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Abstract

Because writing is very significant in students’ academic achievement, it makes a very debatable topic in second/foreign language researches. One of the approaches that has proved to be effective in enhancing students’ writing quality is the cooperative learning approach. On this light, this research study intended to find out if “Think-Pair-Share” as a cooperative learning technique has a significant effect on enhancing students’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence. To give consistency to this study, an experimental design was conducted for the sake of examining the cause-effect relationship between the two variables. Accordingly, to reach the aims of this research, third-year pupils at Maanser Ounis Secondary School “Ain Kercha” were chosen to be the subjects of this investigation. Two groups from the literary stream were assigned randomly as an experimental and a control groups. Before giving the treatment, both groups were pre-tested to see their actual level in writing paragraphs in terms of coherence. Then, the experimental group received the treatment, as reflected in the implementation of think-pair-share strategy. As the final step, both groups were post-tested in the same way they were pre-tested. The obtained results showed that pupils who are subjected to think-pair-share strategy scored a statistically significant improvement in terms of coherence in writing paragraphs when compared to those who were not. Finally, this research study led to the conclusion that think-pair-share technique is effective on enhancing students’ coherence in writing paragraphs. In other words, the research hypothesis which states that think-pair-share strategy would enhance students’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence is confirmed in favor of the null hypothesis. Eventually, it is recommended to adopt “Think-Pair-Share” technique in second/foreign language classrooms to teach the writing skill.
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General Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem

It is worth mentioning that writing is an important but difficult skill to be developed. It is difficult for everyone writing in a first language, and much more difficult for those writing in a foreign/second languages. Many foreign language students complain about being lost when they start writing in English since, in addition to grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics, they are required to express their ideas appropriately and in a clear and a coherent way. Interviewing secondary school teachers of English allows us to say that coherence is one of the greatest problems for students in writing. Even when using a relatively accurate grammar and appropriate vocabulary, students’ paragraphs may sound difficult to understand and follow through them. The main reason behind this is probably due to the lack of the appropriate techniques used to teach writing. Subsequently, teachers have to pay attention to the techniques they provide.

To this end, “Think-Pair-Share”, a cooperative learning strategy, could be the suggested solution and it could be the appropriate technique that suits the learners to improve their writing skill. That is to say, it could help students to write coherent paragraphs in a clear way. Eventually, the present research attempts to investigate the effect of “Think-Pair-Share” strategy on enhancing students’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence.

2. Aims of the Study

The present research study aims at gauging secondary school pupils’ ability in writing coherent paragraphs. It also suggests “Think-Pair-Share” as a workable technique to help the pupils to overcome their problems in writing coherent paragraphs and enhance their overall writing achievement. In other words, this research aims first at evaluating pupils’ performance before using “Think-Pair-Share” strategy and second at measuring
statistically the improvement in their writing as a result to the implementation of this strategy.

3. Research Questions and Hypothesis

The questions that should be raised in this research are:

- Does “Think-Pair-Share”, a cooperative learning strategy, enhance third-year pupils’ paragraphs in terms of coherence?

- To what extent does “Think-Pair-Share” technique help students to write coherent paragraphs?

On the basis of what is mentioned above, we hypothesize that:

- **H1**: There would be a significant improvement in students’ coherence in writing paragraphs if they are guided towards an effective implementation of “Think-pair-Share” strategy.

- **H0**: There would be no statistically significant improvement in students’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence after receiving “Think-Pair-Share” strategy.

4. Tools of the Research

To achieve the aims of this research study, an experimental research design is then opted for. Forty (40) third-year pupils at Maanser Ounis Secondary School are chosen randomly from the literary stream to be the subjects of this investigation. The sample is divided into an experimental group and a control group. Both of them take a pre-test in order to set scores of writing performance in terms of coherence at the starting point of the experiment. During the treatment period, which takes six (6) sessions, the experimental group is guided to use “Think-Pair-Share” strategy in every writing assignment. The control group receives writing instruction in the usual way i.e., with no emphasis on the adopted strategy. By the end, both groups take the post-test and then data are collected, and the results are compared and analyzed.
5. Structure of the Study

This research study covers two chapters: one is the theoretical background of the research and the other is the practical framework. The first chapter is divided into two sections. The first section discusses coherence in writing from different theoretical standpoints, while the second one is devoted to “Think-Pair-Share” as a cooperative learning strategy. The second chapter is devoted to pre-test/post-test analysis where the hypothesis is tested and the main results are obtained.
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Introduction

Writing has always been considered as an important skill in teaching and learning EFL/ESL. Today, great interest is given to the writing skill since it is viewed by many as the most difficult skill among the four. Furthermore, much more emphasize is given to different writing aspects. This section highlights coherence as one of the most important features in EFL writing. First, it seeks to review the nature of writing and the most important approaches to teach writing in terms of coherence. It tackles the importance of writing and also the most common EFL learners’ writing problems. Furthermore, different theoretical standpoints relating to coherence are discussed: its definition, coherence and cohesion, aspects of coherence, and then different techniques of assessing this aspect of writing.

1.1.1. The Nature of Writing

For most people, writing could be seen only as the production of graphic symbols or the translation of what is spoken. However, this is certainly not true, because writing is more than this. It is the matter of arranging those symbols in order to form pieces of words for the sake of producing sentences that have meaning, and that could be understood clearly by the reader (Byrne, 1991). Brown (2001) also argues that the nature of writing is more than only graphic symbols. He states that writing is the activity of text production that requires thinking and drafting, writing and rewriting, and then revising. This process allows writers to generate thoughts and present them in an accurate, coherent and an organized way.

Nunan (1991) sees that writing is an artistic process that can be learned and developed by following some conventions and instructions to improve and promote the writing abilities. In other words, writing needs practice to be developed and improved. Moreover, Hayes (1996) holds that writing is a social activity because it is carried out in a social
setting. In other words, improving the writing skill requires more study and practice, thus, learners could share their thoughts to explore more about the topic to build their confidence in writing their ideas.

1.1.2. Teaching Foreign Language Writing

Teaching writing is not an easy task, especially foreign language writing. It has always been a controversial issue in the field because of the many aspects involved such as product vs. process, the importance of feedback, the role of the first language…etc. Eventually, the following provides the common approaches to teach foreign language writing as well as its importance in students’ achievement. Moreover, it tackles the main problems students face while writing in the target language.

1.1.2.1. Approaches to Teaching Writing

Many approaches to teach writing have emerged for the sake of helping learners/writers to promote their written products and teach them how to write effectively. Choosing one approach rather than the other is much more related to what the learners are expected to do and to achieve. Sometimes, interest is placed on the way learners write (the process of writing), and sometimes focus is placed only on the final product without giving more importance to the steps of writing.

1.1.2.1.1. The Product Approach

The product approach, as its name indicates, focuses on the final product. This approach is one of the earliest writing approaches that has emerged on the mid of 1960’s. It is based mainly on habit formation. That is to say, learners imitate a model of writing that is provided by the teacher, may be some words or sentences that are familiar with the content and then try to transform them to the new product for the sake of being coherent, comprehensible, clear and well organized (Rechards& Rodgers, 2001). However, they state that, errors concerning the other aspects of writing (grammar, vocabulary, spelling
mistakes, and so on) are corrected step by step, because the students’ works are evaluated each time by teachers, and this helps them to correct their errors until the final product which is expected to be perfect. To clarify more, adopting the product approach means that language learners are focusing only on the form of the final product which should have correct grammar, appropriate vocabulary, right punctuation, correct spelling and logical order of ideas. All this is done without giving interest to the process of writing, and this of course is not easy to achieve. Pincas (1982) identifies mainly four stages that comprise this approach before producing the final product, namely familiarization, controlled writing, guided writing, and free writing. Hyland (2003, p.3) in his view agrees in this point. He proposes these four stages to reach an effective written product for those who adopt the product approach. According to Hyland, Familiarization is the stage where the learners are taught certain grammar and vocabulary, usually through a text. In controlled writing, the learners manipulate fixed pattern, often from substation tables. Guided writing is the stage where learners imitate model texts; while free writing is the stage where the learners use the patterns they have developed to write their own written products. Following these basic stages will help the learners to have more linguistic knowledge that helps them to correct their works as much as possible.

1.1.2.1.2. The Process Approach

The process approach has emerged by the end of the 1960’s as a reaction to the product approach. It focuses on the way learners write rather than on the final product. Moreover, this approach of writing is based on learner’s creativity rather than on imitating models of writing (Tribble, 1996). Brown (2001) for his part, states that the process approach is based on learners’ efforts because all their needs, expectations, goals, learning styles, skills, and knowledge are taken into consideration. Brown adds that the main focus
of this approach is on the process of writing but with no ignorance to the writing product itself.

The process approach usually involves several steps. The number of these steps depends on the writing situation, the level of the learners and the purpose of the writing itself. Generally speaking, writers follow three major steps: prewriting, drafting, and revising. In some situations, it is necessary to think, plan, write, and edit. In others, prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and evaluating are required (Rechards & Redandey, 2003).

Many researchers agree that the process approach has many advantages. Brown (2001) says that this model of writing helps the language learners to manage their own writing, and allows them to be more creative while writing; hence, their writing will be clear and coherent. Furthermore, Raimes (1991) states that the process approach is the process of discovery. That is to say, it provides learners with enough time to think, write, and rewrite their ideas. It also encourages them to feel free to convey their own thoughts, yet they discover new information and monitor their errors. Nunan (1991) also confirms that this approach encourages collaborative group work from both teachers and learners, and this promotes their motivation and positive attitudes.

1.1.2.2. The Importance of teaching Writing

Teaching writing is very important for foreign language learners. McArther, Graham, and Fitzgerald (2008) say that: “writing provides an important mean to personnel self-expression” (p.11). In other words, because writing is one of the most difficult skills to be developed, reaching a good level in this skill gives much more power to language learners, and this would be beneficial both psychologically and physiologically. McArther, Graham, and Fitzgerald, explain the importance of writing as follows:
- Writing allows language learners to feel much more free and secure in expressing their thoughts, views, feelings, and experiences.

- It lowers the learners’ blood pressure and makes them more relax and comfortable.

- Writing means providing enough time for thinking, and this helps learners to use different learning styles to convince the others in a logical way (ibid, p.11).

For Hyland (2003), “writing is one of the main ways that we create a coherent social reality through engaging with others” (p.69). That is to say, writing expresses the social relationships which could be discovered through the writers’ texts. Moreover, he adds that teaching and learning EFL writing has a great importance by highlighting two main objectives: (1) promoting students’ learning by helping them to think, reflect, and concentrate and (2) motivating them to develop their abilities to be more organized in their learning process.

1.1.2.3. Problems in Foreign Language Writing

Graham (2006) defines the writing problems as the lack of development in the writing skill. Based on this definition, one can sound that writing problems is a serious issue that most EFL/ESL learners challenge. He adds that most writers have difficulties while writing and much more problems occur when learners are expected to write in foreign and second languages. Schoonen (2003) holds that writing is primary a learned art that requires language learners to develop and use different abilities relaying on their own creativity which seems difficult in foreign language settings. Graham and Harris (1993) maintain that the writing problems could be the result of either the lack of proficiency, the lack of knowledge relating to the subject content, or to the frequent errors that learners unconsciously make. Furthermore, problems may also occur due to the lack of effective strategies used to teach writing.
Moreover, Byrne (1991) summarizes the writing problems mainly under three major categories:

- The psychological problems: here he focuses on two main points; interaction and giving feedback. In short, the lack of interaction and discussion while writing, and obliging students to write on their own most of the time may create problems for them. These problems are basically anxiety, the lack of motivation, and lack of self-esteem and self-confidence. In addition to this, the absence of correction and giving feedback are also likely to lead to problems.

- The linguistic problems: this is related to the lack of knowledge and to the choice of the appropriate words that are related to the content. Learners sometimes have limited information about the subject provided, and this would affect their writing products.

- The cognitive problems: this concerns the way of generating and organizing the ideas in a comprehensible, clear, and a coherent way. Learners sometimes have the enough amount of linguistic knowledge, but they may have problems in the choice of the relevant information. Moreover, they become lost when selecting and putting together interesting items which is probably due to the lack of confidence, or fear of making mistakes (ibid, pp. 10-11).

1.1.3. Coherence in Foreign Language Writing

1.1.3.1. Definition of Coherence

It is worth mentioning that coherence is not an easy term to define. Unlike the other writing aspects, coherence is a complex phenomenon that needs to be focused on. However, talking about this feature of writing requires first to discuss Halliday and Hasan’s research work. Halliday and Hasan (1976) state that in order to make a text or any written product cohere, three major elements have to be taken into account: textual features
and information structure, thematic patterns, and the macrostructure of the text. These elements are working together to achieve the meaning relations underlying the text.

After Halliday and Hasan’s work (1976) many researchers come to expand the idea of coherence and other definitions have been provided trying to clarify more this aspect of writing. Celce-Murcia (2001) for instance, states that coherence is the product of paragraph unity and sentence cohesion. In other words, coherence in writing results when the ideas and sentences are related to each other, but they should flow smoothly in each other without any shift or jump.

Moreover, Chiang (1999) shows that coherence is the result of tying the writer’s ideas and thoughts together so that connections that he or she has made in mind are appeared to the reader. Chiang says that in order to get the easy flow from one idea to another in a coherent way, and to make the structure and arrangement of the information clear for the reader, the writer should highlights the ties between the old and the new information. i.e., all the ideas provided in any written product should be related clearly to the topic provided, this could be achieved only by selecting the important issues and cutting out what is irrelevant or incomprehensible, and of course, this would be strengthen by choosing the effective linguistic devises for the sake of accomplishing global unity and create coherent writing product.

Another definition is held by Reinhart (as cited in Guo& Wang, 2014), in which he has proposed that coherence is composed of the semantic and grammatical connectedness between semantic and discourse. Furthermore, Reinhart says that coherence mainly consists of three major elements: connectedness, consistency, and relevance. First, connectedness is related to the connection and the link that should be made between the different sentences in the text. Second, consistency means that all the propositions that are expressed by the sentences are acceptable and no contradiction between them. Third,
relevance means that all the ideas and information held in the text should be relevant to the general topic or to the subject provided.

An excellent definition of coherence is presented by Johns (1986) in which he proposes that coherence involves both text and reader based features. On the one hand, it includes the text based features which are cohesion (the connection between sentences and paragraphs), and the unity (all the ideas are related to same topic). On the other hand, coherence involves also reader based features, which are the interaction that could be happen between the readers and the text, and this could not be achieved unless the writer recognizes how to relate the readers’ previous knowledge with the new ones.

1.1.3.2. Coherence and Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (1976) refer to cohesion as being a source of coherence. Many other researchers generally agree at this point, but they disagree in certain areas. That is to say, coherence and cohesion are mainly different in some other features. Brown and Yule (1983) generally agreed on this point but, they hold that cohesion is basically much more obvious than coherence in the sense that cohesion deals only with a surface structure without the interference of other features. In other word, cohesion refers to the logical connection in the written product. It could be achieved only through the use of cohesive devices, while coherence refers to the unity and the logical flow of the writing product as a whole. It could be achieved through the effective grouping and arrangement of ideas in a clear way and a logical order. In the same way, Brown and Yule add that cohesion is an effective factor to reach coherence in the writing process.

In short, coherence and cohesion are two different, but interrelated aspects of writing in the sense that cohesion is a useful means to coherence since it facilitates comprehension of underlying semantic relations.
1.1.3.3. Aspects of Coherence

Based on what has been discussed before, it becomes clear that the key requirement for any system that produces text is the coherence of its output. Moreover, creating a good writing product could not be successful unless it is established in a coherent way, since coherence is one of the most important aspects of writing. For this sake, writers/students have to learn the principles of this aspect before starting their writing. Generally speaking, VanDijk, De-Beaugrande, and many other researchers argue that there are five major textual aspects to coherence: local coherence, global coherence, cohesion, information distribution, and meta discourse (Guo&Wang, 2014).

1.1.3.3.1. Local Coherence

The concept of local coherence is much more related to the concept of cohesion as discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) because it focuses on the description of the relationships between the different parts of the text or what is called the semantic relations. These semantic relations refer to the link that should be built between two sentences. These connections could take the form of conditional relations, temporal relations, cause and effect relations, and so on. This is what De-Beaugrande (1991) maintains by stating that local coherence exists when there are connections between successive sentences in the text. Similarly, Van Dijk (1980) claims that local coherence captures the relations in any writing product, but at the level of sentence-to-sentence transitions. In addition to the semantic relations there are two other forms of relations: the functional relations and the pragmatic relations. The functional relations are based on hierarchal meaning links i.e. relations of paraphrase, repetition, correction…etc, while the pragmatic relations take place in a specific contexts and with specific conditions.
1.1.3.3.2. Global Coherence

Local coherence is a very important aspect for a text to be coherent but this is, of course, not enough. Writers should pay attention also to what is called global coherence or the macrostructure. In other words, paying attention to the whole of their writing products, because sometimes they focus on how sentences are linked together without paying attention to the unity of the text and the more global kind of organization. Van Dijk (1980) defines global coherence as the aspect that serves to control the relevance of all the sentences and the ideas in relation to the topic sentence, thesis statement, theme, and so on. He states also that this control could be achieved through the “macro-rules”, which are the rules that writers/students have to adopt in order to reach a global coherence (as selecting, reducing, cutting out irrelevant ideas, reconstructing, and so on).

1.1.3.3.3. Cohesion

Cohesion discussed above is the structural relations on the text surface which has an important role for the text to be coherent. Holliday and Hasan (1976) state that cohesion itself comprises different cohesive devises: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. The reference is related to the anaphoric and the cataphoric references. The substitution is related to the way writers change words by replacing them by other items that reflect them as: one, ones, same, etc. However, ellipsis is the omission of an item to avoid repetition, and it should be obvious for the reader to comprehend. Moreover, conjunction reflects the different devices that show the semantic relations such as, the additive items, the temporal, the causal, and the adversative ones. Finally, lexical cohesion is related to the linking words that provide the continuity from one sentence to another such as, the transitional words, parallel structures, pronouns, etc.
1.1.3.3.4. Information Distribution

In order to achieve a coherent text, writers should focus at first place on reaching both local and global coherence that are represented through different forms of relations. These relations should be organized in a linear way that helps the writers to distribute their information in a clear and correct way (Van Dijk, 1980). De Beagrande and Dressler (1981) support this point of view by saying that in order to represent the hierarchal organization of the whole production, information should be distributed clearly, and writers here have to move smoothly by representing new information that are related to the readers’ previous knowledge. In short, they characterize that information distribution is the process of interaction between what is already known or predictable and what is unknown and unpredictable.

1.1.3.3.5. Meta Discourse

Hyland (2004) has said that meta discourse is based on all linguistic markers that fulfill the same function and work at the level of building a coherent text. Hyland adds that they could take the form of connectives, sequences, adages, and punctuation and they are useful as text organizers and as facilitators of comprehension. In other words, the term meta discourse is used in writing to describe a word or phrase that comments on what is in the sentence, usually as an introductory adverbial clause. It is any phrase that is included within a clause or sentence that goes beyond the subject itself. Meta discourse includes phrases that may denote the writer’s intentions such as “to sum up”, “I believe””, or the writer’s confidence for instance: may, perhaps, certainly, must, and so on. It denotes also the directions to the reader for example, note that, finally, therefore, however … etc. Furthermore, meta discourse markers are used to denote the structure of the text such as: first, second, finally, after all, on the other hand, and so on.
1.1.3.4. Coherence in Writing Paragraphs

According to Zemach and Rumisek (2005), reaching coherence in any large piece of writing entails that language learners achieve a readable level and succeed in writing coherent paragraphs, since this latter is considered the basis of any writing product. A coherent paragraph is made up of three major parts: the topic sentence, the supporting ideas, and the concluding sentence. The topic sentence is the key element that a paragraph is based on. That is to say, each paragraph should have only one topic. After that, the writer has to develop his/her paragraph by the supporting sentences or the controlling ideas. They must be relevant to the topic discussed and should be stated in a clear, ordered, and an organized way (from general to specific, from whole to part, from cause to effect, from abstract to concrete, and so on). This is of course related to the type of the paragraph and to the purpose of the writer. The writers here should include many other things to achieve a coherent paragraph. Moreover, they have to use the appropriate cohesive devices that serve to reach the global unity. Furthermore, they should use examples, the right pronouns, transitional words, parallel structure, and all features that work together to reach a successful paragraph. Finally, the writers have to present the concluding sentence to show the completeness of their paragraphs which is expected to be clear, interesting to the reader (ibid).

1.1.3.5. Techniques of Assessing Coherence

The difficulty and complexity of the concept of coherence have a direct influence on teachers while assessing and evaluating their students’ writing products. Todd (1998) states that if teachers relay on such unclear definition of coherence this would directly create a problem when they correct their pupils/ students papers, either in terms of paragraphs or any other piece of writing. For this sake, developments in the study of EFL
writing in terms of coherence help teachers to look for the easy ways to put such scales in order to be more objective in evaluating their students’ writing products.

To this end, different strategies to assess writing in terms of coherence are suggested by different researchers. Todd (1998) for instance, proposes one of the methods which could be helpful in evaluating coherence suggested for the description of text coherence. This technique is useful when teachers are requiring their students to focus on both local and global coherence. In other words, during this strategy, teachers assess the writing products, particularly writing paragraphs, at the level of paragraph unity and sentence cohesion. Focusing on the topic and ideas, and then how did they contribute in each other and how did they arranged to build the piece of writing in a clear and coherent way.

Similarly, another strategy concerning the assessment of coherence is held by Jacohs et al. (as cited in Weigle, 2002), and it mainly focuses on the same principles. This evaluating technique focuses on sentence topics. That is to say, the teachers, while evaluating their students’ writing products, focus on the relation between ‘the sentence continuity’, ‘sequential progressions’ (i.e., the ideas are more elaborated), and the writing quality. In other words, they base their correction on the right arrangement and order of ideas and sentences, in relation to the topic provided. Concerning the quality writing, it is basically related to the way students select the appropriate information i.e., the more they limit their topic sentences and drop the irrelevant information; the more their writing products will be clear and cohere.

Todd (1998) adds another technique of assessing coherence. They see it as very concrete strategy, but it is not widely used by teachers. Generally, this technique exists when teachers focus in their correction on the semantic analysis of the content of a discourse. It is based mainly on three major steps or measures. First, teachers should
identify the key concepts in the product in addition to the semantic relations that builds and links them. After that, they should measure the average distance of moves between the key concepts. Finally, they should measure the percentage of coherence breaks and the number of moves in relation to t-unit which is the independent clause together with all the dependent ones. In other words, they measure the number of dependent sentences that are related to the topic, and the irrelevant ones. If they find a short distance between the key concepts and few breaks or irrelevant ideas, this means that the writing product is mere coherent.

Another assessment technique in terms of coherence is the one suggested by Pepin (as cited in Achili, 2007) This method is very useful to help teachers correct their students’ papers in an easy way. This strategy also comprises three items. First, cohesion mistakes and this includes all features of cohesion (the use of pronouns, transitional words, the linking words, parallelism, and so on). Second, hierarchy mistakes which include all the mistakes that are related to the arrangement and coordination as well as the mistakes are related to syntactic parallelism. Finally, the third item is the mistakes of uncertain resolution that occur due to the sudden change of ideas. Students here do not make the change clear from one sentence to another because they do not use the correct linking words, or they use ideas that are irrelevant to the topic. This assessment technique is seen as a guide for teachers for the sake of reaching the most reliable scores in an easy way, because it mainly covers all others techniques.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, writing is a difficult skill to master because of the many aspects involved. Good writing competence is widely recognized as an important factor for language development and the whole learning process. Coherence is considered to be a crucial factor that plays an important role in the overall writing quality. Coherence itself
entails a number of aspects that serve to organize the ideas from the sentence level to larger units. Therefore, it is necessary for both students and teachers to devote an adequate attention and to develop that aspect of writing.
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Introduction

Recent approaches of teaching second or foreign languages emphasize the construction of knowledge by both the teacher and the student; hence, the student is considered active, constructor, discoverer, and so on. A practical example of these approaches is the Cooperative Learning Approach (CLA). The main principle of this approach is to give learners the opportunities to practice and learn together, and focus on achieving their shared academic goals. Cooperative learning includes different instructional techniques. This section highlights “Think-Pair-Share” (TPS) as one of those techniques. It tries to give a global picture about the cooperative learning approach i.e., its definition, principles, types, advantages, as well as the roles of both teachers and students when applying it. Add to this, it seeks to review the difference between cooperative and collaborative learning and some models of CL strategies. Finally, some focus is placed on including think-pair-share strategy in particular including its definition, its stages and application, some hints and management concerning this strategy, and some variations concerning this strategy. Then, it presents its benefits for both teachers and students.

1.2.1. Definition of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning has been defined by many researchers, each of them is spotting the light on a particular aspect but in essence, all definitions are falling within the same scope. The one most widely used is probably that of Johnson and Johnson, and Smith (1991) who state that cooperative learning is “the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning” (p.117). Jolliffe (2007) also holds that cooperative learning takes place when pupils/students work in pairs or small groups in order to promote their learning and that of others.

Bruffee (1995) sees cooperative learning as a set of processes that are adopted by a group of people for the sake of accomplishing a shared goal or reaching an end product.
There are many other definitions that are provided to clarify the issue of cooperative learning. Slavin (1995) for instance, approaches CL as the “variety of teaching methods in which students work in small groups to help one another learn academic content” (p.13). In this sense, CL is an approach of learning which is based on learner-centered by which students can help, discuss, and argue with each other. They can evaluate their current knowledge, and fill any gap in each other’s knowledge. Kagan (1989) on the other hand, says that cooperative learning is the structural approach that is based on the creation, analysis, and systematic application of a specific content by giving free ways to organize social interaction in the classroom. He states also that CL is well-recognized as a pedagogical practice that improves learning, higher level thinking, prosocial behavior, and a greater understanding of pupils with diverse learning, social and adjustment needs. He adds that CL entails small groups working on specific tasks. It seeks to overcome some of the weaknesses of traditional small group approaches by structuring activities carefully.

1.2.2. Cooperative Learning and Collaborative Learning

The terms cooperative learning and collaborative learning are often used interchangeably, but according to some there are major differences between the two. Panitz (1997) says that CL is the most structured approach that is designed by the teacher who should define the students’ roles, tasks, and responsibilities, as well as the form of the final product. Collaborative learning on the other hand, focuses on group work in which the group members are the ones who negotiate tasks, roles, and responsibilities to reach a unified final project (Abrami et al., 1995).

Bruffee (1995) proposes that in CL learners learn simple things that are related to their lessons and that are followed by teachers’ evaluation, but in collaborative learning learners are supposed to learn critically, with more responsibility, and take part in decision making. Moreover, he adds that cooperative learning and collaborative learning mainly
differ in the point that the first (CL) is most widely used for the elementary levels, while, the second is used for the adults i.e. at the university and college levels. Matthews et al. (1995) have supported this point of view by stating that at the elementary levels cooperative learning is useful because pupils do not acquire the social skills as the students at the higher levels do.

In fact, the difference seems to be slight for others. Slavin (as cited in Nunan, 1992) considers both of cooperative and collaborative learning as the same and it is better to use them interchangeably. In short, he claims that both cooperative and collaborative learning entail students’ working together to achieve common learning goals. For this sake, differentiating cooperation and collaboration has not to have effect that is why they are going to be employed as the same.

1.2.3. Principles of Cooperative Learning

Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1991) agree that when structuring cooperative learning, five key elements should guide all decisions in order to construct an effective CL. They state that all of them are necessary for CL to be successful. These principles are: personal interdependence, individual accountability, group processing, social skills, and promotive face to face interaction. A visual explanation of these concepts is presented below.

1.2.3.1. Personal Interdependence

Personal interdependence refers to the strong believe that the students have about the necessity of succeeding together. In this sense, they should feel that they are linked to other members in the group in such a way that they cannot succeed unless they coordinate their efforts with each other in order to complete a task i.e., they feel that they are dependent on the contribution, inclusion, and the success of the others. In other words, they sink and swim together to achieve an accomplished goal (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991).
Jolliffe (2007) argues that personal interdependence exists when pupils help, assist, encourage, and support each other to learn. Jollify states that in order to create the feeling that they really need each other, there are different ways to do this:

- Establishing mutual goals: here every student has to learn the material provided, and make sure that the rest of the group also learns this material.
- Joint rewards: here the teacher gives further points (bonus) to the groups who are succeeding in their tasks.
- Shared materials and information: the group members must share the material and the data given about the task. For instance, they distribute the questions to each other and then discuss them, in order to get sure that all of them are engaging in the task.
- Assigned roles: here students have to adopt different roles such as, participators, elaborators, and so on in order to facilitate the learning process and achieve their goals in an organized way (ibid, p. 41).

1.2.3.2. Individual Accountability

Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1991) state that individual accountability refers to the assessment of each individual learner’s performance. They claim that it is important to evaluate individual learning and then the results are given to the group, so that group members can appropriately support and help each other. Similarly, Jolliffe (2007) says that “individual accountability means that each member of the group must learn to be responsible for his or her contribution, otherwise the success of the group will be in danger” (p. 41). She states that in order to insure individual accountability each member in the group should be tested. This could be achieved by selecting each time one member from the entire group to present the answer to see his or her own performance, and then feedback should be provided.
1.2.3.3. Group Process

Group process takes place at the end of the working period. Students here reflect and process the quality of their work in order to determine its success. This could be achieved by knowing whether each member’s initiation is really effective for the whole group, and what can he or she provide to them in order to accomplish a shared goal (Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991). Jolliffe (2007, p. 40) has identified group processing as follows:

Processing means giving pupils time and procedures to analyze how well their groups are functioning and using the necessary skills. This reflection identifies group strengths and goals. It helps all group members achieve while maintaining effective working relationships among members.

Ensuring group process is very important for an effective cooperative learning to take place. One way to reach this is by providing enough time to both the individual and the group in order to think, reflect, and discuss the task. Doing this helps them to correct each other mistakes which could be more beneficial than the teacher do (Jolliffe, 2007).

1.2.3.4. Social Skills

According to Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1991) social skills are very important for an effective cooperative learning to take place. All members in the group are required to improve their interpersonal skills. In other words, learners must have the needed leadership, trust building, decision making, effective communication, and conflict skills. According to Jolliffe (2007), this should be the role of the teachers because pupils come to school without knowing these skills. So, the teachers here have to teach the appropriate skills in order to make them collaborate effectively with the others. To this end, they have to select the needed skill relaying on the type of the task, introduce it, and explain its importance to accomplish the task. Add to this, they have also to select the aids required to acquire the skill, and of course provide enough time to get things better (ibid, p. 42).
1.2.3.5. Promotive Face-to-Face Interaction

Promotive face-to-face interaction is the foundation component to CL. It exists when learners share and discuss their thoughts. They ask each other to clarify the ambiguous points for the sake of accomplishing their tasks. Consequently, the better students think, talk, and act, the better performance will occur (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991). Jolliffe (2007) adds that promotive face-to-face interaction requires two main aspects. The first one is the learners’ physics, that is to say the eye-to-eye contact, while the second one is the student’s involvement and engagement in the given task. Reaching this aspect requires the learners to respect and trust in each other. They have to motivate the self and the others. They should also feel relax and avoid anxiety, particularly when they challenge each others’ opinions. Doing this helps them to reach the best conclusions (ibid, p.43).

1.2.4. Types of Cooperative Learning

Based on Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1998) theory, three types of cooperative learning are identified: formal cooperative learning groups, informal cooperative learning, and cooperative base groups. First, formal cooperative learning groups exists when students are working together from one session to a few weeks in order to complete their tasks and reach their goals. The second type is informal cooperative learning. It could be included in any lesson. Unlike formal cooperative learning that lasts for weeks; this type lasts from few minutes to the whole session. Teachers mainly use this type because it is more helpful for students to engage on the material to be learned. It is based on “turn to your partner discussion” Such as, “think-pair-share” strategy, “think-write-pair-compare”, “write-pair-switch”, and so on. Finally, cooperative base groups is the third type that lasts for a long period of time, mainly for the whole year. Heterogeneous cooperative learning groups are the key point of the groups with the same members during the school year.
They state that this type generally should include the same principles that formal cooperative learning groups based on. They add that, different tasks are included in this type. For instance, academic support tasks as the home work, personal support tasks, routine tasks as taking attendance, or assessment tasks as checking each other understanding.

1.2.5. Teachers’ and Learners’ Roles in Cooperative Learning

1.2.5.1. Teachers’ Roles

Johnson et al. (as cited in, Gillies, Ashman, & Terwel, 2008) argue that in CLA, teachers’ roles should be focused because this affects the quality of group discussions and the learning achieved. Moreover, they argue that making decisions about the size of the class, the method that should be followed, and the material that should be adapted is the important roles of teachers in CL. In other words, teachers should form the groups, put a time schedule to organize the students’ work, and select the appropriate tasks that suits their needs. Add to this, they have to monitor the students’ learning in order to make the learners feel accountable to be affective learners. In short, they have to encourage them and control their work to make sure that they are working seriously on one shared goal. Once teachers do this, they have to evaluate and assess their students’ performance to enhance their achievements.

1.2.5.2. Learners’ Roles

Different roles are assigned for learners to be adopted in cooperative learning. Millis and Cottell (1998) state that for an effective cooperative learning to take place, each member in the group should adopt a specific role (or roles if it is necessary) for the sake of accomplishing their shared academic goal in a successful way. They state that each individual has to take one or more of the following roles: group facilitator, recorder, time keeper, checker, summarizer, and elaborator. Lowry, Gurtis, and Lowry (2004) focus on
learners’ roles in collaborative writing. They state that in order to reach a successful collaborative writing different roles are assigned for learners. Being the writer is the most important role. In other words, the team members should select one student who is responsible for writing. This could not be done unless there is a consultant and the reviewer who are the ones who provide the team with content and related feedback. They add also that in collaborative writing there should be an editor in the team; the one who is responsible for the overall content. Moreover, there should be the team leader who leads the team and facilitate the process of writing. Kagan (as cited in, Woolfolk, 2003) on the other hand, argues that there are different roles that should be adopted by each learner in different collaborative activities. The following table demonstrates the possible roles that learners can perform.
Table 1.2.1: Possible Student Roles in Cooperative Learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourager</td>
<td>Each member in the group should encourage the rest, especially those who are shy, or who are afraid to make mistakes in order to engage them in the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praisers/Cheerleaders</td>
<td>Each member should take the others’ initiation into consideration, and respect each other’s answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>Each member should allow the rest to participate in order to have equal opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question commander</td>
<td>Each member should raise questions in order to simplify the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taskmaster</td>
<td>Each member should involve in the task until the end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>They have to select someone to write down the ideas, answers, and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflector</td>
<td>Keeps group aware of progress (or lack of progress).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet captain</td>
<td>Each member should be a monitor in order to concentrate in the task without noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials monitor</td>
<td>Picks up and return materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kagan, as cited in Woolfolk, 2003, p. 496).
1.2.6. The Advantages of Cooperative Learning

Cooperative language learning is one of the most heavily researched areas of education. Many researchers shed light on this approach because they found that it has many advantages. Jolliffe (2007) has summarized these advantages mainly at three levels: achievement, interpersonal relationships, and psychological health and social competence. It increases the students’ academic achievements in the sense that, they become more productive, and more capable to generate new ideas and solutions. It also helps them to think critically to solve problems and make decisions because it provides them with time to think and discuss, and this allows them to reach the appropriate conclusions. Furthermore, CL is the best way to improve interpersonal relationships between learners. It creates positive social skills. In other words, it makes students enjoy learning and communication with each other. They support each other and feel that that they really share one goal. Add to this, they accept criticism with a greater sense of friendship. Finally, this approach of learning is very beneficial in improving learners’ psychological health and social competence. In short, it promotes the learners’ self esteem and self worth. It increases their self confidence, thus greater interdependence is to take place (ibid, p. 6).

Many other researchers have agreed on these points, Goodwin (1999) for instance says that using cooperative language learning has a great influence on learners’ achievements, social skills, students’ understanding and ability to challenge different problems and integrate a new material.

1.2.7. Models of Collaborative Writing Strategies

In order to perform different classroom activities and promote learning, different CL activities could be set on and followed by both teachers and students. In The following we select the most useful techniques that are available in this approach according to different researchers, particularly, the techniques that are useful in teaching writing.
1.2.7.1. Paired Annotations

In this technique students pair up to review or learn the same article, chapter, history or any content area and exchange double-entry journals for reading and reflection. Students will then discuss key points, compares them, and then looks for areas of agreement and disagreement. After that, they work together in order to summarize the article, chapter, or the material given. Finally, the group prepares an annotation basing on their summaries, and then presents it to the teacher. Students may pair again and again to answer the same exercise to explore important facts and search for similarities and dissimilarities about them (Brown & Lara, 2007).

1.2.7.2. Writing Workshops

Writing workshop has defined by Williams (2003) as classes in which students share their works with one another. Teacher s’ role here is to control their writing products while they starting in drafts i.e., he/she is only the facilitator. In this model of instruction, students form groups of three to five. They help each other to achieve the writing task. Like the all models of CL, writing workshops are highly beneficial in the sense that students are busy all the time during while writing. They talk, write, think and research, and they would better see their roles as active learners.

1.2.7.3. Sequential Writing Model

Lowry, Gurtis, and Lowry (2004), states that this model of collaborative writing is used to explain directions, observations, or exact events. All members of the group are obliged to do their work at a given time. It is much more used at the elementary levels. They add that in order to teach sequential writing pupils first, should be involved in an experience which is based on step-by-step explanation. Then, they are asked to “share write” in a sequential organizer. They do this one after the other in a given time. After that, they remove the “share write”, and each member is asked to write his or her step by step
writing basing on either the shared task or another everyday activity. Lowry discusses the advantages of this model stating that students may not come to consensus on every single point, and that they can change other students' ideas and structures.

1.2.7.4. Parallel Writing Model

Unlike the sequential writing model, in this one every student in a team is assigned a role. Alred, Brusaw, and Oliu (2003) agree that in order to apply this strategy, teachers should designate one person as the team coordinator. Collectively identify the audience, purpose and project scope. Moreover, they should create a working outline of the document, and then assign segments or tasks to each team member. After that they should establish a schedule including due dates for drafts, revisions, and final documents. Once they do this, students write drafts of document segments. They exchange them and revise each other segments. By the end, they would meet their needs.
1.2.8. Think-Pair-Share Strategy

After reviewing some common cooperative learning strategies basing on what is mentioned above, think-pair-share is the chosen technique to be focused in the present research study.

1.2.8.1. Definition of Think-Pair-Share Strategy

Think-pair-share is a cooperative learning technique that has emerged and developed in 1981 by Frank Layman in his college in Maryland. Layman gave it this name because of the three principal steps that are forming it: “thinking” “pairing”, and “sharing” steps (Meyers, 1993). Layman (1987) defines “Think-Pair-Share” as a simple but effective cooperative learning strategy that can be applied in different school subjects before, during, and after the course particularly in teaching writing. He adds that it is one of the potential activities that gives students the feeling of freedom to work by themselves. The key point for this strategy is providing students with wait time or “food for thought” in order to involve in the lesson and to promote their learning.

McTighe and Layman (1988) have defined think-pair-share technique as a multi mode discussion which is designed in a structured way in which students are provided with a question or presentation in a given topic, have time to think and formulate individual ideas, discuss with each other in pairs, and then share their thoughts with the larger group.

Think-pair-share is a simple but an effective assessment technique that is associated to encourage students and promote their learning by providing processing time and builds in wait-time which enhances the depth and breadth of thinking (McTighe & Layman, 1988). Wiesendanger and Bader (1992) state that TPS is a grouping strategy that lets students collaborate on ideas, opinions, research topics, problem solving procedures, debate resolutions, textual analyses, and small group activities. The general idea of the TPS technique is having the students independently think or solve a problem quietly, then pair
up and share their thoughts or solution with someone nearby. Every student should be prepared for the collaborative ideas and share their thoughts or solution with the rest of the class (Arnold, 1999). Ledlow (2001) have said that think-pair-share is a low-risk strategy to get students actively involved in classes of any size.

1.2.8.2. The Application of Think-Pair-Share Strategy

Many researchers agree on the point that “think-pair-share” strategy is based mainly on three major steps, the “think” step, the “pair” step, and the “share” step. For instance, Layman (1987), state that in applying this strategy students should first think about the question given in order to form individual ideas, discuss their thoughts with someone nearby “a partner”, and then share their answers with the rest of the class. In other words, the steps and the procedure that should be followed according to Layman are as follows:

- Think individually: invite each student to think silently about the question or the prompt given in order to prepare individual answers about a minute.
- Pair with a partner: each student should turn to the one who is close to him or her in order to discuss and compare their answers for few minutes.
- Share with the whole class: whenever they are ready, they will be invited to share their final answers with the rest of the class.

In the same view, Arend (2009) agrees that the TPS strategy is based on three main stages. Arend characterizes thinking, pairing, and sharing as the key elements of think-pair-share strategy. He proposes that in applying these steps, students first should think about the question, observation, picture, or any presentation provided by the teacher for one minute. It should be an individual thinking and speaking has to be avoided. After that, students have to pair with those who are setting nearby, discuss, and choose the right
answers or solutions. This should take one or two minutes. Finally, students here have to share their answers with all the classmates.

It is worth mentioning that think-pair-share technique is based on three main steps. However, they may differ on two main points: the amount of time that is provided in each step, and the way students act in the “share” step which can be applied in a variety of ways but all of them are good. Ledlow (2001) for instance, holds that to apply think-pair-share strategy, the procedure is simple. First, think about the question directed by the teacher. Following this step, students turn to face their learning partners to discuss, clarify, challenge their ideas, and choose the right ones. The appropriate amount here is to give them from ten seconds to five minutes. In the last step, teachers call randomly some students to share their answers with the rest.

Moreover, Jones (as cited in Usman, 2015) for his part maintains that in has the sharing step, students’ responses can be shared within the four-person learning team, and then within the larger group. Layman (1987) states that whenever a pair of students share their ideas with another pair this will be a modification in the in the strategy. This is called “Think-Pair-Square-Share” strategy. To conclude, this variety in the application of the strategy is acceptable according to the teaching/learning circumstanstanes.

1.2.8.3. Hints and Management of Think-Pair-Share strategy

Ladlow (2001) proposes that there are some ways and tips that could help teachers when applying think-pair-share strategy in order to use it in an easy and organized way. First, teachers should pre-assign partners. In other words, they have to decide and form the partners before engaging in the lesson rather than waiting until the time discussion. They should indicate in advance who are the students’ Partners will be. Otherwise, the focus may become one of finding a partner rather than of thinking about the topic at hand. Furthermore, it is better to give the students opportunities to think with a variety of
partners i.e. change their partners from time to time in order to give them more chances to improve their learning achievements. Add to this, the teachers have to divide the time in the way that allows students think as much as possible. Moreover, they have to monitor the discussions made in the class, because it is important to listen to some of the discussions so that common misconceptions can be addressed and unique ideas shared with the whole group.

1.2.8.4. Think-Pair-Share Variations

According to Barragato (2015), there are different multiple variations to the TPS strategy. They are: “Think-Draw-Pair-Share”, “Think-Aloud-problem Solving Pairs”, and “Think-Write-pair-Share”.

* “Think-Draw-Pair-Share” technique is based on the same principles of the standard TPS strategy. The key point of this technique is drawing. Students are asked to draw a picture which is usually a cartoon or a concept map, and explain the meaning behind it with their partners. After that students in each partner share their explanations with the class either selected randomly or as volunteers. The focus is not on how well they draw, but on the way they help the class to visualize the topic at hand in a memorable way. This technique helps learners to become creative and critical thinkers (ibid, p.11).

* “Think Aloud Problem Solving Pairs” (TAPPS) is another variation technique of the TPS strategy. The key principle of this technique is that in each pair one student acts as a problem solver and the other as a listener. Moreover, the problem solver explains every sequential step carefully for the sake of solving the problem provided. The listener’s role is to listen and pay attention to his/her partner’s explanation carefully. Whenever the problem solver confuses in such point, the listener asks questions to avoid the ambiguity. Once they finish the task, they switch the roles with a new topic. This learning technique is helpful in
developing the listening skill as well as in making learners much more organized to solve different problems (ibid, p.13).

* “Think-Pair-Write-Share” is a particular variation of the TPS strategy. It is based on the same principles of the standard TPS. In clear, it is based on three main stages including the think step, the pair step, and the share step. The success of this technique relays on the amount of time provided in the task. This technique is much more used as a summary tool at the end of a unit or as knowledge probe at the beginning of a unit. It helps students to compare their thoughts and answers before writing, and this would be beneficial to write effective products (ibid, p.9).

1.2.8.5. Benefits of Think-Pair-Share Strategy

It is mentioned above that the TPS strategy is one of the cooperative learning branches. This learning technique has many advantages because it focuses attention on the key concepts, and provides both teachers and students with opportunities to actively process and develop understanding of class material. Thus, they succeed in the course easily. (Cooper & Robinson, 2000). Different advantages of think-pair-share strategy are summarized in the following:

1.2.8.5.1. For Teachers

Cooper and Robinson (2000) state that think-pair-share strategy is very beneficial for teachers. It allows them to manage their classrooms, to control their students’ understanding, and to make the whole class active. Boston (2002) on the other hand, holds that think-pair-share helps teachers to alter their instruction in the way that would be beneficial to their learners. They could use and incorporate it every time because this strategy does not require specific materials. In addition to this, Ruiz-Primo (2011) adds that teachers use think-pair-share strategy as a form of informal formative assessment that could help them to evaluate and know their students’ level and thinking.
1.2.8.5.2. For Students

   Everything that is beneficial for teachers is of course beneficial for students as well. Think-pair-share technique has many advantages and positive effects for a great number of learners. McTighe and Lyman (1988) state that there are very interested points that TPS could provide to the students rather than any other CL technique:

   - Providing students with “wait time”: when students have appropriate “think time”, the quality of their responses improves.
   - Encourage collaboration and peer cooperation: students learn from each other in a non-competitive way to work together in order to accomplish a shared goal. However many students enjoy learning when they are allowed to enter a discussion with another classmate, rather than with a large group, because they find this safer and easier to engage in the task, and thinking becomes more focused when it is discussed with a partner.
   - Increase self-esteem and participation: think-pair-share technique allows students to become more confident. In the sense that, the feeling of freedom helps them to write, read, discuss, criticize and accept criticism, exchange ideas, participate, and engage easily in the lesson.
   - Build responsibility and self-confidence: students become more responsible towards their tasks. They feel relax, not nervous, and not afraid of making mistakes.
   - Building on the ideas of others is a very important skill for students to learn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, cooperative learning is one of the most heavily researched areas of education. “Think-pair-Share” is an effective cooperative learning strategy in EFL/ESL settings. It is useful to teach different subjects; particularly to teach the writing skill. This learning technique is very beneficial for both teachers and learners when structuring it carefully.
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**Introduction**

This chapter is devoted to discuss the practical framework in which the effectiveness of think-pair-share strategy on students’ coherence in writing paragraphs is examined. It tackles the choice of the method, the population and the sample, and the research design. It gives also an explanation of the procedure adopted. Then, it describes and analyses the data collected, and finally it discuses and interprets the finding.

**2.1. The Choice of the Method**

In order to investigate the effect of think-pair-share strategy on enhancing third-year pupils’ at Maanser Ounis Secondary School writing in terms of coherence, an experimental design is opted for. The reason behind choosing this method is because there is a cause-effect relationship between the two variables which are: think-pair-share strategy (the independent variable) and coherence in writing paragraphs (the dependent variable). Furthermore, it is a useful method that allows to control the research variables. Adopting this research design is also a readable way that helps to fulfill the purpose of the present study by collecting valid data and arriving to the right results. In other words, it allows to control all the conditions in the research study.

**2.2. Population and Sample**

In this research study, forty (40) third year secondary school pupils are selected randomly in order to give all of them equal opportunities to participate in the study. They are from the total population of ninety (90) pupils from the literacy stream, academic year 2015-2016, at Maanser Ounis Secondary School “Ain Kercha”, Oum El Bouaghi. The sample is divided into a control group and an experimental group. Each group includes twenty participants (20). The control group consists of six (6) males and fourteen (14) females, whereas the experimental group consists of two (2) males and eighteen (18)
females. All the participants are between the ages of eighteen to twenty. Choosing third-year pupils exactly is due to the fact that they are aware of the TPS strategy, and also pupils at this level are much more experienced in writing paragraphs, since they are expected to pass their baccalaureate exam. Add to this, choosing the literacy stream in particular is because they give much more importance to English as a module, and this lets them work seriously.

2.3. Research Design

The present research is conducted for the sake of testing the hypotheses proposed, and answering the research questions that are stated as follows:

- Does think-pair-share as cooperative learning strategy enhances third-year pupils’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence?
- To what extent does think-pair-share strategy help pupils to write coherent paragraphs?
  Statistically speaking, the question is as follows:
- Is there any significant difference in the students’ writing scores as the result of the implementation of think-pair-share strategy?

Basing on these research questions, we hypothesize:

- **H1:** There would be a significant improvement in students’ coherence in writing paragraphs if they are guided towards an effective implementation of the TPS strategy.
- **H0:** There would be no statistically significant improvement in students’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence after receiving the TPS strategy.

Before moving to explain the procedure, the following table summarizes the research design.
**Table 2.1**: Research Design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The experimental group</th>
<th>The pre-test</th>
<th>The treatment</th>
<th>The post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The control group</td>
<td>The pre-test</td>
<td>The usual way of writing</td>
<td>The post-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4. The Procedure

#### 2.4.1. Pre-testing

In the first session in the experiment and with the first meeting with the pupils (the participants), both of the control and the experimental groups were pre-tested in order to see their performance in writing (coherence in writing paragraphs in particular), and to have clear idea about their actual level. Therefore, the participants were asked to write about the use of the internet in the educational system. The question is established in the same way as they get used to (i.e., it has the same form of the written expression). In other words, they were given a general idea about the topic at the first place (the support), and then follow this by a question (Appendix A). Furthermore, the participants were informed at the beginning and before starting the pre-test that their marks would not affect their school examination in order to make them work individually, with their own efforts, and with no pressure or fear.

#### 2.4.2 The Treatment

After conducting the pre-test and having an idea about the participants’ writing level, pupils in the experimental group are exposed to the TPS strategy as a suggested solution to improve their overall writing achievement, as far as coherence is considered.
Six sessions (6) are devoted to reach this end, within one hour for each one. During each session, the participants are allowed to choose their seats and partners for the sake of making them more comfortable. After making sure that all of them are taken their seats, the topic is then well-established on the board.

First, pupils are asked to think individually about the topic provided and state their own thoughts at least for five minutes, without living any room for speaking to take place (the “think” step). After that, they move to the next step which is the “pair” step. During this stage, each pupil is asked to pair with his/her partner in order to discuss and exchange their thoughts, ideas, the way they write, and everything related to their tasks (this is also for five minutes). Once they finish this, they move to the “share” step in which all the pairs are asked to share their answers and discussions with the rest of the class (this is done by listening to their answers and writing some of the key points on the board), and this is for five minutes as well. Finally, each pupil is asked to write his/ her own paragraph based on the cooperation as well as his/ her understanding and discussions from the implementation of the TPS strategy. The following table shows the distribution of themes provided for the targeted group (the experimental group) with the type of the paragraphs.
Table 2.2: The Distribution of Themes with Types of Paragraphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Type of the Paragraphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Descriptive paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Problem/Solution paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td>Civilization</td>
<td>Opinion paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Descriptive paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Persuasive paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Expository paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choice of the topics is according to the level of the participants, their program, and their interests. The questions are designed in the same way the pupils get used to receive in their exams and written expression tasks i.e., providing a general idea (the support) about the topic at the first place, and then follow this by a question (Appendix C). The type of the paragraph simplifies the way of writing for the pupils, in the sense that knowing the type will help them to use the appropriate cohesive markers, transitional words, linking words, and the way they write in general.

2.4.3. Post-testing

The post-test is administered for both the experimental and the control groups right after six (6) sessions of treatment. This test is designed and structured in the same way as
the pre-test. In other words, the question is structured in the same form they get used to, by providing a support and then the direct question. Additionally, the same type of the paragraph is provided which is an argumentative paragraph with the same theme as well (education), but the topic was changed for the sake of avoiding the negative effects of the pupils’ familiarity with the previous one. The time allocation was one hour as it is the case in the pre-test. In short, the post-test is identical to the pre-test, and the same conditions and instructions of the pre-test are repeated in the post-test.

The results of the pre-test and the post-test of both groups are gathered, analyzed, and compared in the section of findings in order to check if there is any significant difference in their scores. Besides, to see if the TPS strategy has an effect on enhancing third year pupils’ at the secondary school paragraphs writing in terms of coherence. Thus, the research hypothesis would be rejected or confirmed.

The scoring of both the pre-test and the post-test is out of ten (10) points. Since we are targeting coherence in writing paragraphs in particular, and since the present study is carried out with third-year pupils at the secondary school, this means that they still beginners in writing. Thus, to give reliable marks, three main criteria that serve coherence in writing paragraphs are to be focused on the evaluation. Structure (6 points), the focus is on the topic sentence, supporting details, and the concluding sentence, organization and the logical development of the paragraph (2 points), and the transitions (2 points). The scores are distributed based on the rubric scoring as follows:
### Table 2.3: Scores Distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores Criteria</th>
<th>2 points Very good</th>
<th>1 point Good</th>
<th>0.5 point Average</th>
<th>0 point Needs work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>- Effective, covers the whole topic</td>
<td>- Effective, covers the whole topic but can be enhanced</td>
<td>- Covers a part of the topic</td>
<td>- Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic sentence</td>
<td>- Contains the topic and the controlling idea.</td>
<td>- Contains the topic and the controlling idea but their relation is not</td>
<td>- No controlling idea</td>
<td>- Invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Focuses on one main idea.</td>
<td>correctly stated</td>
<td>- Focuses on more than one idea.</td>
<td>- Inappropriate topic sentence and the main idea is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting ideas</td>
<td>- Supporting detail sentences relate back to the main idea with high fluency of</td>
<td>- Supporting detail sentences relate back to the main idea but may include</td>
<td>- Supporting detail sentences are very few and do not provide a satisfactory</td>
<td>- Paragraph has no supporting detail sentences that relate back to the main idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ideas, illustrate and support the topic sentence and are included within it.</td>
<td>some irrelevant ideas to the topic sentence.</td>
<td>elaboration of the topic sentence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding</td>
<td>- Summarizes the whole paragraph, restates the supporting details and wraps up</td>
<td>- Summarizes the whole paragraph, restates some supporting details and</td>
<td>- Summarizes a part of the paragraph, restates some of the supporting details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence</td>
<td>the idea discussed in the paragraph.</td>
<td>relatively closes the discussion.</td>
<td>and gives no feeling of a conclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>- Following the appropriate pattern of organization (order by importance, by time,</td>
<td>- Following the appropriate pattern of organization with some deviations.</td>
<td>- Following an inappropriate pattern of organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitions</strong></td>
<td>- Clear transitions between ideas and different parts of the paragraph.</td>
<td>- Acceptable transitions between ideas and different parts of the paragraph.</td>
<td>- Moderate use of transitions.</td>
<td>- No use of transitions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5. Statistical Analysis

This section deals with the statistical analysis of the present investigation. The results of both the experimental and the control groups are provided and discussed. This concerns the scores of the pupils’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence. Add to this, the collected data are analyzed and examined in this section.

2.5.1. Data Description

Before being analyzed, data should be first organized and described. For this purpose, some descriptive statistical procedures are adapted.

2.5.1.1. Scores Frequency Distribution

One of the important steps in the descriptive statistical analysis is to organize the data in order to have clear picture of the obtained results. The following represents and explains the frequency of each group scores. To begin with, the table below (Table 2.4) shows the frequency of students’ scores in the pre-test and the pos-test for the experimental group and the control group:
Table 2.4: The Experimental and the Control Group Scores in the Pre-test and Post-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Pre-test E</th>
<th>Post-test E</th>
<th>Pre-test C</th>
<th>Post-test C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.1.2. Control Group versus Experimental Group Scores on the Pre-test

Table 2.5: The Control Group in the Pre-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid 20</th>
<th>Missing 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.61327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6: The Experimental Group in the Pre-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid 20</th>
<th>Missing 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.96013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a starting point in this description, the mean of the experimental and the control groups in the pre-test is calculated. The mean of the experimental group was $\bar{X} = 4$, while the mean of the control group was $\bar{X} = 3.5$. From this one can notice that are approximately the same. For the total number of 20 scores in the control group and 20 scores in the experimental group, the following represents much more information about the number of the pupils who get the average and those who did not in both groups:

**The control group:**

$6 \geq 5 \rightarrow 30\% \geq 5$

$14 < 5 \rightarrow 70\% < 5$

**The experimental group:**

$7 \geq 5 \rightarrow 35\% \geq 5$

$13 < 5 \rightarrow 65\% < 5$

**Frequency Polygon 2. 1:** The Control and the Experimental Groups’ Scores in the Pre-test.
Based on polygon (2.1) and the tables (2.5 and 2.6), one can notice that the scores frequencies of both groups are approximately the same in most cases. Moreover, the control group’s frequency starts at 1 as the lowest score, and ends at 7 as the highest score with 1.5 as the most frequent score. Whereas, the experimental group frequency starts at 1.5 as the lowest score and ends at 7.5 as the highest score with 2.5 as the most frequent score. This indicates that students’ level in both groups is comparable and they are mainly the same.

In order to confirm this result and to check whether the noticed over scoring of the experimental group in the pre-test is only due to chance, an independent sample t-test should be conducted. To reach reliable results, we relay to the statistical program SPSS. The following table shows the independent sample t-test concerning the experimental and the control groups in the pre-test.

**Table 2.7:** The Independent Sample T-test (Pre-test vs. Post-test).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>Std. ErrorDifference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>37.977</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the SPSS results as showed above, the P value tells us if there is a significant difference between the two groups:

- $P \geq 0.05$: this means there is a significant difference between the two groups.

- $P \leq 0.05$: this means there is no significant difference between the two groups.

Before comparing the results, we should first know which row we have to work on (the one indicates equal variances assumed or the one which indicates equal variances not assumed). This could be done with the Levine’s test for equality of variances (as showed in the table). In other words, we first should compare the significant value (Sig) with our level of significant (0.05). If $Sig \geq 0.05$, this means that there are equal variances assumed, but if $Sig \leq 0.05$, this means that there are equal variances not assumed. In our case: $Sig = 0.873$, and it is much higher than 0.05. This indicates the equality of variances assumed, (tables 2.5 and 2.6 also show that they have equal variances). So, we should work on the first row. Now, we have to compare again the level of significant with the significant value (2-tailed) in order to know if the groups have the same level of proficiency.

Relaying on the results generated by the SPSS in the table as above, the P value equals 0.419. It is higher than 0.05. So, one can conclude that there is no statistical difference between the experimental and the control group in the pre-test. This leads to the conclusion that, pupils in the experimental and the control groups in the pre-test have approximately the same level and the difference mean has no significant; thus, the experimental group over scoring was due to chance only. This means also that the changes that may occur in the post-test are obviously related to the treatment period.
2.5.1.3. Control Group Pre-test/ Post-test Scores

The following explanations give clear picture about the control group’s scores concerning the pretest and posttest.

**Frequency Polygon 2. 2: The Control Group’s Scores on the Pre-test and the Post-test.**

First, by observing the above (polygon 2.2), one can say that in the control group, the most frequent score is 1.5 in the pre-test with number of 4 participants who have scored this mark, while the most frequent score in the post-test is 2.5 with number of 3 participants who have scored it. Add to this, the highest score in the pre-test is 7 scored by only one participant. The same point value is achieved by one participant in the post-test. Furthermore, the number of the participants who have marks equal or above the average (05) was 4 participants with the scores from 5.5 to 7, which is the best score in the post-test. From 20 scores, the data are summarized as follows:

**Pre-test:**

- $6 \geq 5 \rightarrow 30\% \geq 5$
- $14 < 5 \rightarrow 70\% < 5$

**Post-test:**
The control group calculated means in the pre-test and post-test:

\[ \bar{X}_I (\text{pre-test}) = 3.5, \quad \bar{X}_I (\text{post-test}) = 3.45 \to \bar{X}_i = \frac{\sum X_i}{N_i} \]

\(\bar{X}_i\): the mean of the control group, \(X_i\): the scores, \(N_i\): the total number of the participants. \(\Sigma\): the sum

Based on the results shown above concerning the control group, the calculated pre-test mean is \(\bar{X}_{\text{pre}} = 3.5\), and the calculated post-test mean \(\bar{X}_{\text{post}} = 3.45\). To find out if any improvement has been noticed in the post-test for the control group, the difference between the means of the two tests should be calculated. Through the subtraction of the pre-test mean from the post-test mean, we find out the difference is \(\bar{d} = -0.05\). Based on this, one can say that the difference mean is not significant, and the pre-test and the post-test show a close relationship, but still the pre-test mean higher than the one in the post test. Eventually, it can be deduced that the standard methodology of instruction does not have remarkable effect on the pupils’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence.

For more concrete data that shows the change in both tests concerning the control group, the following table (table 2.8) and figure (2.1) show the difference for each participant scores.
### Table 2.8: Control Group Pre-test and Post-test Scores with their differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual pupils</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X}=3.5 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X}=3.45 )</td>
<td>( d=-0.05 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1: Control Group Pre-test and Post-test Scores with their differences.

Figure (2.1) and table (2.8) show that there are differences between each individual learner’s scores in the pre-test and the post-test concerning the control group. Most of the pupils’ scores decreased in the post-test. However, these differences seem slight and have no significance. This means that they still in the same level. These results still not confirmed unless the paired sample t-test takes place. The following table generated by SPSS shows the final results concerning the control group changes:
Table 2.9: The Paired Sample T-test of the Control Group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair 1</th>
<th>Control Group Pretest - Control Group Posttest</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>,0500</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>,266</td>
<td>,188</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the P value (Sig 2-tailed) equals 0.853. It is greater than 0.05. So, there is no significant difference between the means. This confirms that the control group’s level still the same in the post-test.

2.5.1.4. Experimental Group Pre-test versus Post-test

Before moving to the t-test, detailed explanations about the experimental group’s scores in the pre-test and the post-test are demonstrated first:

Frequency Polygon 2. 3: The Experimental Group’s Scores on the Pre and Post-test.
It is noticed before that the experimental group scores improved in the post-test when compared to the pre-test scores. This figure clarifies this by showing the significant difference between the two tests. Moreover, the number of the participants who score equally to or above the average 5 increased from 7 to 17. The scores of the participants in the pre-test start from 1.5 as the lowest score to 7.5 as the highest score, whereas the participants’ scores in the post-test start from 4 as the lowest score to 9 as the highest score. The most frequent score in the pre-test is 2.5 by 4 participants, while in the post-test it is 6.5 by 4 participants as well. This demonstrates that the treatment provided to the experimental group (think-pair-share strategy) has a significant effect on enhancing their level in writing in terms of coherence. For the total scores of 20 participants concerning the experimental group, the data are to be summarized as follows:

**Pre-test:**

\[7 \geq 5 \rightarrow 35\% \geq 5 \]
\[13 < 5 \rightarrow 65\% < 5 \]

**Post-test:**

\[17 \geq 5 \rightarrow 85\% \geq 5 \]
\[3 < 5 \rightarrow 15\% < 10 \]

**The experimental group calculated means in the pre-test and post-test:**

\[\bar{X}_1\text{(pre-test)} = 4, \quad \bar{X}_2\text{(post-test)} = 6.15 \rightarrow \bar{X}_2 = \frac{\Sigma X_2}{N_2} \]

\(\bar{X}_2\): the mean of the experimental group. \(X_2\): the scores. \(N\): the total number of the participants. \(\Sigma\): the sum.

The calculated mean of the experimental group in the pre-test \(\bar{X}\text{pre} = 4\) is less than the calculated mean in the post-test \(\bar{X}\text{pre} = 6.15\). The mean difference is \(\bar{d} = 2.15\). For more
clarification, the following table and figure represent the detailed differences between each individual’s pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental group.

**Table 2.10:** The Experimental Group Pre and Post-test Scores with their Differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual pupils</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 4$</td>
<td>123$\bar{X} = 6.15$</td>
<td>$43\overline{d} = 2.15$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.2: Experimental Group Pre-test and Post-test Scores with their Differences.

Figure (2.2) confirms the previously mentioned results of the comparison between experimental group scores in the pre-test and post-test. Besides, it displays that most students’ scores in the post-test are higher than the pre-test scores, i.e., there is a significant improvement in the post-test scores when compared to the pre-test scores. This indicates that the use of the TPS strategy has positive effect. In order to confirm this conclusion and to find out if the TPS strategy is really effective as the post-test scores indicate, and that the difference between the two tests is the result of applying this strategy, not by chance, the t-test analysis is carried out.
2.5.2. Data Analysis (The T–Test Analysis)

Based on what has been discussed before, the results obtained are not enough to confirm or reject the research hypothesis. To this end, two types of tests were used to reach the reliable results: the paired sample t-test and the independent sample t-test.

2.5.2.1. Paired-Sample T–Test

In order to find out if the use of think-pair-share strategy is really effective as the post-test scores indicate, and that the difference between the two tests is the results of applying this strategy, not by chance, a paired sample t-test is carried out. Miller (2005) state that the paired sample t-test is a type of test that is used to compare the data collected in the investigation of the same subject before and after the treatment. In the actual case, the paired sample t-test is used to compare the means of the pre-test and the post-test and calculate the difference concerning the experimental group’s results.

To reach valid results we always relay on the SPSS calculations. The following table shows the results:

**Table 2.11: Experimental Group (pre-test vs. post-test).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. ErrorMean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Experimental Group Pretest - Experimental Group Posttest</td>
<td>-2,150</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results generated by the SPSS in the table as above, the P value equals to 0.000. It is less than 0.05 (P < 0.05). So, this means that there is a significant difference between the means. Moreover, one can conclude that there a significant improvement in
the experimental group’s performance. Therefore, we can say that think-pair-share strategy has positive effects on enhancing pupils’ coherence in writing paragraphs.

Miller (2005) proposes the following procedure as another way to carry out the paired sample t-test to see whether the difference between the scores before and after the treatment period is due to chance or due to the effect of the independent variable. He suggests the following steps:

1. Determine the difference between pre-test and post-test for each subject.
2. Calculate the mean difference ($\bar{d}$).
3. Calculate the standard deviation of the differences $S_d$, and the standard error of the mean difference, $SE (\bar{d}) = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{N}}$.
4. Calculate the t-statistic, which is given by $t = \frac{\bar{d}}{SE (\bar{d})}$ under the null hypothesis, this statistic follows a t distribution with N-1 degrees of freedom.
5. Use tables of the t-distribution to compare your value for $T$ to the N-1 distribution. Choose the level of significance required (normally $p=0.05$) and read the critical value.
6. If the t-value is higher than the critical t-value, it can be said that the differences between the scores of the pre-test and post-test are significant at the level of probability. Thus, the hypothesis will be accepted.

**The mean difference:**
$$\bar{d} = \frac{\Sigma d}{N}$$

Where: $\bar{d}$ = mean, $d$ = difference scores, $N$ = number of subjects, and $\Sigma$ = total sum.

**The standard deviation of the differences:**
$$S_d = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{N} - \bar{d}^2}.$$  

Where: $S$ = variance, $\Sigma d^2$ = sum of the square difference scores.

**The standard error of the mean difference:**
$$SE (\bar{d}) = \frac{S_d}{\sqrt{N}}.$$
The t-statistic: $t_{N-1} = \frac{d}{SE(d)}$. Then, the t-statistic is to be compared with the t-critical.

2.5.2.2. The independent sample t-test

Miller (2005) states that unlike the paired sample t-test that is used to compare the means of the same group, the independent sample t-test is used to compare the means of two different groups. Eventually, in the present case the independent sample t-test is used as the final step to compare the means of both the experimental and the control groups concerning the post-test in order to reach the final results. Thus, the research hypothesis is to be confirmed or rejected. Miller adds that in order to reach the results, the t-calculated should be compared with the t-critical. If t-calculated is higher than the t-critical, this means that there a significant difference between the means. Thus, the alternative hypothesis is to be accepted and the null hypothesis is to be rejected. The following represents the t formula:

$$t_{N_1+N_2-2} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 \sqrt{(N_1+N_2-2)N_1N_2}}{\sqrt{(N_1S_1^2+N_2S_2^2)(N_1+N_2)}}$$

$X_x$ = individual score. $\bar{X}_n$ = the calculated mean. $X^2$ = square score. $N_x$ = number of individuals. $\sum X_x$ = sum of scores. $\sum X^2_x$ = sum of square scores. $S_x$ = sample variance.

In the present study, we rely on the SPSS analysis. The following table shows the results:
Based on this table, Sig is much higher than 0.05. This signifies the equality of variances. So we are assumed to take the first row. The P value (sig 2-tailed) = 0.000, and it is less than the significant level 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05). This indicates that there is a significant improvement in the experimental group’s results. So, these results allow us to confirm the alternative hypothesis in favor of the null hypothesis. Thus, it can be concluded that the TPS strategy has significant effect on enhancing third year pupils’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence.

2.6. General Discussion

The present research study aims at gauging secondary school pupils’ ability in writing coherent paragraphs. Thus, it is hypothesized that their coherence in writing paragraphs would be improved if they are guided towards an effective implementation of the TPS strategy. This hypothesis has been tested through an experimental design by comparing the two groups’ scores. The results obtained showed that the experimental group has better performance than the control group. In other words, the experimental group scored 6.15 as a mean, while in the control group scored 3.43. Furthermore,
comparing the results of the experimental group between the pre-test and the post-test showed that, there is a progress in their performance. Statistically speaking, the mean of the experimental group in the pre-test was 4, and it was 6.15 in the post-test. This demonstrates that there is a significant difference that amounts to 2.5. However, the non-significant results concerning the control group who have obtained 3.5 as a mean in the pre-test, and 3.45 in the post-test, demonstrated that the casual method used to teach writing has no remarkable effect on enhancing coherence in writing paragraphs. Moreover, the satisfactory results concerning the experimental group in the post-test are confirmed by the calculation of the t-test. Based on this, one can deduce that the implementation of the TPS strategy has positive effect on enhancing third year pupils at Maanser Ounis Secondary School coherence in writing paragraphs. This allows us to accept the alternative hypothesis, and reject the null hypothesis. These conclusions also allow us to answer the research questions, in the sense that the TPS as a cooperative learning strategy has an effect on enhancing students’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence with an acceptable significance.

Conclusion

This chapter is devoted to investigate the effect of “Think-Pair-Share” strategy on enhancing third-year pupils at Maanser Ounis Secondary School writing paragraphs in terms of coherence. Thus, it analyzes the data gathered through an experimental design in order to confirm or reject the research hypothesis. The results obtained show that pupils in the experimental group show an improvement in their writing performance when compared with the control group. Thus, the TPS strategy has a positive effect and improves their writing achievement. Based on this, the alternative hypothesis is confirmed in favor of the null hypothesis.
General Conclusion

The present research study is conducted for the sake of examining the effect of think-pair-share strategy on enhancing students’ coherence in writing paragraphs. Furthermore, it aimed at gauging secondary school pupils’ ability in writing coherent paragraphs to overcome their problems and improve their overall writing achievement. To reveal the research purposes, it was hypothesized that if third-year pupils at the level of secondary school are directed towards an effective implementation of the TPS strategy, their writing will be improved as well as coherence is concerned. Before putting this hypothesis into test, relevant theoretical aspects were reviewed. In the first chapter, different theoretical standpoints relating to coherence in writing are discussed. The second chapter is devoted to discuss “Think-Pair-Share” as a cooperative learning strategy. The third chapter which is the practical framework work is conducted through an experimental design for the sake of examining the data and reach reliable results. In short, the findings showed that the experimental group who is subjected to the implementation of the TPS strategy had better performance concerning coherence in writing. To conclude, the TPS strategy has positive effect on enhancing third year pupils at Maanser Ounis Secondary School writing paragraphs in terms of coherence.

Even though there are significant results concerning the application of the TPS strategy to enhance learners’ writing paragraphs in terms of coherence, there are some limitations in this research study. The first one is due to time constrains. The treatment is done only in six (6) sessions, but in fact it needs more time to make the learners get used to this strategy and have better results. The second limitation that was faced in this research is the lack of interest and the absences of some pupils, and this made the sample reduced from sixty (60) to forty (40) participants. The third one is related to the theoretical
framework which is the lack of references concerning the independent variable (the TPS strategy), because it is always discussed as a part in the cooperative learning approach.

Different recommendations are suggested relaying on this research study. First, TPS strategy has shown an improvement in the pupils’ achievements in writing coherent paragraphs. For this, teachers are recommended to use this strategy in teaching writing particularly, those who are following only the traditional ways. Add to this, teachers are advised to make their students engage in the learning process. In other words, the learners need to discuss, share, and exchange their ideas and knowledge concerning their writing products. TPS strategy is based on these principles, because it provides learners with time to think individually and discuss at the same time. That is why, applying this strategy in their classrooms would be better for them. Moreover, teachers are recommended to use this technique because it helps them to pay attention to the process of writing not only the final product. Furthermore, teachers are advised to pay attention to coherence as one of the most aspects of writing, and not only focus on grammatical mistakes or spelling i.e. they are recommended to focus on both form and content. As a final suggestion, teachers may use this strategy to teach speaking skill, because it was noticed that pupils’ speaking would be enhanced while applying it in the experimental design.

For further suggestions concerning the implementation of the TPS strategy, we propose to link between this strategy and reading comprehension. Besides, it is also suggested to link between the TPS technique and students ‘autonomy. Furthermore, it is better to investigate the effect of think-pair-share strategy on enhancing students’ motivation as well as participation.
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Appendix B: Posttest.

Appendix C: The Treatment Period Paragraphs’ Questions.
Appendix A: Pre-test

The pre-test question:

Today, the use of the internet for teaching and learning purposes has received increasing attention. Is the internet has positive or negative effect on the pupils’ learning?
Internal means of communication

Positive Different

Feedback,正面反馈

Social media:
- Facebook
- Twitter

Interpersonal:
- Directly social
- Email
- Phone

Relative influence and authority

I stand.
Appendix B: Post-test

The post-test question:

Many pupils see that their parents should help them to solve their exercises at home and help them in doing their homework, while others see that it is their own work. Should parents have a more active role in the education of their children? Write paragraph in which you state your arguments?
My parents help me in my studies because we’re with each other and I do my homework. My mother helps me. In addition, my parents always help me.

The greatest joy
In my opinion, I see that my parents should help me in education. First, because they encourage me very much. Second, my mother helped me to do my exercise. In addition, they support me for example in exam to revise. Finally, my mother and father always help me and I am very happy.
Appendix C: The Treatment Paragraphs’ Questions

1. The first paragraph question in the treatment period is:

An ideal school embraces the idea that EFL students can learn in an easy and safety way. Write a paragraph in which you state how should an ideal school be?

2. The second paragraph question is as follows:

Many people accept corruption as a way of life. However corruption is an illegal behavior that should be prevented. Write a paragraph in which you suggest solutions to fight this phenomenon?

3. The third paragraph question is as follows:

Algeria is a vast country, it has a great civilization. What do you think? Write a paragraph in which you state your opinion about the Algerian civilization?

4. The fourth paragraph question is as follows:

All people agree that the mother is a great person in the life. Write a paragraph by which you describe your mother?

5. The fifth paragraph question is as follows:

Many people excuse that they do not have time to practice sport, and they do not recognize its importance. Write a paragraph in which you explain the importance of practicing sport?

6. The sixth paragraph question is as follows:

Many pupils prepare, revise well for their exams, but they do not succeed by the end. This is because of stress in exams. Write a paragraph in which you provide some advice to your friend to avoid stress in exams?
Algeria has a great civilization. First, it has a lot of monuments. For example, Baza Hammadam, Timgad, the zigal valley, Djemila. Next, it has a variety of good food. For example, couscous, mhadjej, in addition, kelbes, kachalia, bazines, elhayk. In addition, it has Sahara, and this brings tourists daily, give souvenirs per tourist. Finally, Algeria is a great country among the world.
The practice of Mort is the best thing in life. It has physical and psychological benefits. First, it improves health. Sleep some makes the body more active by giving it time to rest. In the evening, second, it supports weight loss, making the body more flexible. In addition, it reduces stress, helps to reduce stress and organizes the body for the next day. For instance, it strengthens the muscles and supports weight loss. More over, it reduces stress to relax and be comfortable. Finally, when we practice Mort, we enjoy the life and rests with friends.
Résumé

L’expression écrite est un sujet très important et très discutable dans les recherches en langue seconde/étrangère. L’approche de l'apprentissage coopératif est l'une des approches qui se sont avérées efficaces pour améliorer la qualité de l'écriture des élèves. Cette étude de recherche visant à savoir si « Think-Pair-Share » (Pensez-Paire-Partager) comme une technique d'apprentissage coopératif a un effet significatif sur l'amélioration de produire des paragraphes en termes de cohérence. Pour confirmer cette hypothèse un modèle expérimental a été adopté. Quarante élèves de troisième année seconde ou lycée de Maanser Ounis "Ain Kercha" ont été choisis pour être les sujets de cette étude de recherche. Deux groupes du courant littéraire ont été assignés au hasard comme un groupe expérimental et un groupe de contrôle. Avant de donner le traitement, les deux groupes ont été testés au pré-able pour voir leurs niveau réel d'écrire des paragraphes en termes de cohérence. Ensuite, le groupe expérimental a reçu le traitement. Il a été enseigné conformément à la stratégie de TPS tandis que le groupe de contrôle a été enseigné selon la manière conventionnelle. Finalement, les deux groupes ont été post-testés de la même manière qu'ils ont été pré-testés. Les résultats obtenus ont montré que les participants dans le groupe expérimental montrent une amélioration statistiquement significative en termes de cohérence. Enfin, cette étude a conduit à la conclusion que la stratégie de TPS est efficace pour le renforcement de la cohérence du paragraphe. En d'autres termes, l'hypothèse de cette étude de recherche a été confirmée.
ملخص:

إن موضوع الأنتاج الكتابي هو أمر جد مهم في التحصيل العلمي لدى الطلاب، هذا ما يجعله موضوع قابل للنقاش خاصة بالنسبة للأبحاث المتعلقة باللغة الأجنبية. نهج التعليم التعاوني هو واحد من الطرق التي أثبتت فعاليتها في تعزيز جودة الكتابة لدى المتعلمين. على ضوء ذلك، فإن هذه الدراسة البحثية تهدف إلى معرفة ما إذا كانت تقنية "Think-Pair-Share" (فكر-تعاون-شارك) كأسلوب للتعليم التعاوني لها تأثير إيجابي على تعزيز كتابة الفقرات لدى التلاميذ من حيث التماسك والانسجام بصورة هذا الأخير من أهم المعايير النصية في التعبير الكتابي. للإجابة على هذه الفرضية، تم إجراء تصميم تجريبي، بحيث عُينت مجموعتين من تلاميذ السنة الثالثة من التعليم الثانوي فرع أدب وفلسفة في ثانوية معنصر أونيس (عين كرية). قبل تطبيق استراتيجية TPS تم اختبار كل الفوجين لمعرفة مستوى الفعلي في كتابة الفقرات من حيث التماسك. بعدها درست المجموعة التجريبية بتطبيق التقنية الواردة أعلاه. كخطوة نهائية تم إعادة اختبار قدرات كلا المجموعتين بنفس الطريقة التي تم اختبارهما من قبل. أظهرت النتائج أن تقنية TPS حققت تحسنا كبيرا من خلال إحصاء TPS ومقارنة نتائج اختبارات الفوجين. أدت هذه الدراسة البحثية إلى استنتاج أن تقنية TPS هي استراتيجية فعالة في تعزيز تماسك الفقرات لدى التلاميذ. وعبارة أخرى تم تأكيد فرضية البحث التي تنص على أن هذه الاستراتيجية من شأنها تحسين مستوى كتابة الفقرات من حيث التماسك.