

## A Comparison of Two English Reading Classes: With a Focus on Cooperative Learning\*

Jae-Suk Suh  
(Inha University)

Suh, Jae-Suk. (2005). A comparison of two English reading classes:  
With a focus on cooperative learning. *English Language &  
Literature Teaching*, 12(3), 79-98.

As one way of changing a teacher-fronted, grammar-based reading class into a meaningful, fun-creating one, this paper compared teacher-fronted reading with student-centered reading framed upon cooperative learning. In a study in which each type of reading method was conducted for college students in an EFL reading course for a period of one semester, data were gathered via questionnaires. The results showed that though each type of reading instruction came with its own strengths and weaknesses, student-centered reading instruction was preferred for various reasons. Most important, through an active participation in cooperative work, subjects were motivated and interested in L2 reading much, were exposed to various reading strategies and skills, and practiced them in a friendly, low-anxiety learning climate.

[reading instruction/cooperative learning/student-centered reading,  
독서교육/협동학습/학습자중심독서]

### I. INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of the educational paradigms of constructivism and humanistic

---

\*This work was supported by Inha University Research Grant.

psychology has contributed much to L2 teaching profession. Constructivists espouse social interaction in language learning as a fundamental notion through which progression is made toward the 'zone of proximal development.' Humanistic psychologists view learning basically as a function of affect or emotion, and highlight the crucial role of a non-threatening, stress-free learning environment in L2 development (Rogers, 1983 in Brown, 2000). Major effects which both paradigms have had on L2 instructional approaches can be seen clearly among language practitioners and teachers who have shown a strong preference for student-centered, process-oriented, and collaborative learning. In addition, a variety of L2 teaching methods and techniques have emerged in recent years in an effort to foster communication skills within the framework of constructivist and humanistic model of language learning.

Despite the widespread popularity and adoption of the two paradigms combined into communication-oriented classrooms in ESL contexts, such is not necessarily true in EFL contexts. The implementation of communication-oriented instruction under a supportive, low-anxiety learning climate in EFL contexts has been difficult, ineffective or even unsuccessful (Brindley & Hood, 1990). For instance, though it is clear that the importance of developing communication skills through interactions in a non-threatening, friendly classroom atmosphere has been long recognized among teachers and scholars since 1990s in our nation, it is not difficult to see that a considerable amount of a class period for English nationwide is allotted for the learning of grammar and vocabulary rather than centering on communicative aspects of language. In grammar-based instruction, the learning of conscious linguistic knowledge is facilitated and enhanced by reading which is usually done through word-for-word translation at sentence level (Im, 1993). Such a decoding approach to L2 reading in grammar-based instruction is sharply contrasted with a current, popular view of reading as a tool of communication through meaning-construction processes (Ruddell & Unrau, 1994), and as a source of comprehensible input in communication-oriented classrooms (Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Omaggio-Hadley, 2001).

In the light of a current trend of L2 teaching profession stressing meaning-focused learning in social contexts, it is necessary that L2 in-class reading should be taught as a meaning-making, fun-creating task based not only on

bottom-up processing skills, but also on top-down processing skills, and as a tool of communication fostering communicative skills through interactions in open-ended, low-anxiety learning situations. As one way of creating such a reading class, among a variety of instructional approaches, perhaps cooperative learning can become a legitimate, appropriate candidate to inject some healthy doses of ideas of the two aforementioned theoretical disciplines into L2 reading classrooms. That is, when integrated into L2 in-class reading in a careful, well-preplanned way, cooperative learning is assumed to increase the overall target language proficiency as well as L2 reading ability through such fundamental features of cooperative learning as interdependence and accountability among group workers.

The purpose of this paper was to increase the effectiveness of L2 reading instruction by comparing a teacher-fronted, grammar-based reading class with a student-centered reading class framed upon cooperative learning. To this end, the following questions were addressed.

1. What are advantages and disadvantages of using both student-centered, cooperative learning instruction and teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction in an EFL reading course?
2. In what ways is student-centered, cooperative learning instruction particularly beneficial and helpful in the promotion of L2 reading skill as compared to teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction in an EFL reading course?

## II. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

### 1. Cooperative Learning and Second/Foreign Language Learning

Cooperative learning is rooted in John Dewey's (1904, in Grisham & Molinelli, 1995) idea of child-centered progressivism around the early twentieth century, and was formally introduced as an instructional alternative to teacher-fronted, competition-oriented pedagogy in the 1960's and 1970's (Grisham & Molinelli, 1995). In spite of no clear definition of cooperative learning, one of the most

frequently cited definitions comes from Olsen and Kagan (1992) who viewed cooperative learning as “group learning activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others” (p. 8). Such a definition suggests a close link between cooperative learning and language learning which has led researchers and practitioners to consider cooperative learning as a vehicle for developing communicative competence in L2 learning and teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Numerous researchers have been active in providing rationales or justifications for using cooperative learning in L2 development. McGroarty (1989) was among the first to examine cooperative learning in bilingual and second language education, and saw cooperative learning as conducive to the attainment of the full L2 communicative competence since it provides increased opportunities for language practice, and promotes motivation through an active involvement in authentic language use. Long and Porter (1985), who made a comprehensive review of research findings on the notion of comprehensible input in L2 learning and the role of negotiation in non-native conversations, gave a psycholinguistic justification for group activity in a clear, cogent manner. They suggested that group work can become an effective, attractive alternative to teacher-fronted, lockstep instruction in L2 classrooms if the structure of group work or task is carefully taken into consideration. In the same vein, Knerr and James (1991) identified several benefits of cooperative learning in L2 development such as creation of non-threatening, friendly learning climate, increase in opportunities for language use, and development of various types of discourse strategies necessary for everyday life which would not be offered within a teacher-fronted classrooms in an easy, effective way. Likewise, according to Fathman and Kessler (1993) who provided principles and characteristics of cooperative learning, cooperative learning is an effective tool to help learners to become communicatively proficient L2 users though it can not replace a whole instructional system. Finally, Oxford (1997) attempted to make a comparison among cooperative learning, collaborative learning and interaction, and viewed cooperative learning as more organized, and more prescriptive on the part of both teacher and students than collaborative learning whose aim lies

in the reacculturation of students into knowledge communities through help of more knowledgeable persons. In sum, the forementioned, various rationales and justifications for the use of cooperative learning in L2 development clearly show its strong foundation in theory though research findings have been somewhat mixed and inconclusive (Grisham & Molinelli, 1995).

## 2. Cooperative Learning and EFL Reading

Unlike a plethora of theoretical rationales for cooperative learning in SLA, there has been a relatively small number of studies on cooperative learning and L2 reading in EFL context. Bang (2002) conducted a study in which more than one hundred students were divided into two groups, an experimental group engaging in cooperative work and a control group engaging in teacher-fronted, grammar-based reading in a college reading course for one semester. She found the positive role of cooperative learning in L2 reading by showing that the experimental group scored much higher on a reading fluency test than the control group. Similarly, Rha and Lee (2004) examined the effect of small group work on EFL reading in college, and showed that four subjects during reading constantly interacted with one another by offering information on grammar, vocabulary and context, which led to the promotion of L2 reading skill. Finally, Hahn and Jeon (2005) investigated EFL teachers' attitude toward cooperative learning with a focus on classroom practice in a study in which data were gathered via questionnaires from more than two hundred teachers in Korea. It was reported that most important, though the majority of teachers fully acknowledged the beneficial role of cooperative learning in developing reading skill as well as other skills, a relatively large number of teachers showed reluctance of using cooperative learning in their classes mainly because of either their unpreparedness for conducting cooperative learning or disciplinary problems.

### III. METHOD

#### 1. Participants

Subjects in the study were composed of thirty-six college students who were enrolled in one of the major universities in the nation. They were taking a course entitled "English Reading" at the time of study. All the subjects majored in English education, and about two thirds of them were either junior or senior. Twenty-five students were female, and self-rated English reading proficiency ranged from intermediate-mid to advanced. According to background information gathered at the beginning of course, it was shown that all subjects had become accustomed to teacher-dominated English classes in middle and high schools in which L2 reading had been taught mainly through word-decoding processes centering on the learning of grammar and vocabulary.

#### 2. Instrument and Procedures

In an effort to answer research questions, data were collected by means of questionnaire. Questionnaire was designed to elicit data on subjects' reactions to different types of reading instruction which they were exposed to throughout one semester. As stated before, since the focus of the study was on comparing a teacher-fronted, bottom-up approach with a student-centered, cooperative learning approach in an EFL reading course, two different questionnaires were created each of which contained questions asking about subjects' thoughts, feelings, or opinions about each type of reading instruction. Each questionnaire was given to the subjects immediately after the completion of using each type of reading instruction, and was attached in Appendix A and B, respectively.

As for the implementation of two differing types of reading instruction in the study, the first half of the semester was devoted to the use of a teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction while the second half of the semester was allotted to a student-centered, cooperative learning approach. More specifically, during the first seven weeks, students were in a reading course in which they played the role of recipients of knowledge while an instructor played the role of an information-giver or controller who was in charge of every moment during a

class period. Under this learning circumstance L2 reading was taught in such a way that an instructor introduced a new topic of a given text with a view to activating subjects' schemata facilitating the comprehension of a text, and read aloud L2 texts sentence-by-sentence for translation along with a focus on new vocabulary items and complex, challenging grammatical structures. After the completion of teacher-initiated reading instruction, students were given some time to ask questions or raise problems or issues involving the understanding of a given text. In this way, students had a chance to make sure that what they missed or did not understand during instruction could be treated again in their efforts to gain a clearer, better understanding of L2 texts.

On the other hand, after a one-week period of a mid-term examination, for the second half of semester, a student-centered, cooperative learning approach was used. The students during this period were engaged in one typical type of cooperative learning, Jigsaw, in which they were asked to work in small groups of four. Nine home groups were created each of which was instructed to submit a list of names of group members for the sake of group management and grading. For each class period, each group member in individual home groups was given a differing portion of a text for homework which he or she had to have a thorough knowledge about for the following class. The term, expert, was used to indicate the group member who was responsible for a particular portion of a text. Expert groups were formed in which experts who had the same assigned reading, but were in differing home groups worked together to assist one another in achieving a full, solid understanding of their common reading assignment. Then experts went back to their home groups to teach other group members what they learned from expert groups. After the sharing of what each expert learned with teammates in home groups, a quiz was given to all students as one way of evaluating cooperative work in Jigsaw. Since by its very nature, cooperative learning requires an individual student to take responsibility for others' as well as his or her learning for an effective, successful learning to take place, class attendance was always emphasized throughout the semester.

### 3. Data Analysis

The data collected by means of questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively. A

qualitative analysis was done in such a way that subjects' written responses were read several times with careful attention paid to content to determine 'communication unit' which has an independent meaning expressing subjects' feeling, thought or behavior (Langer & Applebee, 1987, in Mangelsdorf, 1992). Next, identified communication units which showed similar concepts were placed together to develop categories, and a comparison among communication units in the same group was made to check whether there was any overlapping or relatedness among them. Such a process led to a gradual emergence of categories of communication units, and each category was given an appropriate name best representing its concept or notion.

#### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

##### 1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Two Types of Reading Instruction

The use of two differing types of reading instruction, i.e., a teacher-fronted, grammar-based approach and a student-centered, cooperative learning approach, throughout semester brought a variety of advantages and disadvantages in the EFL college reading course.

**TABLE 1**  
**Advantages of Each Type of Reading Instruction**

TFGBI (Categories of unit of communication)	SCCLI (Categories of unit of communication)
Gaining an accurate, clear, line-by-line translation of text	Gaining a comprehensive understanding of text based on various perspectives from others
Saving time	Active, voluntary preparation of class
Offering an easy way of comprehending difficult parts of text	Promoting interest & motivation for class
Offering a chance to have a deeper understanding via teacher explanation	Building a good relationship among classmates
	Fostering an active participation in class

Cf) TFGB: Teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction

SCCL: Student-centered, cooperative learning instruction



As seen in Table 1, each type of reading instruction had its own benefits for L2 reading. As one main advantage of teacher-fronted instruction, many subjects saw that teacher-initiated line-by-line translation helped them to gain an accurate, detailed understanding of text. As another advantage, teacher-fronted instruction guided subjects in understanding difficult, challenging parts of text in an easy, rapid way, and further in attaining a deeper and clearer understanding of text as one subject mentioned, "I like the way in which reading is taught because teacher explains what we have to know in a concrete, easy manner. This leads me to compare my version of translation with teacher's, and helps me get a better, deeper understanding of text." As a result, the teacher's role as information-giver or controller who took care of every moment of a class period seemed to allow subjects to save much time in their efforts to comprehend text, otherwise they would have spent a lot of time reading through text by themselves for comprehension.

Meanwhile, nearly all the subjects agreed that gaining a comprehensive, clear understanding of text based on various perspective of other teammates in small groups was one major advantage of a cooperative learning approach. Several subjects mentioned that they were able to listen to others' opinions or thoughts about reading materials, and discuss them to reach consensus on comprehension, which was never possible during independent, isolated reading, and helped to enhance an overall comprehension of reading materials. Further working together in cooperative Jigsaw groups naturally led to an active participation in class through interaction among classmates, and helped to improve a learning atmosphere beneficial to the development of L2 reading. One subject remarked that "One great thing of Jigsaw activities is the classroom atmosphere which is more friendly and more supportive than teacher-fronted learning, and encourages me to work hard to read better in L2." It is obvious that an active involvement in group work and an improved learning climate contributed to the increased intimate relationships among class members. In light of the fact that group members' counting on one another is one of the key features of cooperative learning, the successful implementation of Jigsaw activities relies much on positive interdependence among teammates that comes basically from an active, enthusiastic participation in interaction (Grisham & Molinelli, 1995). During interaction, group members become engaged in the performance of various types

of socially motivated language functions (e.g., request, apology, description, explanation, suggestion, argumentation, and persuasion, among others) through which they get to know each other, develop insights into others' perspectives, and promote familiarity. These pro-social skills and behaviors seem to contribute considerably to the increasing of close relationships among classmates. One subject made this point clear, saying that "a constant information exchange among teammates helps me understand what others think or feel. Based on various opinions or thoughts, we try to reach an agreement on problems or issues during reading through discussion, which gradually led us to trust each other, and establish a good relationship among us both in and out of classroom."

Another advantage of cooperative Jigsaw activities addressed by subjects in the L2 reading class involves the promotion of motivation, stimulation of interest and little tedious experience of class. Here are some examples taken from data:

"Unlike teacher-fronted classroom where we can be absentminded, or hide behind from time to time, Jigsaw activities always require me to stay attentive to the class to get on the right track. Though such a demanding is hard to meet, it really motivates me to become a good contributor for the work."

"The idea of working collaboratively in a reading course is entirely new to me, but stimulates lots of interest in L2 reading which I had done mostly from a sense of obligation to gain high scores on tests like TOEIC in the past."

In addition, several subjects did not hesitate to point out that their experience with Jigsaw activities helped them to build responsibility for their own learning. They stated that a mandatory participation in Jigsaw activities led them to become sensitive to what should be done for the class, and to have a strong sense of responsibility for learning that they had seldom felt before since everyone in the class had to be an expert in an assigned reading. Finally, many subjects listed a good, thorough preparation of the class as one benefit of the Jigsaw method in the L2 reading class. They saw class preparation as

necessary and indispensable for the effective, successful learning to take place though they felt that the processes involving class preparation were often boring and time-consuming.

Next, Table 2 showed major disadvantages of each type of reading instruction addressed by subjects throughout the semester.

**TABLE 2**  
**Disadvantages of Each Type of Reading Instruction**

TFGBI (Categories of unit of communication)	SCCLI (Categories of unit of communication)
Passive involvement in class	Distraction of attention after work
Poor class preparation	Poor class preparation
Heavy dependence on teacher	Difficulty of reaching an agreement
Little interest and motivation	

Cf) TFGB: Teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction

SCCL: Student-centered, cooperative learning instruction

As one noticeable weakness of teacher-fronted reading instruction, nearly all the subjects voiced that there were little opportunities for them to have an active participation or involvement in class since an instructor took care of every moment of class period. Such a teacher-dominated instruction resulted in several serious problems. For instance, many subjects told that a passive, involuntary participation in class reduced their concentration on class to some extent, and hindered the promotion of critical thinking ability since an instructor led the class unilaterally. Also according to several subjects, teacher-fronted instruction caused them to depend on an instructor for class preparation or review, which was not desirable not only for learning itself, but also for exam preparation later. One subject cogently explained this by saying that "Though there was no burden placed upon me for class preparation in the teacher-fronted class, I had a tendency to rely much on teacher, and to be negligent in making a preview or review of class since he handled almost everything in text in a clear, detailed manner." Another subject complained about his negligence in an appropriate class preparation by saying that "little

class preparation made me confused about which part of text I understood or which part I didn't."

There were still other subjects who saw little interest in or tediousness about class as another major weakness of teacher-fronted instruction. One subject showed how she felt during teacher-dominated instruction, remarking that "Like me, other students in the class appeared to get less motivated for learning, and on top of this, the learning atmosphere was inactive and depressed." Meanwhile, one thing of interest here is that though grammatical explanations were given often in an explicit, clear manner during the class, subjects did not express their concern or dissatisfaction with the ways of teacher's dealing with grammar in the class. It is likely that despite their much experience with bottom-up, decoding process in the past, they still felt a need for learning more about grammar for a better comprehension of L2 texts which contained more challenging and more complex grammatical rules and structures than those treated in high school days.

On the other hand, in cooperative Jigsaw activities there were also some drawbacks identified by subjects. These drawbacks include: distraction of attention due to variations in time of completion of work among groups, poor class preparation, and difficulty of reaching agreement among group members. First, several subjects expressed their concern about distraction caused by differences in time of completion of work among groups. Though an emphasis was given on the importance of observing a time limit whenever subjects began to engage in a new reading material, in reality, there existed differences among groups in the completion of a reading task, which often induced some groups to fall into gossiping, or even lose track of the class. One subject worried that "Frequently the earlier completion of work tended to lead teammates in my group to spend the remaining time on talking about things irrelevant to reading. Though I believed that a little gossiping or small talk was helpful in having a smooth start or building familiarity among group members, the excessive use of it could be a problem or barrier to the class." Second, subjects were concerned about the negative effect of insufficient preparation on their group work. Since Jigsaw activities presupposes accountability and positive interdependence among teammates for maximal learning outcomes, each individual's contribution is fundamental, which requires every group member to make a proper, sincere

preparation for the class. Many subjects stressed that the success of cooperative work depended entirely on sufficient preparation of what each one of them was supposed to do in groups, and otherwise, the group work would have been ineffective, and even wasteful. Third, some subjects complained about the difficulty of reaching consensus among group members during cooperative work. Such an occasion usually occurred when several different opinions or thoughts about a given problem or issue were competing with each other, and teammates had no sufficient confidence of which to choose from as a final solution. This difficulty often resulted in an inaccurate, unclear understanding of text.

## 2. Facilitative Role of Cooperative Work in L2 Reading Class

As for an answer to the research question 2 (i.e, the beneficial role of student-centered, cooperative learning instruction in the promotion of L2 reading fluency as compared to teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction), subjects perceived cooperative Jigsaw activities as more beneficial and more useful for fostering L2 reading fluency than teacher-fronted instruction in several ways. First of all, most subjects thought that L2 reading in cooperative work allowed them to know what they are supposed to do for L2 reading comprehension through discovery learning. They said that by considering various thoughts and opinions from teammates, it was possible to try several interpretations of a given part of text, and reach the best comprehension. This way of testing various hypotheses and reaching a final solution through trial- and error-kinds of discovery learning helped to build confidence in L2 reading, which in turn would facilitate the promotion of L2 reading ability as one subject explained that "I felt more confident and more motivated engaging in L2 reading during cooperative work in which we by ourselves were able to find ways leading to achieve a better and more comprehensive understanding of text, and increase our reading skill in a slow, but successful way." Second, cooperative Jigsaw activities played the beneficial role in fostering L2 reading ability in that subjects during cooperative work had plentiful opportunities to help others or be helped by others through giving and taking help, guide or assistance, and achieved a deeper level of understanding of whatever they learned in a given class period. In other words, while working in groups, individual subjects were

exposed to large quantities of scaffolding which enabled them to move from what they had already known to what they would be able to do through interactions with teammates (Baron & Boschee, 1995; Han, 2006; Nyikos & Hashimoto, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978). Subjects' easy and rapid access to various kinds of help or assistance through scaffolding seemed to help them solve reading problems effectively and successfully, and become skillful, fluent L2 readers.

Third, as stated above, many subjects agreed that learning effectiveness increases in cooperative work to a greater extent since interaction with group members in a higher level of reading ability helped them to understand a text in an easy, rapid way than in the teacher-initiated reading class where they either received new knowledge passively, or looked up new, difficult vocabulary items or grammatical rules in a dictionary or a grammar book alone. One subject made this point clear, saying that "cooperative activities in small groups worked well for me since I felt discussion of ideas and opinions about reading with teammates helped me to know about our text easier and faster, and further to remember new words or information in it longer." Finally, nearly all subjects did not hesitate to mention student-centeredness as one clear benefit of the cooperative Jigsaw method that lacks in a teacher-fronted reading class. It seemed that during the cooperative Jigsaw method, subjects looked active and energetic, and were eager to try hard in doing whatever they worked on. Such an attitude toward learning was hard to observe in a teacher-centered class, and played a major role in creating a variety of benefits (e.g., creation of a friendly, supportive classroom atmosphere, provision of opportunities to learn and practice various reading skills and strategies, and promotion of a spirit of mutual help as an important pro-social skill necessary in everyday life) conducive both to the building of confidence in L2 reading and to the increasing of L2 reading skill.

## V. CONCLUSION

The present paper focused on making a comparison between two types of reading instruction, i.e., teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction and student-

centered instruction framed upon cooperative learning in terms of advantages and disadvantages, and on determining the facilitative role of student-centered cooperative learning instruction in an EFL reading class. As the results of the study showed, both types of reading instruction had their own strengths and weaknesses though the cooperative Jigsaw method had far more benefits than teacher-fronted method in several important ways. Above all, the cooperative Jigsaw method was excellent in getting subjects to participate in class actively and voluntarily through active class preparation and discovery learning in their efforts to attain their common goal in groups. Such an active, enthusiastic involvement in class in turn led subjects to be motivated and interested in the reading class, and contributed considerably to the creation of a learning climate in which subjects could help each other, and be helped by teammates through interaction to solve reading problems. During interaction they had plentiful opportunities to be exposed to a variety of reading strategies and reading skills necessary for a better, faster understanding of L2 texts, and to practice them in a contextualized, low-anxiety classroom, which would have a positive effect on the promotion of L2 reading skill. Meanwhile, despite some serious problems such as lack of interest and motivation for learning, a poor class preparation, and a heavy reliance on teacher, teacher-fronted instruction was perceived as useful in offering an accurate, correct translation of L2 texts in a clear, time-saving manner.

The major advantages of student-centered, cooperative learning instruction, which best represent the currently popular educational mottos highlighting learning through social interaction in a non-threatening, low-anxiety classroom environment, can lead one to believe that when planned and used carefully, cooperative learning can become an appropriate candidate to be integrated into L2 reading in order to make existing teacher-fronted, boring reading classroom more interesting, more energetic and more successful. However, this does not mean that teacher-fronted instruction should always be avoided in L2 reading classes. The majority of subjects in the study fully acknowledged the positive role of teacher-fronted instruction in L2 reading, and agreed that they would be active in combining student-centered, cooperative learning instruction together with teacher-fronted instruction in the future because they saw a clear, strong need for teacher-fronted instruction for the purpose of explaining grammar in an

explicit way, holding control over to both class and students, and developing basic reading skills. So it can be safely said that student-centered, cooperative learning instruction along with teacher intervention whenever necessary would maximize students' potential ability to become accurate, fluent L2 readers who have a balanced development between bottom-up reading skills and top-down reading skills.

As for the weaknesses of the study, since each type of reading instruction was conducted within a relatively short period of time (i.e., six weeks for each type of instruction), subjects might not be immersed fully into each type of instruction, particularly cooperative Jigsaw method, which can have a negative effect on the overall findings of the study. Similarly, another problem involves a short period of separation between the two types of reading instruction. As a buffer to reduce any effects or influence of teacher-fronted instruction on the following cooperative Jigsaw method (Pritchard, 1990), an interval of one week was used, which might not be sufficient to make subjects free from a previous method and refreshed for a new reading method. Finally, gender was not controlled properly. It is possible that female dominance in group work would influence various aspects of interaction such as the number of turn taking, the amount of speech produced by male teammates, and the kinds of reading strategies and skills preferred by female teammates, among others.

As L2 teaching profession stays away from teacher-fronted, product-oriented instruction, and moves toward student-centered, process-oriented instruction, it is necessary for teachers to change their EFL reading classes accordingly. As the findings of the study showed, one good way of making such a change happen is by injecting some healthy doses of ideas of cooperative learning into traditional L2 reading instruction. By doing so, it can be hoped that our students would be more likely to enjoy a meaning-driven, self-direct, and fun-creating L2 reading task than ever before.

## REFERENCES

- Bang, Y. J. (2002). The use of collaborative work in a college EFL reading classroom. *English Teaching*, 57(3), 145-167.



- Baron, M., & Boschee, F. (1995). *Authentic assessment: The key to unlocking student success*. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic.
- Brindley, G., & Hood, S. (1990). Curriculum innovation in adult ESL. In G. Brindley (Ed.), *The second language curriculum in action* (pp. 232-248). Sydney, Australia: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th ed.)*. Longman.
- Dewey, J. (1904). *The educational situation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fathman, A., & Kessler, C. (1993). Cooperative language learning in school contexts. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 127-140.
- Grisham, D., & Molinelli, P. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Professional's guide*. Westminster, CA: Teacher Created Materials.
- Hahn, J. W., & Jeon, I. J. (2005). Korean EFL teachers' beliefs of cooperative learning: With a focus on classroom practice. *English Teaching, 60*(4), 87-108.
- Han, S. H. (2005). Effects of small group transcription activities on university students' English listening comprehension. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 12*(1), 257-286.
- Im, B. B. (1993). An effective teaching & learning approach to improve EFL reading comprehension by exercising faster reading and facilitating to comprehend written texts. *Kongju University Monograph Collection, 31*, 51-77.
- Knerr, J., & James, J. (1991). Partner work and small group work for cooperative and communicative learning. In L. Strasheim (Ed.), *Focus on the foreign language learner* (pp. 54-67). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Center.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: The Alemany Press.
- Langer, S., & Applebee, A. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking*. Urbana, Illinois: NCTE.
- Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 207-227.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT, 46*, 274-284.
- McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *NABE Journal, 13*, 127-143.

- Nyikos, M., & Hashimoto, R. (1997). Constructivist theory applied to collaborative learning in teacher education: In search of ZPD. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 506-517.
- Olsen, R., & Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning* (pp. 1-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning: Collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 443-456.
- Pritchard, R. (1990). The effects of cultural schema on reading processing strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *25*, 273-295.
- Rha, K. H., & Lee, S. (2004). On group dynamics and teacher's role in a reading group. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *10*(1), 77-106.
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, C. R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the eighties*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Ruddell, R., & Unrau, N. (1994). Reading as a meaning-construction process: The reader, the text, and the teacher. In R. Ruddell, M. Ruddell & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 996-1056). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

## APPENDIX A

Questionnaire (Given after teacher-fronted, grammar-based instruction)

- Male ( )                      Female ( )
  - Year in College: Freshman ( )    Sophomore ( )    Junior ( )    Senior ( )
  - Your level of English Reading Fluency:
- Intermediate-low ( )    Intermediate-mid ( )    Intermediate-high ( )    Advanced ( )
-

Please read the following questions, and answer them based on your thoughts or feelings about what you have experienced in a reading class.

1. Describe the way that you had been taught English reading in your school days?
2. What do you think is the most serious problem with the teaching of reading in our English classrooms these days?
3. If you teach students how to read in the English class, how will you do so? (What is your own idea of teaching reading effectively and successfully?)
4. Do you feel teacher-fronted reading instruction (TFRI) was helpful in improving your reading skill? Why or Why not?
5. Do you think you have enjoyed TFRI throughout semester? Why? or Why not?
  - What you like most:
  - What you hate most:
6. What do you think are advantages of TFRI?
7. What do you think are disadvantages of TFRI?
8. Would you like to use TFRI in your future EFL classroom? Why? or Why not?

## APPENDIX B

Questionnaire (Given after student-centered, cooperative Jigsaw activities)

Please read the following questions, and answer them based on your thoughts or feelings about what you have experienced in a reading class.

1. Do you feel cooperative learning (CL) was helpful in improving your reading skill? Why? or Why not?
2. Do you think you have enjoyed CL throughout semester?
  - What you like most:
  - What you hate most:
3. What do you think are advantages of CL?
4. What do you think are disadvantages of CL?
5. Would you like to use CL in your future EFL classroom? Why? or Why not?
6. Which of the two methods, TFRI or CL, do you like better? Why do you

think so? Please specify your reasons.

**예시 언어(Examples in): English**  
**적용가능 언어(Applicable Languages): English**  
**적용가능 수준(Applicable Levels): Secondary/College**

Jae-Suk Suh  
Inha University  
Younghyun-dong Nam-gu, Incheon  
Tel: (032) 860 - 7854  
Fax: (032) 865 - 3857  
E-mail: jssuh@inha.ac.kr

Received in July. 2006  
Reviewed by Aug. 2006  
Revised version received in Sept. 2006