is teaching students the required social skills. In cooperative writing, students are required to learn academic writing task and also to learn the social skills required to function as part of a group. Group members must know how to provide effective leadership, decision-making, trust-building, communication, and conflict-management, and be motivated

to use the prerequisite skills. Since cooperation and conflict are inherently related, the procedures and skills for managing conflicts constructively are especially important for the long-term success of learning groups.

The fifth basic component of cooperative writing is group processing. Group processing exists when group members discuss how well they are achieving their goals and maintaining effective working relationships. Groups need to describe what member actions are helpful and unhelpful and make decisions about what behaviors to continue or change. Continuous improvement of the process of learning results from the careful analysis of how members are working together.

As these five elements must be carefully implemented and maintained, as parts of the world, cooperative writing in Ethiopia is now an accepted and highly recommended instructional procedure because it emphasizes active interaction between students who have diverse abilities and backgrounds. If students

engage in pairs or small groups, they tend to speak more freely than they are required to stand up and respond individually to questions from the teacher. They are also more likely to be active in the lessons than when they simply listen passively to the teacher. Cooperative learning activities also produce a valuable learning environment in which the students can correct and help each other (Richards and Rodgers 1986). Therefore, the learners become more confident and competent in using English when they have engaged in cooperative writing.

Even though cooperative learning has been decided to use in all educational institutes of Ethiopia to emphasize student center, the expected outcome hasn't yet been ascertained. The English language proficiency of the students in Ethiopia is still very low (Seid M. 2012).

With this respect, researchers and educational officers of Ethiopian preparatory schools, particularly, in Debre Markos and Burie shikudad preparatory schools have been dissatisfied with the structure of pair and group writing to promote cooperative learning in the EFL instruction. In this regard, Debates and discussions have been held on among teachers and other concerned bodies in each of their annual and six month reports. They believed that students in Burie shikudad and Debre Markos preparatory schools were not successful in writing a text at their level. Therefore, students have low writing ability in relation to what is expected of them. One factor that might be attributed to students' low writing performance more than others is the efficacy of the instruction. Therefore, cooperative learning is the best option of learning writing skills to achieve the objective of EFL instruction

Thus, this study focused on familiarity and prevalence writing of cooperative writing in Preparatory high Schools, to this end, it was intended to answer the following main questions.

- Did cooperative writing familiar and prevalent in Ethiopia Debre Markos and Burie EFL preparatory instruction?
- What were some major challenges that can impede familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing in EFL preparatory instruction?

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study was delimited in Ethiopia Debre Markos and Burie Preparatory schools. It focused on cooperative writing instruction because writing is not solitary enterprise, and it is a social act. Debre Markos and Burie shikudad preparatory high schools were randomly selected.

METHODS

A mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) design was chosen for this study due to the requirement of quantitative and qualitative data to attain the main objective of the study. Qualitative approach was employed to describe the data collected through an interview in the way that would answer the research questions. Quantitative approach was also employed to collect the data through questionnaire to analyse and discuss it statistically.

POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The subjects of the study were taken from Debre Markos and Burie shikudad preparatory high school students and EFL teachers. The total population of the study was 3157 preparatory high school students. There were also 21 English language teachers in both preparatory schools. Stratified random sampling and comprehensive sampling methods were employed to select students and teachers participants respectively.

Stratified random sampling was used in order to adequately represent student participants from each sub groups (strata) in the population in terms of school and grade level. To this end, Strata sample sizes are determined by the equation of $n_k = (N_k / N) * n$.

Where n_k is the sample size for stratum k , N_k is the population size for stratum k , N is total population size, and n is total sample size. Accordingly, 292 students were selected as participants of the study, among them 260 student participants were responding and submitting the questionnaires properly.

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

The methods of data collection of the study were questionnaire, interview and classroom observation. The questionnaire had two main parts. The first main part of the questionnaire comprised items used for gathering information pertains to familiarity of cooperative writing (CW) in the preparatory high schools (PHS). The second main part of the questionnaire contained items used to gather information pertains to prevalence of CW in PHS EFL lesson.

The other data gathering technique was semi-structured interview. The main purpose of using the semi-structured interview in this study was to get deeper information from EFL teachers about their familiarity, prevalence and some main challenges that impeded familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing in preparatory high school. The interview was employed from the selected six EFL teachers in the two preparatory schools.

Non-participant observation was also used to gather first hand information from the actual practice of cooperative writing. The purpose of the observation was to collect a practical data about familiarity and prevalence of activities pertains to the basic elements of cooperative writing. The classroom observations were conducted with co observer with a check list. Eventually the data were tailed and quantified the frequency of activities being performed and not performed.

DATA ANALYSIS

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative techniques of data analysis were used. Accordingly, the quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20 to

compute mean scores of familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing at preparatory schools. Furthermore one sample t-test was employed to see if the mean score of each variables of cooperative writing is significant. On the other hand, the qualitative data that focused on familiarity of cooperative writing and major challenges that can impede familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing were analyzed using the methods of description, narration and interpretation.

RESULTS

As noted on the above the main objective of this study was to examine familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing in preparatory high schools. To this end, the collected data through questionnaire interview and observation are presented qualitatively and statistical as the following subsection.

Students' Familiarity and prevalence to variables of Cooperative writing (CW)

Table I. One-Sample Statistics for students' response with regard to variables of Familiarity of CW

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Mean.
Characteristics of CW	260	3.27009	.563003	.034916	
Reasons for CW	260	3.48681	.645428	.040028	
principles of CW	260	3.28419	.516478	.032031	

Table 1 indicates the average mean score of students' familiarity to items of characteristics, reason and basic principles of cooperative writing. They are $m=3.27$, $m=3.49$ and $m=3.28$ respectively. From this, one can deduce that students' familiarity to items of characteristics and basic elements of CW are nearly similar, they are slightly higher than the ideal average test value of 3. Students' familiarity of items to reasons for cw is also higher than the ideal mean value of 3.

Table II. One-Sample Statistics for students' response with regard to variables of Familiarity of CW

Variables	Test Value = 0					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
characteristics of CW	93.656	259	.000	3.270085	3.20133	3.338
Reasons for CW	87.110	259	.000	3.486813	3.40799	3.565
Elements of CW	102.533	259	.000	3.284188	3.22111	3.347

The one sample t-test, on the above table2 shows that the samples seemed agree because the mean score of students' familiarity to items of characteristics, reason for and basic principles of cooperative writing shown on the above are slightly higher than the ideal average (mean) which is 3. Moreover, the p-value of the 2-tailed significance which is 0 .000 is less than the 0.05 significance level which is an additional evidence for the mean score to become significantly higher than the ideal average test value of 3.

Therefore, students' familiarity of items to characters ties and principles of CW are slightly higher than the ideal average test value of 3.

As table 2 depicted, the mean score of 3.49 of reasons for cooperative writing appears to be significantly higher than the ideal average score which is 3. Moreover, the p-value of 0.000 is less than the 0.05 level of significance. This would imply that the samples seem to agree about familiarity to reasons for cooperative writing significantly with 95% confidence interval.

Table III. One-Sample Statistics for students' response with regard to variables of Familiarity of CW

variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Table 3 reflect prevalence of
Positive interdependence	260	3.04615	.690605	.042829	
Face to face Interaction	260	3.54359	.807662	.050089	
Individual accountability	260	2.06923	1.082065	.067107	
Social skills	260	3.2910	.87895	.05451	
Group processing	260	2.5808	.93887	.05823	

elements of cooperative writing. The mean score of positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, and social skills are 3.05, 3.54, and 3.29 respectively while the mean value of individual accountability and group processing are 2.07 and 2.58. Therefore, prevalence of positive interdependence and social skills are nearly similar to the ideal mean score that is 3; the mean score of prevalence of face to face promotive interaction is higher than the ideal mean score.

On the other hand, table 3 also reveals the mean score of prevalence of individual accountability and group processing are 2.06, and 2.58 respectively. Therefore, the mean score of prevalence of individual accountability and group processing are less than the ideal average value that is 3. Therefore, individual accountability and group processing are not prevalent.

Table IV. One-Sample t-test Test with regarding to prevalence of basic Elements of CW

Variables	Test Value = 0					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
positive interdependence	71.123	259	.000	3.046154	2.96182	3.13049
Face to face interaction	70.746	259	.000	3.543590	3.44496	3.64222
Individual accountability	30.835	259	.000	2.069231	1.93709	2.20138
Social skills	60.375	259	.000	3.29103	3.1837	3.3984
Group processing	44.323	259	.000	2.58077	2.4661	2.6954

Table 4 depicts one sample t-test of elements of cooperative writing prevalence. As it can be seen on the above the mean score of positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, individual accountability, social skill and group processing are 3.05, 3.54, 2.067, 3.29 and 2.58 respectively, and the p value of each basic elements of cw is $p=0.000$ which is less than at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, each mean score of prevalence of basic element of cw is significant. Thus we can deduce that positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction and social skills are sometimes prevalent; however, individual accountability and group processing are not prevalent because the mean score of them are less than that of the ideal mean value of 3 with 95% confidence interval.

Table V. Frequency, percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to familiarity of characteristics of CW, N=20

<i>No.</i>	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	25%	0%	75%	100%	3.4889	.6185

Table 5 displays that 25% of respondents reported that they were not be familiar with the characteristics of cooperative writing. On the other hand, 75% of them believed that they were familiar with the characteristics of cooperative writing. The mean of teachers' response indicated that their familiarity about characteristics of cooperative writing is 3.49. This shows teachers were familiar to the characteristics of cooperative writing. Therefore, majority of respondents believed that they were familiar with characteristics of cooperative writing. Because the mean score is higher than the ideal mean score of 3.

Table VI. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to reasons for cw, N=20

<i>No.</i>	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	10%	0%	90%	100%	3.3571	.3664

Table 6 depicts that 10% of respondents reported that they were disagree to be familiar with reasons for cooperative writing. On the other hand, 90% of them believed that they were familiar with reasons for cooperative writing. The mean of teachers' response indicated that their knowledge about reasons for cooperative writing is 3.36. This shows that teachers were familiar to reasons for cooperative writing. From this result, we can deduce that the familiarity of teachers to reasons for cooperative writing is slight higher than the ideal mean score 3.

Table VII. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to basic principles of cw, N=20

<i>No.</i>	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	10%	5%	85%	100%	3.4388	.4362

Table 7 shows that 10% of respondents didn't believe that they were familiar with the basic principles of cooperative writing, and 5% of them were neither disagree nor agree that they were familiar to the basic elements of cooperative writing. On the other hand, 85% of them agreed that they were familiar to reasons for cooperative writing. The mean score of teachers' familiarity with the basic elements of cooperative writing is 3.44. This indicates that teachers' seemed to be familiar to the basic principles of cooperative writing. From this result, it could be inferred that the familiarity of teachers to the basic elements of cooperative writing is slightly higher than the ideal mean score 3.

Table VIII. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to prevalence of positive interdependence N=20

<i>No.</i>	Not prevalent	Sometimes	Prevalent	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	35%	20%	45%	100%	3.0900	.8168

Table 8 displayed that 35% of teachers' reported that positive interdependence is not prevalent, and 20% of them reported that sometimes it is prevalent. On the other hand, 45% of them reported that positive interdependence is prevalent. The mean of teachers' response indicated that prevalence of positive interdependence is 3.09. This shows positive interdependence sometimes involved in group writing lesson. From this result, we can conclude that the involvement of positive interdependence is equal to average mean 3; i.e. sometimes involved.

Table IX. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to prevalence of face to face promotive interaction N=20

<i>No.</i>	Not prevalent	Sometimes	Prevalent	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	40%	10%	50%	100%	3.116	.880

Table 9 displayed that 40% of teachers' reported that face to face promotive interaction is not prevalent, and 10% of them reported that sometimes it is prevalent. On the other hand, half of the respondents (i.e., 50%) reported that face to face promotive interaction is prevalent. The mean of teachers' response indicates that prevalence of face to face promotive interaction is 3.12. This shows face to face promotive interaction sometimes involved in EFL lesson. From this result, we can conclude that the involvement of face to face promotive interaction is nearly equal to average mean 3;

Table X. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to individual accountability N=20

No.	Not prevalent	Sometimes	Prevalent	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	75%	10%	15%	100%	2.50	.8002

Table 10 revealed that 75% of teachers' reported that individual accountability is less prevalent, and 10% of them reported that sometimes it is prevalent. On the other hand, 15% of them reported that individual accountability is prevalent. The mean of teachers' response indicated that prevalence of individual accountability is 2.500. This shows individual accountability is not prevalent in EFL writing lesson. From this result, we can conclude that prevalence of individual accountability is less than average mean 3;

Table XI. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to social skills N=20

No.	Not prevalent	Sometimes	Prevalent	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	30%	15%	50%	100%	3.26	.834

Table 11 displayed that 30% of teachers' reported that social skills items are less prevalent, and 15% of them reported that social skills items are sometimes involved. On the other hand, half of the respondents (i.e., 50%) reported that items for social skills are prevalent. The mean of teachers' response indicated that the prevalence of social skills is 3.266. This shows social skills is prevalent in writing lesson. From this result, we can conclude that the prevalence of social skills in group writing is slight higher than 3.

Table XII. Frequency percentage and mean of teachers' response with regard to group processing N=20

No.	Not prevalent	Sometimes	Prevalent	Total	Mean	Std. Deviation
Frequency%	70%	20%	10%	100%	2.0750	.9357

Table 12 reveals that 70% of teachers' reported that the items of group processing are not prevalent, and 20% of them reported that group processing are sometimes prevalent. On the other hand, 10% of them reported that group processing items are prevalent. The mean of teachers' response indicated that prevalence of group processing is 2.0750. This shows group processing is not prevalent in EFL writing lesson. From this result, we can conclude that prevalence of group processing is less than average mean 3;

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION DATA ANALYSIS

This is the section at which data gathered through sixteen continuous writing classroom observations summarized and presented.

Table XIII. Percentage and frequency of prevalence of activities with regard to basic elements of cooperative writing

<i>Variables</i>	(+) %	(-) %	Total%
Decision before group work.	41.67	58.33	100
Positive Interdependence	28.125	71.875	100
Individual accountability	23.96	76.04	100
Social skills	41.67	58.33	100
Group processing	7.812	92.19	100

Performed (+) Not performed (-)

Table 13 shows data collected through sixteen continuous classroom observations to collect the data pertain to activities of basic elements of cooperative writing. As it is shown, 41.67% and 58.33 % of activities associated with decisions before the group writing task were performed and not performed respectively. Therefore, the majority of the activities associated to decisions before group work were not performed. This result shows that decisions performed before group writing task was low.

The table also depicts 28.125, 23.96, 41.67, and 7.812 percent of the total observed activities of positive interdependence, individual accountability; social skills and group processing were performed respectively. On the other hand; 71.875, 76.04, 58.33, and 92.19 percent of the total observed activities of positive interdependence, individual accountability, social skills and group processing were not performed respectively. Therefore the result reveals that more than half of the activities relating to positive interdependence, individual accountability, social skills and group processing were not performed in the writing lessons of higher preparatory schools. Thus positive interdependence, individual accountability, social skills and group processing were less prevalent in preparatory writing lesson.

TEACHERS' INTERVIEW DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected through an interview from six EFL teachers were summarized in the following paragraphs. Teachers reported that cooperative writing instruction was not prevalent in preparatory EFL classroom instruction because most of the time, they gave students writing tasks as home work individually.

Since EFL teachers were unable to detail the way they structure cooperative learning in the writing lesson, they were not well informed in the way they structure cooperative writing in their classroom lesson. However; , they reported as they sometimes use cooperative writing in their EFL lesson because it was interactive approach, so students were engage and actively participate in their learning. They also said that cooperative learning was a technique that allows students to learn from each other and gain important interpersonal skills. In addition to this; it enhances cooperation, support among peers, decreases fear or failure, improve their writing and other language skills, and fosters problem solving skills. Therefore it was very useful for all levels, particularly for lower students, and they learned more from each other.

DISCUSSION

Concerning the first research question, do preparatory students and EFL teachers familiar with of cooperative writing? As results show preparatory students were slightly familiar to the characteristics, reasons and basic elements of cooperative writing. Results from students' questionnaire indicate that the average means score of students' familiarity to characteristics, reason for and basic principles of cooperative writing were 3.27, 3.49 and 3.28 respectively. Therefore, students' familiarity of characteristics and basic principles of cw were slightly higher than the ideal average test value of 3. Students' familiarity of reasons for cw is also higher than the ideal mean value of 3.

Data from teachers also show that the mean score of familiarity of teachers to characteristics, reasons, and basic principles of cooperative writing were 3.49, 3.36, and 3.44, respectively.

Similarly, the interview result confirms that they sometimes use cooperative writing in their EFL lesson because it was interactive and engaged actively in their learning. Teachers were also believed that cooperative writing was a technique that allows students to learn from each other and gain important interpersonal skills. In addition to this; it enhances cooperation, support among peers, decreases fear or failure, improve their writing and other language skills, and fosters problem solving skills. Therefore, EFL preparatory teachers confirm that they were familiar to the reasons why they use cooperative writing in their EFL instruction. This finding agrees with the findings of Rod Ellis (2003), Brubacher and et.al (1990). With this respect, scholars like Johnson and Johnson (1994, Richards and Rodgers 2000) also agree that teachers should be well oriented and equipped with the necessary skills and competences of cooperative writing.

The other research question of the current study sought to answer if basic elements of cooperative writing were prevalent. The finding of the study indicates that two basic elements such as individual accountability and group processing were not prevalent; on the other hands, three basic elements such as positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction and social skills were prevalent in some extent. The result does not coincide with the perception of scholars like Richards and Rodgers (2000), Liang (2002). They believe that there are five necessary conditions to structure cooperative writing such as positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, individual accountability, social skills and group processing. If one of the basic elements of CW is missed in the instruction, cooperative writing is unable to be prevalent.

In relation to other research question: "What were some major challenges that can impede familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing instruction in EFL preparatory instruction" the interview result confirms that low students' interest and experience to work in groups, large class size, the volume of text book and its tasks i.e. bulky, students exam oriented and time or period for writing lesson are some problem to apply cooperative writing. This was coincide with the findings of Nunan D.(19 89), and notion of Putnam, J. (1997).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In examining familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing in preparatory high school, data were collected through questionnaire, interview and classroom observation from Debre Markos and Burie Shikudad preparatory high schools. Accordingly the study found out Preparatory students and their EFL teachers were slightly familiar to the characteristics, reasons and basic elements of cooperative writing.

The basic elements of cooperative writing such as positive interdependence, face to face promotive interaction, and social skills were prevalent to some extent; however, prevalence of two basic elements, individual accountability and group processing were less than the ideal mean 3; the mean scores of the two basic elements from students and preparatory EFL teachers were $m=2.07$, 2.58 , and $m=2.50$, 2.07 respectively. Therefore cooperative writing in preparatory high school is not prevalent.

Data from observation and interview found out that classroom activities related to characteristics and basic principles of cooperative writing were low.

The data from interview as well found some major challenges that impede familiarity and prevalence of cooperative writing in preparatory schools. They were students' interests to work in groups writing, large class size, and nature of writing activities, the volume of text book and, time or period for writing lesson.

On the basis of the above findings, syllabus designers, EFL teachers, and academics experts should exert their efforts to familiarize and prevalent cooperative writing in preparatory higher secondary schools to bring learners the center of learning.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brubacher, M. Payne, R. & Rickett, K. (Eds.) (1990), *Perspective on small group learning: Theory and practice*. Canada: Rubicon Publishing Inc.
- [2] Cushing S. (2002), *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University,.
- [3] Johnson, D.W. & Johnson F. (1994), *Joining together group theory and group skills*, (5th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [4] Johnson D. & Johnson R. (2001), *The hand book of research for educational communication and technology: Cooperation and the Use of Technology*. U.S: University of Minnesota.
- [5] Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R. (1988) "Impact of positive interdependence and academic group contingencies on achievement". *Journal of Social Psychology*. Vol. 128, pp. 345-52.
- [6] Johnson, D.W., & Johnson F. (2009), *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (10th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.,
- [7] Putnam, J. (1997), *Cooperative learning in diverse classrooms*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,.
- [8] Richards J. and Rodgers T. (1986) *Methods and Approaches of Language Teaching and Learning*. Oxford: Oxford university,.
- [9] Richards J. and Rodgers T. , (2001), *Methods and Approaches of Language Teaching and Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University.

- [10] Rod, E. (2003) Task Based Language Learning and Teaching Oxford: Oxford University Press,.
- [11] Seid, M. (2011), “ Effects of Cooperative Learning on Reading Comprehension Achievement in EFL and Social Skills of Grade 10 Students,” Unpublished PhD dissertation.