Language learners' memory and language learning strategies: can cooperative language learning instruction make a difference?

Soheila Zamini[1] and Zahra Gholami[2]

[1]Educational Psychology, University of Tabriz, Instructor in Payame Nour University of Shabestar, Iran.
[2]Educational Management, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effectiveness of cooperative language learning (CLL) on using language learning strategies in interaction with self-efficacy among female students. The participants included 34 third junior high school female students in Tabriz that were selected through cluster random sampling. 17 students were in experimental group and 17 students were in control group. In the pre-test stage, all of the subjects in both groups answered to the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES). Then, the experimental group was treated by cooperative English learning, and control group received traditional English learning during one academic semester. After the treatment, the subjects in both groups were post-tested by the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). Data were analyzed by ANCOVA and the results showed a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of memory for the experimental group. The findings also revealed no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive and affective and social strategies. The paper discusses implications of employing CLL to foster language learning.

Introduction

One of the teaching approaches which is an important part in constrictive learning theory is cooperative learning. Cooperation means working together as a team to gain a common goal. Cooperative learning means the usage of training exercise in small groups which students work together to maximize their learning ability (Johnson, et al, 2001). There are lots of reasons why students that work together have a better function. One of the reasons is the use of high level thinking, such as classifications, comparison, thoughts and so on. Also, cooperative learning gives students an opportunity to have other students as an example in learning (Peklaj, 2006).

Another main reason is using memory ability in information learning. Creating a relation between new data and the earlier ones is a way to keep information in memory for a long time. Learners establish this relation while explaining this information to one another (Slavin, 1995).

On the other hand, experts are interested in using learning strategies to improve the language. Oxford (1990) describes the learning strategies as learners go through to improve their language. Nisbet and Shucksmith (1991) reveal that the strategies are high level skills which are responsible for more controlling and more adjusting the scientific language skills in different situations. They give some characteristics for those strategies. They believe that the strategies always have goals to obtain. In addition, they are performance processes which help to select and adapt skills and there are higher level skills. Finally, strategies are adaptable which means they change regarding texture. Language learning strategies have been categorized several times. The categorization by Oxford is the most perfect and the most comprehensive one off all (Vidal, 2002).

Oxford (1989) classified it in six levels as memory strategies (like grouping noise in memory), cognitive strategies (like repetition, analysis, and taking notes), compensation strategies (like using the other clues), meta cognitive strategies (like annexing new information to the earlier –self control), affective strategies (decreasing anxiety with music, self-encouragement, relate feeling to others), social strategies (asking explanation, cooperate with others, developing cultural understanding). Based on Oxford (1989), strategies are not just self-consciousness.

In his social-cognitive theory about self-efficacy concept, Bandura says that the behavior of individuals not only has been controlled by circumferential and external factors but also has an important role in individual behaviors. His consideration on self-efficacy is a sense of worthiness, qualification and ability in getting along (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy relates with individuals' belief about their abilities, and this belief can be related to different abilities (Wells, 2001). In learning language, the self-efficacy's belief expresses his opinion about his ability in what they can do and how they can organize it (Bandura, 1984). Researchers show that the cooperative learning affects learning strategies. Henze and Berger in their research find that cooperative learning has a positive effect on increasing self-discipline, internal-motivation, of learners. Adeyemi (2008), Onwuegbuzie & Daros-Voseles (2003), Kilic (2008), Tanel & Erol (2008), show that individuals learn more through cooperative learning than traditional learning way. Slavin (1995) also argues that cooperative learning procedure has a longer effect on metacognitive than traditional procedures. Chang (1991) and Yilmaz (2010) express that among learners the compensation strategies are used much more than affective strategies in spite of the fact that we know in most

researches meta-cognitive has the highest usage (Magogwe, & Oliver, 2007; Akbari, 2003; Tajedin, 2001).

Ziahosseini & Salehi (2007) stated that first of all internal motivation has got the biggest part in memory strategies. After that, we can put the others like cognitive, meta-cognitive, social and affective strategies which have a positive and significant relationship with internal motivation. Now there is a question and that is whether cooperative learning has any effect on using language learning strategies especially memory strategy and whether this effect is significant in terms of self efficacy.

Methodology

This study is a pre-and post-test experimental one with a control group to find the effect of cooperative learning on using language learning strategies. The sample population of this research was all of female third grade junior high school students in Tabriz that were selected by the cluster random sampling.

Among this cluster, two classes were selected and one of them was in the experimental group (17 students) and the other one was in the control group (17 students). The first one had the cooperative teaching method with an experienced teacher and the second group had the traditional teaching method as we use in our schools nowadays.

Instruments

The strategy inventory for language learning (SILL): This tool is used to measure how much the learners use the language learning strategy; this inventory contains 50 questions for learners that studied English as their second language or foreign language and measures 6 levels of strategies as memory, cognitive, compensation, affective and social strategies. Each question has 5 alternatives (Oxford, 1990). In so many research studies in Iran that use this questionnaire, the researchers confirm its validity. Some of these researchers include; Borzabadi Farahani(2009) from Iran a= 96%, and Sheikh Al Eslami (2006) a= 59%. In this study, the reliability of this questionnaire on 30 people was found to be 79%.

The general self-efficacy scale (GSES): This scale is used to measure the self-efficacy with reference to no specific situation and contains 17 factors and measures the expectations of learners' self-efficacy in 3 levels: 1. Desire for beginning the behavior, 2. Desire for finishing the behavior, 3. Resistance to face obstacles.

The cooperative language learning plan (CLL)

The cooperative language learning plan was two 90 minutes sessions a week for three months and it needs to be noted that the teacher was an experienced one who was completely familiar with the procedure.

1. First, the students in the experimental group were divided into 4 groups including one strong, one weak and two mediocre. They were given responsibilities to do.
2. In the dialogues, they were asked to listen to the tape. Then, students discussed about statements, repeated them, teacher asked them some questions and certainly they learned some new words.
3. In grammar they were asked to read the structures and being in the same mind and make an example and at the end each group had to deliver a report.
4. To strengthen the listening skill, the teacher asked them to listen to the tape and repeat some sentences if necessary.
5. In the case of reading, first they listened to the tape several times. Then, they read the text together and adjusted their pronunciation problems. At the end, each group delivered an summary of the text.
6. Now they had some questions individually and in groups to answer and it was for that they compared their efficacy with their grades in groups and individually.
7. As they did a team work, the teacher was moving among them to answer their questions and cooperate with them.
8. At the end of each session, the average of groups' grades would be measured and the group with the highest point is known as the best ones.

Intervention

1. Pre-test: Before classes started, the two groups had completed both "strategy inventory for language learning" and "general self- efficacy scale".
2. Interference stage: The students in experimental group were given the cooperative language learning plan and the students in control group were given the traditional language learning plan. This plans lasted one semester.
3. Post-test: Following treatment, both groups completed strategy inventory for language learning again.

Results

We used co–variance analysis to examine the function of cooperative English learning in using English learning strategies with learners. Before analyzing the results, we compared the students' grades on pre-and post-test in both groups. The grades' average of "language learning strategies" of students at experimental group in post-test was more than that of the pre-test. Also, it shows us the effect of independent variance. This difference was not observed in the control group. The result is reported in Table 1.

Also Leven's test and equality of Covariance reveal that the supposedly harmonious gradient with learning strategies is not significant or meaningful. Thus, we used the co-variance to examine this hypothesis and the result is on Table 1.

Table 1. Results of ANCOVA on the mean of pre and post-test scores of SILL

source	Dependent variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
group	memory	128.899	1	128.899	4.902	.036	.164
	cognitive	84.276	1	84.276	1.131	.298	.043
	compensation	.524	1	.524	.024	.877	.001
	meta-cognitive	.813	1	.813	.019	.890	.001
	affective	18.291	1	18.291	1.477	.236	.056
	social	29.464	1	29.464	1.629	.214	.061

According to this Table, the differences between pre- and post-test grades in both groups for memory strategy's variable (P<0/05, F=4/90) is significant and the mean scores of the experimental group in memory strategy's variable at level of Eta square=0/16, (P<0/05) is more than that of the control group. Therefore, the findings results support the effects of cooperative learning on increasing the use of memory strategies. The researchers then examined the hypothesis that cooperative learning has a significant effect on using English learning strategies with relation to self-efficacy. We used the self-efficacy variable as a moderator variable and the following result showed cooperative learning had a major impact on using English learning strategies when self-efficacy was controlled (Eta square=0/138,P<0/05).

Discussion

The results show that the effect of cooperative learning on dependent variable (memory strategy) is significant. This finding confirm the study of Kagan (1994), . Neysia, Najarian,

Sheykhiani (2005). These studies also found that cooperative learning increases the learning ability of learners and improve the power of their memory. We can say the learners who used the cooperative learning strategy allocated more time to doing their homework. Spending more time to learn and more repetition caused the learning process to be deeper (Craik, & Tulving,, 1975).

Compared to their counterparts, the learners that used this approach received more examples. And thus, they memorized it better (Santrock, 2008). On the other hand, the learners can see the way that others pronounce words and make sentences and this helps them draw pictures to keep the information in their memory (Paivio, 1986).

This approach also helped them to establish links between the earlier information and the new one and retain it for a long time more than before (Slavin, 1995).

This study proves that the independent variable, i.e. cooperative learning did not have any significant effect on dependant variables, namely cognitive, compensation, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategy. In this regard, the findings of this study do not correspond with those of Tanel & Erol (2008) which confirms the effect of cooperative learning on students' meta- cognitive and of Slavin (1995) reporting that cooperative learning has a significant effect on developing social skills. We think that probably time limitation is the factor which affects that. It means if the learners use this method for more than one semester, most probably they will use cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategies more.

Another finding of this research is that the self-efficacy could not affect the usefulness of cooperative learning on using learning strategies. Self-efficacy could predict the performance of the students so in this study we controlled it ,and saw the major impact of cooperative learning on using of memory strategy.

References

1. Adeyemi, A. B., (2008). Effects of cooperative learning and problem-solving strategies on junior secondary school students achievement in social studies. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 6* (3),l6,

2. Akbari, R., (2003). The relationship between the use of language learning strategies by Iranian learners of English their foreign language proficiency and the learners' IQ scores. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics,6*(1), 1-20.

3. Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling Misconceptions of Perceived Self- Efficacy. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 8,231-255.

4. Bandura, A. (1997). Self–efficacy: The exercise of control. *http://www.Merel.org/prducts/nate,139-156.*

5. Borzabadi Farahani, D. & Nejati, R. (2009). Investigation of the construct validity reliability of Oxford's strategy inventory for language learning. *Pazhuhesh- E Zabanha- Ye Khareji, 50, 5-22.*

6. Chang, S. J. (1991). A study of language learning behaviors of Chinese students at the university of Georgia and the relation of these behaviors to oral proficiency and other factors. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Georgia, USA.*

7. Craik, F. I. M. & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 14*, 268-294.

8. Hanze, M. & Berger, R. (2007). Cooperative learning, motivational, effects, and student characteristics: An experimental study comparing cooperative learning and direct instruction in 12th grade physics classes. *Learning and Instruction, 17(1), 29 – 41.*

9. Johnson, T, Roger, Johnson, W. David, Snyder, Bill. (2001). The impact on achievement in cooperative learning groups, University of Minnesota and Iowa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 129* (3), 389-397.

10. Kagan, S. (1994). Cooperative learning (10th ed.). San Juan Capistrano, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.

11. Kilic, D. (2008). The Effect of the Jigsaw Technique on Learning the Concepts of the Principles and Methods of Teaching. *World Applied Sciences Journal 4*(supple), 109- 114.

12. Magogwe, J. M, & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of language learners in Botswana. *System, 35*, 338- 352.

13. Neysia, A. S., Najarian, B., Sheykhiani ,M. (2005). Comparing the effects of cooperative learning and traditional instruction on the academic performance, retention, achievement motivation and self- concept of second grade students Bushehr's high schools. *Journal of Education and Psychology, 11* (3-4), 25 – 43.

14. Nisbet, J., & Shucksmith, J., (1991*). Learning Strategies*. London: Rutledge.

15. Onwuegbuzie, J. A, Daros-Voseles. A. D. (2001). The Role of Cooperative Learning In Research Methodology courses : A Mixed - Methods Analysis, Mid-South. *Educational Research Association, 8*(1), 61 – 75.

16. Oxford, R.L. (1990*). Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle..

17. Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of Language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System, 1*, 253- 247.

18. Paivio, A. (1986*). Mental representation: A dual coding approach*. Oxford University Press.

19. Peklaj, C. (2006). Cooperative Activity and Its Potential For learning in tertiary Education. *Horizons of Psychology, 15* (3), 37-50.

20. Santrock, J. W. (2008*). Educational Psychology. 4th Ed*, Mc Grow Hill. University of Texas at Dallas: McGraw-Hill.

21. Sheikh Al Eslami, R.; & Khayer, M. (2006). Relationship between motivational orientations and English language learning strategies in university students. *Journal of Psychology, 10* (1), 37, 22-33.

22. Slavin. J. R., (1995*). Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know*. Center for Research on the Education on Students Placed at risk, Johns Hopkins University.

23. Tajedin, Z., (2001). Language learning strategies: A strategy-based approach\ to L2 learning strategic competence, and test validation. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Allameh Tabatabaee University, Tehran, Iran.*

24. Tanel, Z and Erol, M. (2008). Effects of cooperative learning on Instructing magnetism: Analysis of an Experimental Teaching Sequence Latin American . *Journal of Physics Education, 2*, (2) 45-57.

25. Vidal, R. T. (2002). Is there a correlation between reported language learning strategy use, actual strategy use and achievement*? Linguagem & Ensino,5*(1) 43- 73.

26. Wells, G. (2001). The role of memory self- efficacy in memory performance and performance estimation accuracy in old age. *Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Windsor, Proquest Dissertations and Theses.*

27. Yilmaz, C. (2010). The Relationship between Language Learning Strategies, Gender, Proficiency and Self- Efficacy Beliefs: A study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2) 682- 687.

28. Ziahosseini. S.M., and Salehi. M., (2008). An Investigation of the Relationship between Motivation and Language learning Strategies. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji,. 41*(Special Issue), 85-107.