RESEARCH ARTICLE

EFL INSTRUCTORS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTION AND MOTIVATION TOWARDS TEAM LEARNING: A CASE OF ETHIOPIAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

*Endalfer Melese and Getaw Girma

Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, Ethiopia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The main objective of this study is to explore university EFL instructors' and students' perception and motivation towards one-to-five team learning in Ethiopian public universities. To achieve this objective, relevant data were collected using a five point likert scale close-ended questionnaire (filled out by 28 EFL instructors and 80 third year English Language and Literature students). Results of the quantitative data were analyzed via frequency, percentage, mean and two tailed Pearson correlation using SPSS version 20. The qualitative data gathered through the general open-ended questionnaire was thematically organized and analyzed. Similarly, results of the department heads and mentors' interview, group leaders' Focus Group Discussion (FDG) and the randomly selected low and middle achievers' FGD were audio recorded, transcribed and thematically analyzed. The results indicate that most of the respondents show positive perception (with mean values of 3.15 and 3.44 for students and instructors respectively) and motivation (mean score of 3.37 for instructors and 3.17 for students). There is also strong correlation between students'($r =.615$) and instructors' ($r = .660$) perception and motivation respectively. Results of the qualitative data show that many of the student respondents believe team learning is important; however, almost half of them do not think this approach is better than that of the teacher centred approach and they complained that team works are usually done by group leaders and do not help the team members as expected. Similarly instructor's responses show that though learning in teams is pedagogically acceptable, some of them reflect that one to five grouping becomes a means by which clever students help others to score better grades but has limited academic contribution to group members for different reasons. Most of the respondents appreciate mixed ability grouping; however, most of the team members do not actively participate and develop dependency on team leaders.

INTRODUCTION

Team learning method is necessary for enhancing students' academic achievement, social skills and motivation to learn. It has a solution to teaching learning problems emphasizing critical thinking skills (Seid, 2012). According to Johnson and Johnson (1989), team learning plays an important role in providing learners with the opportunity to practise English with classmates. They further state that it helps students to practise social and interpersonal skills through interactions with their team members (Gaikwad, 1996). Instructional methods like lectures, demonstrations, explanations, question-answer practices, assigned reading and guided activities focus on academic goals, providing limited opportunities for students to learn and practise interpersonal skills. Nevertheless, team learning with its dual emphasis on academic and interpersonal

skills (Smith, 1996) appeals to both teachers and students as it integrates diverse goals. According to (Hill & Hill, 1990), if students are left out of the teaching learning process, they are likely to be isolated from taking responsibilities. Fekadu (2015) states that team learning plays a vital role in bringing strong interaction among the students and in enhancing active learning method. On top of the points noted above, there is a controversy among educators and learners on the significance of working in pre-established teams throughout the academic semester or year. Some scholars even argue that team learning overshadows independent and competitive learning situations. Besides this, learners' perception and motivation towards one-to-five form of team learning has not yet been investigated in Ethiopian higher institutions. Therefore, it appears important to undertake a study and know the nature of instructors' and students' perception and their motivations towards this teaching and learning approach in the context of Ethiopian public universities.

Corresponding author: Endalfer Melese
Department of English Language and Literature, Jimma University, Ethiopia

Statement of the Problem

The active exchange of ideas within small teams not only increases interest among students but also promotes critical thinking (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). One-to- five team learning, therefore, can be a means by which learners can work on different topics among themselves and enrich their understanding from different sources. However, according to Dembo (2004), students' academic performance might not be linked to the method of instruction, but principally on how the student perceives his/her own learning responsibilities and if s/he is intrinsically motivated to achieve. This implies that unless learners are motivated and have clear understanding of learning in on-e-to-five team formation, the intended objective may not be obtained. Based on our experiences as university professors, we noticed that although one-to-five team learning approach has been implemented in the Ethiopian public universities in the last four years, it seems that stakeholders (instructors and students) have still insufficient awareness about the approach. When it comes to students, some feel that group task is the responsibility of team leaders and few responsible team members. If this is the reality, the intended goal of implementing one-to-five team learning will not yield positive results. This problem may, therefore, continue to *exist unless proper investigation is conducted and worked on this issue timely*.

The second problem is that the teaching and learning process is highly teacher-centered. For instance, as Richards (2005) has suggested, a teacher's role should include organizing, motivating, and counseling, providing language models, developing materials and acting as a facilitator. On the other hand, learners should take responsibilities for their own learning. In class, instructors must initiate the discussion and students must be active learners. However, in most universities of all generations-first, second and third, the instructors' role is mainly to act as all knower, explainer and corrector of errors; and the students' role is to do what the instructor says. Consequently, students tend to be over-dependent on their instructors' and always think that the knowledge comes from them. Teamwork between students is seldom used as a teaching practice, and interaction is hindered as there is only one-way communication. Therefore, the incorporation of this innovative method into the educational context is facing problems. Learners' and instructors' motivations and perceptions may be the major factors that hinder this innovative method of which English language instruction is one. Typically, in Ethiopian EFL classrooms at all educational levels in general and higher education institutions in particular, a teacher-centered approach needs to be minimized.

This being the case, yet, studies that focus on EFL instructors' and students' perception and their motivation towards one-to-five team learning are insufficient in this context. Taking this into account, this study attempts to explore university instructors' and students' motivation and perception towards practicing one-to-five team learning approach in teaching English as a Foreign Language in Ethiopian public universities. It will also investigate the relationship between students' and instructors' perception and motivation towards one-to five team learning. Therefore, this study is aimed to fill this knowledge gap by discovering the relationship between students' and instructors' perceptions with that of their motivation Objectives ascertain

General Objective

The main objective of this study is then to explore university EFL instructors' and students' perception and motivation towards one-to-five team learning in Ethiopian public universities.

Specific objectives

Specifically, this study tried to identify EFL instructors' and learners':

- Perception about one-to-five team learning
- Motivation towards one-to-five team learning.
- Correlation of students' perception and motivation towards one-to-five team learning practices.
- Correlation of instructors' perception and motivation towards one-to- five team learning practices.

Scope of the Study

Although, 'one to five' team learning has been implemented in all fields of study, this study is limited to English majors. On the other hand, while there are other universities which train English language in Ethiopia, the study is confined to Jimma, Debre Berhan and Wolkite universities. In Addition, it addresses only final year students in the program. The study limited to graduating year English majors and instructors who are offering courses to these students. To select the three institutions, all public universities are clustered in three groups based on their establishment as first, second and third generations. One university from each generation is purposefully selected. That is, universities with 10 years and above practice are categorized as first generation, those which have 5 years and above as second generation and those which have less than five years as third generation. Accordingly Jimma University from the first category, Debre Birhan University from the second and Wolkite University from the third category are taken as the focus of this study. On the other hand, third year English Language and Literature students of the stated institutions were chosen because the students, having accomplished their first and second year requirements of learning through team learning approach, are expected to have ample experiences and can provide adequate information on the issue raised.

Limitation of the Study

While it was planned to interview the three universities' mentors, one of them did not respond for he did not accomplish what he had to and the study focused on the two universities' interview data along with all the department heads. These setbacks may affect the generalizability of the findings of the research to the whole public university student and English language instructors.

Definition of Terms and Abbreviations

Team learning is a broad term that refers to numerous methods for organizing and conducting classroom instruction. Almost any teacher can find a way to use team learning that is congruent with his/her philosophies and practices. So many teachers use it in so many different ways that the operationalaization cannot all be listed here. Team learning has been named differently: cooperative learning, peer learning,

group learning, peer assisted learning or peer initiated learning in various teaching learning scenarios. Most recently, it is also called one-to-five team learning in the Ethiopian academic contexts; and it is being under implementation in all Ethiopian public universities (Melaku, Temechengn, & Harrison, 2013; Efrem & Oukula, 2015).

JU = Jimma University
DBU = Debre Birhan University
WU = Wolkite University

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area and Period

The study was conducted in Ethiopian public universities with particular focus on EFL instructors and learners in the year 2015/16. The students were third year English majors who were selected from the following public universities: Jimma, Debre Birhan and Wolkite as representative for the three generations (first, second and third respectively) based on their years of establishment. The students were classified as low, middle and high ability groups based on their CGPA results in the previous semesters and years.

Study Design

The study employed a descriptive survey design in which qualitative and quantitative data were collected to explore the motivation and perception of participants. The investigators believed that descriptive survey study design can increase the reliability and applicability of the conclusions by providing different types of data related to the same research problem. Thus, by employing this study design, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected in order to answer the research questions set based on the research objectives.

Study Population

The target population was 80 EFL third year English majors learning in the Ethiopian public universities of Jimma, Debre Berhan and Wolkite. Twenty-eight English language instructors, three department heads and two mentors of the stated universities were also considered as part of the study. The participants were a final year undergraduate students majoring in English language and literature. They are selected based on our assumption that they could have ample experiences with regard to team learning during their three years stay using this approach

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

Department heads of English language and literature from the four target universities were interviewed. All team leaders of third year English majors were also taken comprehensively for the focus group discussion since their number was manageable to handle. To select instructors and students to participate in the study, comprehensive sampling method was employed for the questionnaire. However, purposive sampling technique was used for middle and low achiever participants for the FGD based on their CGPA cut off points.

Data Gathering Tools and Analysis Procedure

Three type of data collection tools were employed in this study. The first one was open and close ended questionnaires

for target students and instructors. The second one was FGD for group leaders as well as for middle and low achiever student. The last one was semi-structured interview for mentors and department heads of the English language and literature of the target universities. Data gathering was accomplished through the following steps: Firstly, a relevant literature was systematically reviewed. Thirty-one close ended (sixteen perception based and fifteen motivation focused) and one open-ended questions were designed for the purpose. Then, the questionnaire was pilot-tested with 31 second year English major students, 8 TEFL instructors who do not offer courses to under graduate English majors at Jimma University and Quality Assurances Officers of Social Science College and Jimma University. Based on the feedback obtained from the pilot study, the questionnaire was reworked slightly. After the consent of the relevant officials was obtained, the questionnaire was administered by the researchers. As for the qualitative data two instruments (the interview and FGD) were prepared based on the literature review so as to get deeper information and triangulate the data gathered via questionnaire. The face-to-face interviews were audio recorded on each of the stated university. In the case of FGD, one for group leaders and one for randomly selected low and middle achievers were conducted and audio recorded. In this study mixed research design (qualitative and quantitative methods) was implemented. With regard to the qualitative data, the required information was audio-rrrecorded, transcribed, thematically sorted, analyzed and interpreted qualitatively. Whereas the quantitative data was tabulated, calculated and presented in the form of frequencies, percentages, mean and correlations using statistical packages for social sciences (SPSS version 20).

Data Analysis and Presentation

Analysis of Quantitative Data

To identify the respondents' perception about 'One-to-Five' team learning and their motivation towards it, five point Likert Scale ranging from (1=strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree) questionnaire was used. A total of 80 students (29 in Jimma University, 18 in Wolkite University and 33 in Debre Birhan University) and 28 English language instructors (10 instructors from Jimma University, 8 from Debre Birhan University and 10 from Wolkite University) filled out the questionnaire and all of them responded to the items meant to obtain the required data. Two of the objectives of the study were to identify instructors' perception about 'One-to-Five team learning and their motivation towards it. The data relevant to these objectives were collected through questionnaire from 28 respondents of the three institutions using a five point likert scale. The result is indicated below in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Instructors

	N	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Perception Average	28	3.12	3.4420	.79074	.625
Motivation Average	28	2.93	3.3786	.70950	.503
Valid N (list wise)	28				

Table 1 depicts that majority of the instructors with mean value (3.44) as indicated above have awareness about one to five team learning approach. This again implies that they are doing their job with some kind of knowledge related to team learning. However, the above statistical data again shows those instructors who have no information about the status of the

approach or have some kind of doubt are not small as such. Similarly instructors' motivation towards it is also positive with mean value (3.37). From this one can say that more than half of them have interest with this approach. Nevertheless, when we see their degree of motivation in comparison to that of their perception, their motivation (3.37) is still less than that of their perception (3.44). This may mean that some instructors' motivation is affected to some level.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Students

	N	Range	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Perception Average	80	3.19	3.1531	.83693	.700
Motivation Average	80	3.75	3.1784	.79791	.637
Valid N (list wise)	80				

Table 2 illustrates that many of the students with the mean score (3.15) have information about one-to-five team working. This can show something that more than half of the student population in the study areas have awareness about the team learning. Nevertheless, students who either have doubt or no information about this approach are not very small. On the other hand, students' motivation towards it is also many with a mean value (3.17). As the above table depicts, students' motivation (3.17) is not as such higher than that of their perception (3.15).

Table 3. Correlation of Instructors' Perception and their Motivation

		Perception Average	Motivation Average
Perception Average	Pearson Correlation	1	.660**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	28	28
Motivation Average	Pearson Correlation	.660**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	28	28

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in Table 3, above, there is positive relationship between instructors' perception and their motivation towards 'One-to-Five' team learning in the three universities. This two-tailed Pearson correlation between the two variables shows that there is strong relationship between perception and motivation (r=.660). This indicates that when perception increases, motivation also increases or vice versa. Therefore, the relationship between the perception as measured by perception likert scales and motivation as measured by motivation likert scales was a strong, positive correlation between the two variables r=.660, n=28, p<000 high positive perception correlated with high motivation.

Table 4. Correlations of Students' Perception and Motivation

		Perception Average
Perception Average	Pearson Correlation	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	N	80
Motivation Average	Pearson Correlation	.615**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	80

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 above shows the correlation between students' perception and motivation, its significance level and the sample size. It indicates that we have a 'strong' positive (significant) correlation between perceptions and motivation.

In its full notation $r = (80) = .615$, p = .000. The number of cases on which this correlation is based is 80. The two tailed significance or probability level is .000, so the correlation is statistically significant. As statistical significance examines the likelihood that the null hypothesis is true (in this case, that there is a relationship between perceptions and motivation. This means there was a strong positive (Pearson's) correlation: positive perceptions were correlated with high motivation: r (80) = .615, p = .000. Since the magnitude of the coefficient for Pearson's correlation is based on how much the data (within each variable) vary according to their respective means, and how much those scores vary for each participant across both variables, there is positive relationship between English language students' perception and their motivation towards 'One-to-Five' team learning in the three sampled universities. This two-tailed Pearson correlation between the two variables shows that there is a very strong relationship between perception and their motivation (r = .615). To understand the relationship better, it is more useful to see how far this relationship actually indicates that the two variables overlap or are providing similar information that is when students' perception about 'One-to-Five' team learning increases, their motivation towards it also increases or vice versa. The "p" figure refers to the probability level is also calculated and, a reported r of .615 significant at $p<.01$ would show a shared variance in our study of .382, suggesting that 38.2% of the variance in perception is accounted for by motivation. To put this value into perspective, this leaves 61.8% of the variability still to be accounted for by other variables. Since a strong relationship between these two variables exists, perception may be used to predict success in the motivation. So, showing that a correlation exists between the variables are often the first step toward proving that they are causally related. Since correlation is primarily concerned with finding out whether a relationship exists and with determining its magnitude and direction. We can therefore conclude that there is a strong positive correlation between the two variables (r = .615, p = .000), with a greater number of perception being associated with a higher motivation rating.

Analysis of Qualitative Data

In addition to closed-ended items, the questionnaire included one open-ended item intended to allow the respondents to freely explain the respondents' (instructors and students) overall reflections about ' One-to- Five' team learning, semi-structured interview and focus group discussions to investigate the respondents' reactions on the issue raised. They are interpreted bellow.

Analysis of Data from Open-Ended Questionnaire

Students and instructors' reflections to the open-ended item of the questionnaire are coded and thematically analysed. They are categorised in to three groups: those who believe one-to-five team learning is useful in different ways in the first category, those who admit the importance of team learning but have some reservations about its practicality in the second category and those who have totally disagree with the significance of one-to-five team learning in the third group.

Analysis of Instructors' Open-Ended Questionnaire

Instructors' responses to the open-ended item of the questionnaire are summarized as follows. Majority of them

think that one-to-five team learning is essential. They believe that team learning is theoretically grounded and educationally recognized. They think that since it is one form of cooperative learning, it is helpful for learner's success both academically and personally. It creates conducive environment and opportunity to learners to scaffold each other develop their creativity. For example, one of the respondents said:

I think one-to-five team learning is pedagogically accepted since it creates opportunities for learners to interact among themselves and exchange experiences and knowledge in the process of working together. It can develop learners' confidence and make them autonomous for their own learning. Though some others acknowledged the importance of one-to five team learning, they have doubts about its practicality in our contexts for some reasons. Some of the problems they mentioned are: lack of students' motivation, awareness, regular follow up, resources, and students' fair collaboration among team members and manageable class size. One of the respondents, for instance said: Although one-to five team learning is theoretically good and pedagogically recommended, it is necessary to teach the learners about its importance." Another respondent stated that "The concept and principle of one to five team learning approach is very interesting; however, if it should be implemented in Ethiopia, both instructors and students have to get awareness about it.

Still some other respondents stated that this approach can benefit learners if the team members are organized by individual course instructor since s/he knows who is the fast, average or slow learner in his/her class. In addition to this another respondent expressed the role of this approach but emphasized the importance of practical training to the learners so that they can be more motivated and engaged in the group tasks and activities. However, since this situation is not created, every student is not taking responsibility in the process. Consequently, group members are developing sense of dependency on the shoulder of others, especially group leaders.

On the contrary, others actually very few of them have negative attitude towards one-to five team learning. For example one of the respondents declared "I strongly disagree about one to five group formation and team learning. This participant thinks that 'one-to-five team learning is politically imposed by authorities. "Another respondent wanted to know the academic relevance of fixing group members to five for a semester or a year while a group work whose members and roles may change as the need arises. One more respondent complained that this approach is being practiced since it has been ordered by higher officials and has encountered several problems like sense of dependency to some of the students on high achievers.

Analysis of Students' Open-Ended Questionnaire

Like the instructors, students' responses to the open-ended item of the questionnaire are categorized in to three. Most of the student respondents feel that one-to-five team learning has different advantages. They believe that team learning creates favorable learning environment and increases their creativity. It helps them work together and exchange ideas, experiences and knowledge among themselves. This again minimizes their nervousness, boosts their confidence, improve their interpersonal relationship among themselves, and ease their

understanding of concepts which are not clear to them in the class while they are working with their instructors. It also helps them score better grade. In addition to this, they think it can improve their communication and social skills which are very essential for their future career. Some of them believe that working in team is better than working individually and working with mixed ability group members is important since everyone can have possibility to be supported in the area s/he has limitation for complete understanding of the given academic task. For example, one of the respondents said, "I think one to five team learning is very useful to develop learners' habit of working together for a common goal. This approach can be more important if learners are regularly supported during their engagement in the group tasks." Another one said, "I am always interested learning in one to five teams. It gives me opportunity to participate with my team members freely and avoid feeling of nervousness."

Some of the respondents appreciate the importance of team learning but have doubts about its effectiveness. They say working in group is important but team members do not usually cooperate and do their share. Most of the time, the group assignment is done by few individuals. Consequently, one to five team formations becomes a means by which clever students help low achievers score better grade and minimize attrition rate. One respondent said "I like working in teams but team leaders do not always motivate other members to share their views or ideas. Some teachers also do not properly use this approach. One to five teams is only connected to group assignments. Another respondent added that one to five team learning approach is useful for students' academic performance and success if it is implemented appropriately. However, the current practice shows that it is being done only for the sake of reporting. Because it is more politicized by some of the students and instructors, almost everything is done by the group leader. As a result it is developing dependency. Some others do not like one to five team learning for some reasons. One student for example, thinks that there is no need of establishing one to five team in this campus since there is no regular follow up by instructors. So forming group is not important for me because the leader does the assignment and presents for the group. The only thing I can get is the mark on what I contributed nothing. One student said "I think this approach is not necessary. It is one way of killing our time. It is obvious that students do not work together. It is the responsibility of the group leader."

Analysis of Department Heads' and Mentors' Interview

Three department heads and two mentors were interviewed. The interview focused on 10 open ended items. The questions are related to the implementation of one to five team learning, whether they have clear information about this approach, its advantages and disadvantages, instructors' and students' motivation, nature of their group organization, whom they think can be more benefited from this approach, its practicality and what to be done in order to implement this program effectively. All of the interviewee said that one to five team learning has been implemented in their respective departments. They said that undergraduate students are organized in one to five cooperative learning teams. They used student's previous results as criteria to include high achievers, middle achievers and low achievers in one group in order to create conducive learning environment for them. The group is fixed and mostly continued for a semester. Relating to the question whether they

have clear information and training on this approach, two department heads and one mentor said that they had short term refreshment training but not pedagogical concepts of team learning. Others said they did not have any training at all. One of them for example said, "As far as I am concerned, I did not have any chance of training but I think instructors have awareness about it since it is one form of active learning approach. "However, another interviewee again stated "I do not think instructors and students have clear information about one to five team learning style."

In relation to its advantage, they all think that working in team can contribute a lot to improve education quality. It helps them know very well and exchange experiences. For instance, one of them said" When students work in teams, they can solve a great deal of academic problems and develop team spirit among themselves." Another respondent believe that if students work in teams, they can exchange more information and support one another because low achievers can get a lot of support from middle and high achievers. They can freely ask their team members for help any time they like. Even clever students can develop their speaking skills while explaining topics during the discussions and presentation. One department chair also said "Theoretically one to five team learning has advantages because the students can come together to bring different ideas and share to the group so that every member of the group is assumed to have deeper understanding of the given topic. Although all of the interviewees admit the importance of team learning, they have reservation on its practicality for some reasons. One of them, for example said:

We experienced several challenges while implementing this approach. Based on my talk to students and my own observations while offering courses in the classroom, I recognized several disadvantages. Only one clever student (the group leader usually) among the five does assignments. Secondly students do not usually feel comfortable when they are organized in this kind of grouping. Sometimes it becomes source of conflicts. The main reason for the conflict is lack of willingness to take responsibilities for the group activities. They lack commitment and capacity as well to contribute for the team work. So in my evaluation some of the students are fed up of getting together and doing tasks collaboratively. This as a result is creating dependency.

Most of the respondents believe mixing students of different ability in one team based on set criteria is very important. Some of the students actually like the fixed grouping because of the dependency they have developed in their clever team leaders. They even wanted to continue with the same group in the next semester. One of them said the grouping is permanent throughout the semester but they encountered disagreements among the team members, in this situation, regrouping sometimes are considered by the department. Some others, especially some group leaders do not like mixed ability grouping since every load is left for one person. Answering the question 'who is more benefited out of one to five team learning,' respondents have slightly different views. One of them said, "Obviously, low achievers benefited the most because middle and high achievers can help them much while performing group tasks, clarifying contents and doing assignments. Another respondent said, "In principle all of them are beneficiaries of team learning. In reality, lower achievers are more benefited in terms of results but not academically since group leaders do many of the activities and the group

work is evaluated uniformly for every team member. On the contrary, the third respondent said, "I think all of them can be benefited since everyone has different experiences, they can exchange experiences each other". Finally, one of the interviewee said, "Of course, all of them. If I rank them, lower achievers, middle achievers and high achievers can be benefited because high achievers also can get advantage of clarifying contents to his/her team members."

As to the question of 'What should be done? In order to solve the challenges they face in the process of one to five team learning approach, respondents forwarded the following; One of them suggest since pedagogy is very important for quality education stakeholders need to equip instructors with proper pedagogy. MOE and university officials should create proper awareness about one-to-five team learning to instructors. Instructors need more training about pedagogical role of this approach like the way it is implemented in the classroom, how to give different responsibility to each member, how to assess team works and the like. Another respondent said, "We, instructors, should create awareness about the importance of this approach to our students. We should be competent enough to change their way of thinking so that they can be good participants in the team work." Another interview also suggests that both instructors and students should formally know the principles of one to five team learning. Students find this approach difficult to apply. Instructors should also be given training so as to implement this approach properly. Still another one thinks that this approach needs commitment. He suggested much to be done on it. Firstly, theoretical ground of team learning needs to be made clear. Secondly, grouping need to vary in relation to the nature of the course and course contents since some contents and courses, for example skill and literature, may need more or less than five group members. Thirdly, the grouping need not be fixed throughout a semester since it will be more appropriate if it is left for every instructor to take the responsibility for s/he clearly knows who is clever, average or weak in his or her subjects. He also suggested that students need to get convenient place outside class to do their group tasks properly. Since students are busy doing four courses at a time, they usually find no time to spare for their group assignments. Due to this, most of the time group assignments are left for the leader. If it will continue like this, it will be superficial because group leaders are repeatedly reporting that the rest of the team members are simply writing their names when group assignments are done by the group leader but do not do anything in their teams.

Analysis of Team Leaders' FGD

Focus Group Discussions (FGD) to group leaders' of the three sampled institutes were conducted. The main focus of the group discussion was related to the way one to five team learning is implemented, its advantages and disadvantages, whether they prefer static or flexible team formation, what they think about student centred and teacher centred approach, what they think about students' and instructors' motivation towards it, who they think can be benefited out of team learning and what measure they think to be taken to improve the implementation of one to five team learning at university. All of the respondents confirm that one to five team learning has been implemented in their classes at present. However they have different views about the degree of its implementation and practicality. Some of them think one to five team learning is very important and they say it has an advantage for all as

long as it is implemented properly. Some others, actually, majority of them feel that is has both advantages and disadvantages as well. On the contrary few of them believe that one-to- five team working has no pedagogical contribution. Among those who favor one to five team learning, one of them expressed "I think one to five team learning is useful. It is a matter of using it properly or not." The second respondent added "I believe team learning is important for us because it helps us understand the lesson equally." Another group leader stated, "Theoretically learning in team is good but a lot has to be done to get all group members participate in the group activities.

Its main advantage is that it helps learners understand each other, investigate problems and find solutions to problems they encounter easily." In line with this one of the leader also said, "Anyone who knows about a topic can help others during the discussion. Team members can raise any question when they find some difficulty and get support from their partners easily." On the same taken, one of them said," If I know one portion of the topic, I can support others and I can possibly get assistance from other group members on the area I have difficulty. So working in group has a lot of advantages." Moreover another respondent believe that one to five team learning can make team members one family when they work cooperatively because it helps everyone remember what s/he forgets during the discussion. When team members work together cooperatively, they become more acquainted one another. On the other hand, most of them think that one to five team learning has both advantages and disadvantages. One of them, for example said, "Working in teams has both merits and demerits. When we come to its advantage, it helps learners cultivate their skills and abilities through working together, but it takes much time. Consequently, some students do not have interest to work together."   Another leader believes that team learning is good only for other group members. It has no advantage to the group leader. It takes much of his/her time and result as well since s/he is doing almost the entire group works alone while other team members are doing their own. He added, "When I was second year, my grade was affected because I was a group leader and wasted much of my time doing the group assignments alone." Similar to this view, one of the leaders added, "I think others who are not leaders are more benefited from team learning because as in our case the group leader is doing everything for the group. Others do not do anything except writing their names when the assignment is ready for submission. When they are asked to do something, they are not willing. Most of them think the group work is the duty of the team leader. Finally, one of the group leader added "Team members are not equally responsible for the group work. The only good thing about grouping is exchange of cultural experiences among team members. Another one also said, "I think group learning can develop group members' knowledge. Its disadvantage is when assignment is given; it may overload the leader because there is no team spirit to do assignments cooperatively." On the contrary those who totally disagree with the advantage of one to five team learning have the following to say: One of them think that one to five team learning has no advantage at all. He said that group members do nothing together except writing their names and IDs before assignment is submitted. Therefore, I do not see the importance of team learning."

When they were asked to compare student-centred and teacher-centred approach, most of them appreciate student-centred approach. They said that students can feel free to ask their friends any question they want and get different ideas from different individuals, especially from group discussion. One of them, for example said, "I prefer student centred approach because different individuals can interact one another and share more ideas and knowledge." Another one also said, "The advantage of student-centred approach is that students who are afraid of raising questions in the class can ask their group members freely." However some of them do not like student centred approach. For instance, one respondent stated, "Strategically, student centred approach is better but it depends on the students. Some of them do not like to share ideas to the group." Another one also said, "I do not feel comfortable with student centred approach. I prefer the teacher centred because I become confident about something when I am told by teachers."

In reply to the question of the nature of grouping, they have different views. Some of them like flexible grouping because they can get different opportunities of getting different individuals. It can avoid feeling of boredom as a result of working with the same individuals permanently. One of them, for example, said, "It will be boring listening to the same individuals who have similar ideas and approaches." Another respondent added, "Flexible grouping is better because it is not good to be always led by one person. There needs to be a change frequently." Then again, others favor fixed grouping. They said that fixed grouping can help them to know one another more and make them one family. One of them for example said, "I prefer the fixed grouping because it can help everyone get familiar and get understood." More over another respondent believed "When a group is fixed, there could be more adaptation among themselves and make some members to feel at home. As a result, they can obey their group leader's instruction and do things with family sprits." In relation to students' and instructors' motivation towards one to five team learning, respondents have different views. Commenting on instructors' motivation, one of the group leaders said, "It depends on the individual instructor. Some of them give us team works and ask to present in the class. Some of them evaluate our assignment uniformly. While some others give marks to individuals for the presentation and uniform mark for the written work. Whereas some others even if they know there is a team work, they do not make follow up evaluation. They do not know who does the group assignment. They simply take the group assignment and mark uniformly. So we can say that while some of the instructors have positive attitude and commitment towards one to five team learning, some others do not have such interest.

In the case of students' motivation towards one to five team learning, most of the group leaders do not have interest to it. One of them, for instance, said, "I have been a group leader for the last three years. Now, I do not want to make others dependent and I want to do only my own job." The next respondent added, "Many of them are not motivated to work with their team members. They do not come when they are appointed for the team work. They only come to give their names and IDs before submission of assignment." On the contrary, one group leader also said, "I think students like working in group. I personally enjoy working in group. However, some group members may not participate with interest.' Answering the question, 'Who is more benefited from the team work?' most of the group leaders think that others are more advantageous than the group leaders. They

said that leaders waste more time doing the team work while other team members read and do their own.

However, the group leader can be benefited to some extent from doing team works himself or herself may gain more knowledge. Secondly, when a course material is given to the team, only the group leader has the access. So this can be another advantage as well. One respondent stated, "I think all are equally benefited unless all duties are given to the leader. " Another group leader also said, "I I think all team members benefited from one to five team learning because they discuss and share ideas together." Next to this, one of the group leader said, "I think other members are more benefited because the group leader tried all their best to do the group assignment and explain it to them. So the group leader's advantage is no more than doing for others."

In relation to the nature of grouping, most of the group leaders agree that mixed ability grouping is advantages because lower ability students can get benefit from the group." One of them said, "I think the mixed ability grouping… It does not mean that the one on top does not necessarily mean s/he knows everything. Others who are middle and low achievers can contribute if they are given the opportunities to share their own experiences and knowledge on the topic." Finally, answering the question what should be done to solve problems related to one to five team learning? They suggest the following: Instructors need to be aware of this approach; they also need to take follow up to the team work; they should give more attention to one to five team work. Students should also do things not because they will be asked but for knowledge; trainings should be given to both instructors and students on the principles of one to five team working.

Analysis of Low and Middle Achievers' FGD

Six respondents from low and middle achievers were randomly taken for the second type of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) so as to gather relevant data about one to five team learning. The main focus of this FGD was related to the way one to five team learning is implemented, its advantages and disadvantages, whether they prefer stable or flexible team formation, what they think about student centred and teacher centred approach, what they think about students' and instructors' motivation towards it, who they think can be benefited out of team learning and what measure they think to be taken to improve the implementation of this approach at university. According to their reply, one to five team learning is being practiced in each of the institutes. However, they have diverse views about the extent of its implementation and practicality. Some of them think one to five team learning can be useful for everyone if it is implemented properly. They think that anyone who has difficulties on a particular topic could get support from others. Moreover, one of the respondents added, "One to five group learning makes the group members one family when they work cooperatively because it helps everyone to remember who s/he forgets during the discussion. When the team works like this, they get more and more acquainted. Team members get more familiar than others in the class since they are doing together and sharing experiences."

Nevertheless, most of them think this approach is practically benefiting group leaders. One of the respondents complained, "The leader does everything because instructors do not assign roles to each member of the team." Another one also said,"

Assignments and presentations are left for the group leaders. I think it is not good. We are not here for mark but for knowledge." Finally, one of them said, "This approach was introduced to get every member of the group work together and support one another, but everything is done by the leader. There is no transfer of knowledge. As a result some of us do not give attention to this team work." On the contrary some of them think low and middle achievers are advantageous. One respondent said "Low achievers are more benefited because they can get more support from middle and high achievers during the group discussion." Another one also assumed "Low achievers are more benefited since the group work is done by the group leader."

Their reflection to student centred and teacher centred approach has variations. Majority of them, actually, think student centred approach is better than teacher centred approach. One of the candidates, for example, said "Myself, I see the advantage of student centred approach because it helps students to find solutions to problems by themselves. As a result, we could have deep understanding about the issue." Another respondent also added "I think student centred approach is better since everyone brings new ideas to the group and gets more information about the topic." The third respondent emphasized "Student centred is better, especially, for language students. It can help us to ask one another in English freely. A student may not ask the instructor in the class even if he has ideas, but it is easy in the student centred approach." On the contrary, few of them think student centred approach has both advantages and disadvantages. One of them for instance, believes "When I come to the advantage of student centred approach, it helps us to find more information. Its disadvantage is when we all find the topic difficult, it will not be clear to any one of us."

Their responses on their instructors and their won motivation to wards one to five team working is also different. Some of them said that their instructors have positive attitude towards it. One of them said "Some of the instructors have interest to team work. They give us tasks for group. They also told us what and how we can do it." On the contrary one student said, "Actually, some teachers give us team work and give follow up while others simply take the assignments and we simply see the result." I think some teachers come without any belief on one to five team learning. They sometimes think it is related to politics. They ignore the one to five grouping and form a group of six or seven. At this time I go to the group I want and others to their own choices. " In relation to students' motivation, most of them have positive attitude towards it. In relation to this, one student said, "I think students like the grouping. I personally like if assignment is given for the group and presented individually, but only the leader does the assignment and present it. The main reason why the group leader is presenting the group assignment is that other group members do not come during the discussion and it will be difficult to give part of it to the group members. Since every member of the group is not playing his responsibilities, the leader is focusing on the report." When we come to the kind of grouping, they have different stands, some of them like the fixed grouping while some others prefer flexible one. For example, one of them said, "I like the grouping to be fixed and extended for a year because it helps us to know one another and makes us work together more freely. Since the team is organized by the department head based on our previous results, we do not face problems."

On the contrary, some of them like flexible grouping. One of the respondents stated, "I like the flexible grouping instead of the fixed one which extends for a semester or a year because the flexible one can allow everyone to take his own responsibility through time. However, since the group continuous throughout a semester or year, our load is left on the group leader for long. I think this is not good, but if it is flexible, I take the role and feel responsible and the same will be to others. By so doing, we can get better and better academically." In addition to this, another one asserted "The group is formed by the department based on what he knows, but as for me, I do not like this way of grouping. I like the group to be formed in a semester. It can make others dependent to group leaders." Answering the question related to who are more benefited, they have different opinions. Most of them believe that group leaders can be more benefited than the low and middle achievers whereas some others think low and middle achievers can be benefited out of one to five teams working if it is properly implemented. Some of the students think that other group members are more benefited than the group leaders. One of them said, "I think low achievers are more benefited because they can get more support from others during the discussion." Another one also said, "Low achievers are more benefited since everything is done by the leader." Similar to this, one student added, "One to five team learning approach is introduced to support everyone in the group; however, there is no transfer of knowledge since most of the things are done by the leader."

Majority of them believe that the group leader is more benefited from one to five team learning. Of whom, one said, "When course material is given to the group by the instructors, only the group leader has the opportunity. He uses it to do the assignments and develop his knowledge. Other members cannot get that material easily." Another one also complained, "Group leaders do not have trust on individual members to do some part of the group work since they think it will affect the quality of the whole assignment and their result." One more respondent also said, "I like mixed ability grouping. The problem is that it is not properly implemented. It does not mean that the one on top necessarily knows everything. Others who are middle and low achievers can contribute a lot as well if support is given by others and ply each responsibility." Finally, answering the question what should be done to solve problems related to one to five team learning, they forwarded different suggestions. One of them for example advised, "Firstly, teachers need to come first believing on this approach. They should not relate it to other things like politics. So, since a child obeys his father, we are doing what the teacher is showing us. Secondly, I think those who are on top should first discuss on and make continuous follow up about its implementation. Thirdly, group leaders need to stop thinking middle and low achievers do not have knowledge and stop asking them for money to bind the assignment at the end."

Others also forwarded the following: Training should be given both to instructors and students on one to five team learning approach; both instructors and students need to have motivation to team work; instructors should give more attention to one to five team work; students should do things not because they will be asked but for knowledge; instructors need to have regular follow up and check how the assignment is done; they need to give roles and responsibilities to each member of the group when they give team.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Here, the results and discussion of the data collected through closed ended and open ended questionnaire, interview and FGD are treated. The quantitative data are analyzed via descriptive statistics of frequency, percentage and mean while the qualitative data are dealt using thematic qualitative analysis technique. First, the results and discussions of the quantitative data are presented. Next, the results of qualitative data are carried out. Then, the correlation between instructors' and students' perception and motivation towards one to five team learning are discussed respectively. Finally, the quantitative data is triangulated with that of the qualitative data for valid conclusion.

The Quantitative Data Findings and Discussions

Two of the objectives of the study were to identify EFL instructors' and students' perception and their motivation towards one-to-five team learning respectively. The two questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS Version 20. Each questionnaire has two categories: perception and motivation. The data relevant to these objectives were collected via closed ended questionnaire using sixteen perception related and fifteen motivation oriented items. Eighty graduating year students (29 from JU, 18 from WU and 33 from DBU) filled out the questionnaire. In addition to this, 28 instructors' (10 from JU, 10 from WU and 8 from DBU) responded to the second questionnaire. According to the quantitative data as shown in tables one and two, both the instructors and student respondents' perception towards one to five team learning is positive with a cumulative mean values of 3.34 and 3.15 respectively. The result of this study is consistent with the students' reactions to team learning groups confirmed by other researchers (Dembo, 2004; Gillies, 2006). This implies that team learning has been implemented in the three universities in the last four years and majority of them showed their agreement and awareness about this approach. In other words, the data also indicated that more than 19 (68.8%) out of the 28 instructors has acquaintance about one to five team learning. Similarly, over 50 (63.1%) out of 80 student respondents have some kind of background information about this approach. Here, when we compare instructors' and students' degree of perception, about one to five team learning, instructors showed a bit better level of awareness than that of the student respondents. When we come to their motivation towards this approach, both the instructors and students have strong motivation towards it. According to the data indicated in Table 1 (see page 16) and Table 2 (see page 17), instructors' degree of motivation shows mean value of 3.38 and 3.18 for the students. When we interpret these figures in to frequency and percentage, we get 18.9 out of 28 that are 67.6% for instructors and about 50.9 from 80 which is nearly 63.6% of the student respondents. From this we can deduce that the instructors' degree of motivation is somewhat bigger than that of the students. This again may imply that some of the students lack interest towards this one to five team learning approach due to their own practical challenges they are facing during its implementation stage. When we see the relationship between instructors' perception and their motivation about one to five team learning, we find a strong positive correlation i.e. .660 (see Table 3) using a two tailed Pearson correlation statistical analysis. This data tells us both their perception and motivation are parallelly increased. This result is similar to findings by (Johnson & Johnson, 2006). Similarly, the students',

perception and motivation has also a strong positive correlation that is .615 (see Table 4) but it is somewhat weaker than that of the instructors'.

The Qualitative Data Analysis and Discussions

Based on the open-ended items of the questionnaire, interviews and the two FGDs, many of the student respondents think one to five team learning is a useful approach and they believe that working in team mutually benefit themselves from one another. However, almost half of them do not think this approach is better than teacher- centred approach and nearly half of them replied that team learning tasks are usually left for few responsible team members, especially group leaders. On the other hand, more than half of the instructors believe that one to five team learning is pedagogically valid technique in the field of EFL. Nevertheless, some of them think it is a means by which clever students support low achievers. Parallel to this, almost half of them stated that this approach contributes little to high achievers' academic development

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

The analysis of the quantitative data (See Tables 1 and 2) indicated that most of the participants (63.1% of the students and 68.8% of the instructors) positively perceived one to five team learning. Similarly, their motivation towards this approach is also encouraging. Among student respondents, about 63.6% and 67.6% of the instructors showed their interest towards this approach. There is also strong correlation (r=.660) between instructors' perception and their motivation to one to five team learning. Students' perception and motivation is also strongly related which is r=.615. This indicates that majority of the respondents think one to five team learning approach helped students learn better and improve their social skills. However, according to the qualitative data, there is variation among participants. Most of the student respondents stated that the team work is left for the group leaders. With this regard, some of the middle and low achievers complained that group leaders do not allow them to participate in the process of group activities, for they do not have trust up on them. Similar view is reflected by one department head interviewee. He said, "They (team members) lack commitment and capacity as well to contribute for the team work." Team leaders, on the contrary, blamed most of the group members' lack interest to do their own share for the team tasks. In relation to this, some of the group leaders as well as low and middle achievers criticized some of their instructors who do not assign roles and responsibilities when they give team works and do some kind of follow up on who does what. Many of the students and instructors appreciate mixed ability grouping for the justified pedagogical roles they have; yet some of them like flexible grouping. They want grouping should be left for instructors since working with new individuals on new topics provides new opportunity to learners. This idea is also shared by instructors.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings, the following recommendations have been made:

- Some of the respondents lack interest and knowledge about one to five team learning, thus concerned bodies such as college and university level Reform and Academic Quality Assurance Coordinating Offices need to provide trainings, create proper awareness and provide continuous follow up. Moreover, since pedagogy is very important for quality education stakeholders need to equip instructors and students with proper implementation of team learning.

- Most of the respondents reflect that group assignments are left for the group leader which is against the principle of team learning. Therefore, instructors should assign roles to group tasks and raise their students' awareness via special support so that every member of the group can contribute for their own learning and benefit equally. Mixed ability grouping appeared to be effective for team learning since it enables learners get every possible learning opportunity from different personality levels. Conversely, group formation need to be considered in the nature of courses modifying accordingly as they are vital for effective learning.

REFERENCES

Dembo, M. 2004. *Motivation and Learning Strategies for College Success: A Self-Management Approach.* New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.erlbaum.com

Efrem, O. and Oukula, O. 2015. Students' attitude towards One-to Five Peer Learning: A New Approach for Enhancing Education quality in Wolita Sodo University. *Journal of Education and Practice.* V. 6, No. 19

Fekadu, G. 2015. The Practice, Attitude and Challenge of Cooperative Learning Implementation in Ethiopian Higher Institutions. *International Conference on: The role of Higher Education in Development* (pp. 12-19). Addis Ababa: MoE.

Gaikwad, P. 1996. *Cooperative Learning: Setting the Stage for Faith and Learning in the Classroom.* Newdelhi: Spicer Memorial College.

Hill, S., & Hill, T. 1990. *The Collaborative Classroom.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Johnson, W., & F.Johnson. 2006. *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, W., & Johnson, R. 1989. *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research.* Edina: Interaction Book Company.

Melaku, M., Temechengn, E., & Harrison, A. 2013. Ethiopian University Science and Technology Instructors' Attitudes toward Active Learning. *International Journal of Science and Technology Educational Research, 4*(3), 47-56.

Richards, J. 2005. *Professional Development for Language Teachers: Strategies for Teacher Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seid, M. 2012. *Effects of Cooperative Learning on Reading Comprehension Achievement in EFL and Social Skills of Grade 10 Students. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation).* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

Smith, A. 1996. Cooperative Learning: Making "group work" work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 67,* 71-82.

****