Local-Culture-Based Materials in Online Cooperative Learning: Improving Reading Achievement in Indonesian Context

Hieronimus Canggung Darong[1*]

[1]Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus, Indonesia

Correspondence to: hieronimusdarong@gmail.com

Abstract: The use of Cooperative Learning (CL) has attracted a great attention in the field. The aim of this study was to examine the effectiveness of CL in question along with local-culture-based materials toward students' reading achievement. To achieve this goal, mixed method research design was employed incorporating cluster-random sampling technique of the third- grade- college students as the population. Post-test and interview were carried out to get the data which then were respectively analyzed statically and content analysis. The findings demonstrated that online Cooperative Learning (CL) along with local-culture-based materials was of benefit for better students' reading achievement. This occurred as the pupils have good knowledge background to understand the texts in classroom activities. More importantly, students' ability in predicting the idea of the text was better. To add the two essential features of CL, positive interdependence and individual accountability, text familiarity that so-called local-based-culture is demanded in implementing the online CL. In this respect, being cooperative does not solely guarantee successful learning. Content and text- familiarity are important to cope with.

Keywords: local-culture, prediction, collaboration

INTRODUCTION

Cooperating and working with others is expostulated as a central of human existence. As such, those two in question appear in all aspects of humans' life including in teaching-learning process. Social constructivist learning theory as highlighted by Vygotsky in (Topçiu & Myftiu, 2015), alleged that learning is a social process in which knowledge construction may transpire. In this regard, it is not only an individual process but a social process. The learning might be more meaningful as one collaborates in some activities with others. This is strengthened by (Maphosa & Wadesango, 2017) saying that Cooperative learning (CL) deals with individual involvement in a certain community where knowledge construction occurred.

One of Cooperative Learning (CL) principles as highlighted by Johnson and Johnson 1987 in (Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Saekhow, 2015) is face-to-face interaction. However, previous studies have claimed that collaborative learning is more effective as it is facilitated in a cyber face-to-face online environment than face to face offline learning. Despite the degrees of collaboration varied among the features gauged, there is a tendency that the former is facilitated more (Wang & Chen, 2012). Likely, with regard to the employment, online cooperative learning instruction that so-called blogs groups might enhance the intercultural communication competence and lessens intercultural communication apprehension among language learners students (Awada & Gutie, 2019). Meanwhile, focusing on cognitive domain in synchronous collaborative writing, a work of Lange et al. (2020) found that pupils could attain higher cognitive load levels, which in turn benefits for learning, as they involved in successful collaborated activities. It therefore, synchronous collaborative activities are definitely demanded as the ways of sharing knowledge and ideas in order to have higher levels of writing quality. This is to highlight that CL through cloud platforms is of benefit and effective for leaners.

Other studies also signify the benefits of online CL. The studies found that online CL influenced learning and affected classroom community (Chang & Benson, 2020; Istiqomah et al., 2021). In addition, there is an increased positive perceptions and motivation of a CL language class climate (Alkhannani, 2021; Crone & Portillo, 2013; Darmon et al. 2012; Shahamat & Mede, 2015; Slavin, 2015; Susanti & Subekti, 2020). In this respect, online CL which includes group activities has positive influence both in teaching and learning English. Yet, to actualize CL, group size, number, pupil seating, tool, joint effort, and composition are essential to cope with (Yang et al., 2011). In this respect, knowledge sharing might occur as teachers and students have joint effort to make use such aspects in question in teaching-learning process. The aspects might assist pupils to participate and interact with both teacher and other pupils following the mode, either face to face either and online interaction.

Pushing to the principles ahead, CL integrated Johnson and Johnson's five principles (1987) in (Johnson & Johnson, 2014) namely positive interdependence, individual responsibility, team reflection, small-team skills and face-to-face interaction. The former deals with other group mates' success determining students' success in doing the task. The second is concerned with individual contribution to the team's goal. The third highlights group processing through discussion during and after the task. The fourth that so-called interpersonal small team skills emphasize the encouragement to share knowledge, to listen others, to give and wholeheartedly receive feedback. Meanwhile, the last principle is direct personal touch with other students during the task.

However, researchers such as (Klang et al., 2020; Laal, 2013; Scager et al., 2016) generally agree on two essential features to cooperative learning namely positive interdependence and individual accountability. Positive interdependence deals with member involvement in completing the task. Each students have to support and assist each other for the sake of the team success. Meanwhile, Integral to this is the individual accountability requiring sharing ideas, inputs among members within group. Two features in question become the umbrella presupposing intellectual work by students, or students and teachers jointly. Then, apart from teacher helps, there is a need for students to collaborate on a frequent task, holding up, and supporting each other to enhance their learning target.

With respect to the two essential features mentioned above, there have been many research studies regarding the CL. The employment of CL contributes to learning outcomes as the students share ideas and knowledge each other (Darmon et al., 2012; Slavin, 2015). CL which includes collaborated group activities has positive influence both in teaching and learning English (Shahamat & Mede, 2015). This is strengthened by (Lange et al., 2020) demonstrating that students involved in successful group work had higher levels of cognitive load and significantly benefits for learning. Meanwhile, focusing on speaking, the most recent studies have shown that incapacitated pupils who may be struggling to speak up as they frequently participated in group activities (Alkhannani, 2021; Susanti & Subekti, 2020). Thus, the findings of such previous studies highlight the benefits of the essential features in CL. The presence of such features determines the nature of CL in its real implementation.

Regarding the employment, a good collaboration might be successfully done as the teachers pay attention on task types provided for pupils. A work by (Hummel et al., 2015) has proved that the CL can be successfully eased by the script used as a tool task type in both face to face and online learning. As such, the findings have shown that the results do not differ for both modes. In addition, in its implementation, there should an inclusion of constructive assessment, as part of instructional process, drawing pupils' attention through feedbacks to attain future learning goals. This is highlighted by the findings of (Ismail & Allaq, 2019), cooperative learning is a valuable instructional procedure for promoting better learners' engagement and classroom social interaction.

Crafting innovations of the employment CL were also the concern of previous studies. Pupils sometimes need to be helped with moving over the disequilibration activity that might appear when new information against with their prior conceptual references or paths of recognizing as they learn new materials or skills. In this context, CL and the ZPD (zone of proximal development) can be of benefit to help the pupils with working through the disequilibration activities, comprising acquiring the contemporary information and skills into their own use (Clapper, 2015). Meanwhile, the way of recommending CL's activities to pupils should consider vital issues of increasing interest namely pupils' preferences and learning needs. The activities should be regarded as a problem solver in teaching-learning process (Troussas et al., 2020). To add on, through collaborating, there is a need for the teachers to be role models along with their innovative ways of employing CL for their pupils. In this regard, the collaboration and innovations cover cognitive presence and social presence both with teaching materials and s with pupils (Liebech-lien, 2020). These should be employed in such a way that they can reach the learning goals.

With regard to the results of its employment, CL has shown something positive. Having been given cooperative learning (CL), pupils' motivation increased. Although the result is different, CL could benefit teaching-learning process in English classes, which may in turn evolve pupils' speaking skills (Fernandez-rio et al., 2016). Pupils' cooperation, relatedness, motivation, enjoyment, and novelty essential elements also appeared. Aside from motivation, CL increased positive perceptions of teaching-learning process (Namaziandost & Shatalebi, 2019). Along the line of the findings in question, pair work, group work, interview, and role play utilized in CL were positively perceived by the pupils (Sun & Yuan, 2017). In a more specific knowledge repositories analysis, a work of (Pimlott & Tikasingh, 2020) revealed that pupils' perceptions of working collaboratively and their perspectives of the potential usefulness of the content for study were positive. These findings have an implication that CL deserves to be employed by the teachers as it positively results in teaching and learning activities.

Differently, the employment of CL remains no effect and have some challenges. Forming cooperative-based- learning groups does significantly boost college students' learning outcomes (Chen & Lin, 2020).

Meanwhile, teachers are particularly ill at ease with embedding cooperative learning in the curriculum, finding the space and time needed for cooperative learning and assessing pupils when employing CL. The issues such time pressure and curriculum are essential challenges to conduct CL (Baloche & Brody, 2017). Likely, students' reluctance, teachers' insufficient experience in providing tasks always appear in the employment of CL (Saito et al. 2020). At this point, regardless of its benefits, CL still have some challenges in its implementation. Thus, previous studies have identified the nature of CL, practice and the challenges. However, again, a great reminder saying that language is in us as much as we are in language (Brown, 2001; Duranti, 1997). As such, there is a need to deal with the language users and their cultures. Therefore, the culture position in the employment of CL needs to be explored in this pandemic situation.

Nowadays, the contextualization of language is robustly flourished. Previous studies have suggested that teaching language should cover the culture of language user (Michelson, 2017). In the same vein, as the changes of teaching toward learning, target culture awarness is very essential in classroom activities. In this regard, the target language learnt is senseless if the learners do not know the culture of people who speak it (Limberg, 2015, 2016; Miska et al., 2017; Yang & Li, 2019). Moreover, learning the target language is insufficient to cope with the linguistic domain such, phonological, morphological, and syntactical aspects. There is a need to go further that so-called pragmatic rules and culture norms of the target language speakers. Consequently, a successfully target language learner are definitely a successfully target culture learners. On the other way around, one may fail as he/she ignores the pragmatic and culture norms of the language users which, he/ she, in tuns makes pragmatic errors (Brown, 2001; Kadarisman, 2015; Mahmud, 2019; Taguchi, 2012; Taguchi & Cmu, 2011; Zhu, 2012). The findings are strengthened by Dinamika & Hanafiah (2019), Fadilah (2019), Fitria (2018), Fitria (2020), Kalee et al. (2018), and Setiyorini et al. (2020) saying that learners might be struggling with linguistics forms of the target language. Learners often make errors in speaking and writing as they have insufficient knowledge of target culture.

Given the important role of target culture in language learning, it is reasonable for teachers to insert the culture of L2 in classroom activities (Couper & Watkins, 2016; Lindahl & Watkins, 2015; Mahmoud, 2015; Marhamah et al., 2017; Miska et al., 2017; Tajeddin & Pezeshki, 2014). As such, it is of benefit for putting the language barriers away and can have a culture adjustment in language production. Therefore, there should be a space for teachers to embedded the target culture in language teaching as they are interrelated. It should be employed in such away that teaching activity might evolve pupils in terms of having sufficient knowledge of language and culture being learnt.

However, in contrast with the findings above, other researchers also have promoted the significant role of local culture in English Language Teaching and learning. The basis consideration of such idea is English as *lingua franca.* Teachers should contextualize and teach English following the context of pupils. (Cocks et al., 2017; Shin et al., 2011; Tin, 2014). In this regard, the pupils are helped to reconstruct their local knowledge which subsequently as a means to facilitate them in acquiring the English-target language. Apart from the mentioned reason, pupils' burden are also highlighted to be the reason for placing local culture in teaching context. Having negative reactions and feeling shocked toward unfamiliar content or context is another problem for pupils found in the given target culture context. Briefly, pupils' burden would be more. As highlighted by Chan (2013), Nicholas (2015), Siegel (2014), and Siegel (2015) aside from linguistic problems, feeling of alienation and strangeness is another problem to cope with . Saying it differently, processing overload that includes linguistic and target culture at the same time may hinder the success of teaching and learning the English as a target language. Thus, the use of local culture is an alternative way to facilitate pupils in learning English- target language during teaching activity.

Moving to concrete action ahead, other studies have promoted the insertion of local culture reflecting local people's life and manner, local experinces and interest in a teaching material (text-book). It should be designed in a local-culture- based as it is recognized as more experintially than written by native speakers. As such, it should be done in such away that the textbooks which are used in teaching and learning English-target language can help pupils to attain the learning goals; no drawback, or if any, learners' obstacles can be overcomed steadily (Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015; Snodin, 2015; Suswandari, 2017; Syahri & Susanti, 2016). To add on, Hajar (2017), Motteram (2016), Reed et al. (2019), and Teng (2020) have proposed the learners' identity awareness in global context by utilizing local materials. Teaching them to write or even to speak should result in their communication skill to living globally. In this respect, aside from successfully learn English-target language, local-culture- based materials can keep pupils' own identity.

Despite the well-established benefits of online CL, a great reminder saying that language is in us as much as we are in language (Brown, 2001; Duranti, 1997) is very essential to cope with. This implicitly means that there is a close relationship between language and its users and culture. In this article, the writer reports on a study of the effect of using online CL utilizing local culture on students' reading achievement. Students were taught reading subjects through online collaborated activities drawing on their own cultural experiences. Despite having numerous studies on online CL, employing local- culture-based in teaching reading is lacking

and has been overlooked in Indonesian context. Therefore, this study wants to answer the following research question "what are the effects of local- culture- based materials in online cooperative learning on students' reading achievement? Aside from improving students' reading comprehension, this study is of benefit to assist teachers and improvise their teaching methods during the pandemic of covid-19.

METHODS

Research context

This study employs mixed-method as a research design incorporating both qualitative and quantitative methods to examine the effects of implementing online CL utilizing local-culture-based materials. Specifically, posttest-only control group design as it involved only two groups, the groups that receive the experimental treatment, and the control group (Borg & Gall, 2005). The population was the third grade of college students and cluster-random sampling was used as the population was already divided into several groups. Following (Borg & Gall, 2005; Kerlinger, 1973) the sample was randomly assigned and the treatments were employed differently. The first group was given CL along with local-based- culture material and the second one was without local- culture- based material. At the end of the treatments, the researcher gave post-test to know students reading achievement. The textbooks used by the teachers are designed by native speakers and he is required to complete all units following the syllabus and lesson plan provided by the English study program. Despite the fact that the teachers were able to complete all topics along with activities, they still did not have sufficient space to improvise activities or even provided any other sources that much more flexible for students' achievement. As for the assessment, the teachers followed the settled program of summative test that were carried out in the mid-term and at the end of semester.

Setting and Participants

This research was conducted at a private university in Indonesia comprising two classes of the third grade of English study program with a total of 54 students. Random assignment was administered to determine which class would be the experimental group and the control group. From the result, class, the class consisting of 26 students (14 boys and 12 girls) was the experimental group and the class consisting of 28 students (16 boys and 12 girls) was the control group. The third grade was chosen as they have joined many English language skills and components in the previous semesters. Thus, their proficiency level was regarded as basic reason for involving in this study. Aside from students' involvement, one English teacher, a graduate of the Department of English Language Teaching (ELT) and 11 years teaching experience involved in this study as well.

Instruments and Data Collection Procedures

Online teaching scenarios were utilized to guide the teaching process. Learning materials were prepared and carried out online using CL the jigsaw activities along with local- based culture materials and online classes CL without local-based materials. Although the two groups have different learning materials, both, experiment and control group, were divided into some small teams and allow them to discuss following the rules of CL jigsaw activities proposed by Johnson et al. (1993). As such, the students were asked to build a group that so- called the home group. Then, each member of the group were assigned with different tasks namely word meaning, references, specific information and main idea of paragraphs within the text. Each students was responsible in one of the tasks in question. After all member of all groups already knew their tasks, they were assigned into an expert group; sit together and fix their tasks. They should work on group cooperatively. Meanwhile, the researcher monitored to make sure that all students worked cooperatively. Then, after completing the task in expert group, the students went back to their home group to make the members understand the tasks given. Each members of the group had to share they had in their expert group and make sure that all their members in home group understand it.

Aside from teaching scenario, achievement test was used to gather data. The achievement test was aimed at measuring what an individual has learned during certain period (Best, 1981). The achievement test that so-called post-test was conducted at the end of the experimental treatment. The test was given for both experimental group and control group to measure the students' achievement in reading. However, For the sake of validity and reliability, try- out test was conducted in advance to meet the criteria of content validity, facility Value (FV), Index of Discrimination and reliability (Borg & Gall, 2005; Heaton, 1975). To strengthen the quantitative data, the researcher conducted semi-structure interviewed to students (experimental group) and the teacher with interview questions that adapted from (Golnaz, 2019). In this respect, they were interviewed regarding their respond and experiences in teaching- learning process of reading course resulting from the employment of online CL method with local-culture-based materials.

Data analysis

After obtaining the scores from the post-test given, the data were analyzed in two phases namely pre-experimental design and hypothesis analysis. The former analysis includes data normality of Kolmogorov-Smirnov's formula and homogeneity test of variance using Levene's formula. Then, both of those tests in question were analyzed using SPSS 16.0 for Windows. In the meantime, the later that is hypothesis analysis utilized descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. As such, central tendency or averages (mean, mode, median) and measures of spread or dispersion (variance, standard deviation) for each group were analyzed descriptively. Besides, since the data were interval, parametric test namely *t-test* was used to compare the mean score of the experimental group and the control group in the post-test was compared. Meanwhile, through content analysis (Dinçer, 2018), under two themes namely positive interdependence and individual accountability, the qualitative data were interpreted following the needs of the study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After obtaining the scores resulting from the given posttest, the researcher test the normality of data and homogeneity of Variance using SPSS 16.0 for Windows as presented in the following tables:

Table 1. Result of Normality Data test

Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
Normality test	Statisctic	df	Sig	Statisctic	df	Sig
1	.150	26	.135	.957	26	.343
2	.135	28	200	.977	28	.763

a. liliefors significance correction
*This is a lower bound of the true significance

Table 2. Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Normality test	Based on Mean	2.797	1	52	.100
	Median	2.041	1	52	.159
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.041	1	44.916	.160
	Based on trimmed mean	2.625	1	52	.111

Normality data test confirms the significance value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov for experimental group (1) was 0,135 which was more than significance level 0, 05. It means that the distribution of experimental Group data was normal. In the meantime, the distribution of Control Group data was normal for the Control Group (2). As such, the significance value of Kolmogorv-Smirnov' was also above the significance level; 0,200. In the meantime, the homogeneity of variance test for both experimental and control group data based on mean, median, median with adjusted df and trimmed mean was homogen. The significance value of four categories are above the significance level of 0, 05 as used in this study. At this point, with respect to the two tables above, thus, the data of both groups can be further analyzed using inferential analysis (Table 4).

By the descriptive statistics, the data were analyzed in terms of mean, median, mode, standard deviation, variance, and range. The mean, median, and mode generally provide information on test performance. On the other hand, the standard deviation, variance and range might inform the individual performance vary from the central tendency. Eventually, by inferential statistics, the difference of the mean score of the two groups was analyzed in order to find out whether there was a significant effect of CL jigsaw type along with local-culture-based texts as shown in the tables below.

Table 3. Descriptive Analysis using SPSS 16.0 for Windows

		Experimental	Control
N	Valid	26	28
	Missing	2	0
Mean		81.6692	72.1250
Std. Error of Median		1.61416	1.99791
Median		83.3000	73.3000
Mode		80.00[a]	73.00
Std. Deviation		8.23061	1.05720E1
Variance		67.743	111.766
Skewness		-.646	-.140
Std. Error of Skewness		.456	.441
Kurtosis		.945	.802

Std. Error of Kurtosis	.887	.858
Range	36.70	50.00
Minimum	60.00	46.70
Maximum	96.70	96.70
Sum	2123.40	2019.50
Percentiles 25	76.7000	64.1500
50	83.3000	73.3000
75	86.7000	79.1750

Table 4. Inferential analysis (t-test analysis)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Post test	Equal Variances assumed	.944	.336	3.682	52	.001	9.54423	2.59238	4.34224	14.74622
	Equal Variances not assumed			3.716	50.510	.001	9.54423	2.56849	4.38655	14.70191

In the meantime**,** apart from the quantitative analyses, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the students in the experimental group to explore the extent of the employment of online CL along with local-culture-based.

Positive independence
[…] We can complete our task in time. The use of local-culture-based materials provided by the teacher helps us to do the task successfully (S5, semi structured interview, 11.12.2021)
[…] We always got a very good impression from our teacher. The task is completely done. It is very helpful for us to understand and predict the text (S1, semi structured interview, 14.12.2021)
[…] We can answer all questions in the text such as word meaning, specific information, and reference. One more thing, we can easily predict the main idea of the text (S12, semi structured interview, 12.12.2021)
Individual accountability
[…] My knowledge of my own culture helps me to understand the text and is very helpful to help my friends in my team dealing with the main idea of the text. (S7, semi- structured interview, 8. 12. 2021)
[…] Although my vocabularies are not really good, by looking at the pictures containing my culture in the text, I can predict the words meaning in a text. To be honest, I can take part in the discussion and share ideas in my team as my teacher gives me my own culture materials (S13, semi- structured interview, 13.12.2021
[…] I feel happy as I can involve in the discussion. I rarely involve in the discussion before as I have problem with the idea of text. Yet, now, I actively involve such as giving inputs, ideas or objection as the texts are easy to understand. (S3, semi-structured interview, 9.12.2021)
Teachers' Reflection
[…] I don't know why the students are more enjoyable joining my course. They collaborated well in their own team. The class is now more alive. Furthermore, their scores were satisfying. And one thing I like much is their prediction toward the texts ideas (semi-structured interview, 9.12.2021)

There were some important points regarding the findings. First, descriptive statistical analysis confirms that the mean score of the experimental group was 81, 67 while the control group was 72, 12. In this respect, the students in experimental group performed better in the tests than the students in control group as they got higher test score. In the meantime, the standard deviation showed the standard deviation of the experimental group was 8,23 while the control group was 10,57. Following Fraenkel and Wallen (2012) saying that the more spread out the scores are the greater the deviation score will be. From the standard deviation, the experimental group gained lower than the control group. Thus, the scores of the control group were more spread out than those of the experimental group.

Second, for the sake of inferential statistics analysis, the t-test was administered in order to prove the significant difference of the two means between the experimental group and control group. Yet, before administering the t-test, two pre-experimental design analysis were administered namely test for normality data and homogeneity of variance. The result of those tests confirmed that the data were normally distributed ad the variance of the two groups not differ significantly, then the t-test could be administered. As such, Table 2 indicates that the value of t observe was 3,682 and thus, the null hypothesis of this study was rejected. In this context, since the samples were more than 30, the researcher worked on the 5 percent (.05) alpha level of significance for the standard level of rejecting the null hypothesis and the hypothesis required two-tailed test, whenever the value of the t observe equals or above the z score (1,99). From the comparison of those two value, it was clear that the t observe exceeded the z score. Consequently, there was significant difference between student's reading comprehension using CL Jigsaw type with local-culture-based materials (texts) than those who were not.

Third, the local- culture- based materials are of benefit to assist pupils in understanding the English texts. The data got from interview both from pupils' and teachers' interview saying that students could understand, construct knowledge even predict the texts easily as they dealt with locality aspects. The contexts found within the texts were close to their life experiences; no linguistics and culture burden hinder the learning. Therefore, questions dealing with words meaning, references and specific information can be answered well. On the other way around, the pupils (control group) got some difficulties as they were still given unfamiliar context. Aside from finding the main idea, they are also difficult to cope with specific information and reference question of the texts. This occurs as they are definitely pushed into unfamiliar content or context.

Owing to the important points of the findings, this study contrasts with previous studies saying the online CL is effective and can facilitate learning (Wang & Chen, 2012), enhance higher cognitive level (Lange et al., 2020) and influence learning and affect classroom community (Chang & Benson, 2020; Istiqomah et al., 2021). This study found that good collaboration is insufficient to successfully apply on CL. The data found in control group (Table 1 and Table 2) have confirmed that on CL is not effective without the local-based-culture texts. Despite the fact that the students collaborated each other, it can't facilitate learning as they have linguistics and culture burden comparing with the students taught using local-based-culture texts. Now pushing further, this study mirrors the previous studies saying that the reconstruction of local knowledge is beneficial for learning and acquiring the target language as teachers contextualize their teaching activities (Chan, 2013; Cocks et al., 2017; Kao et al., 2011; Nicholas, 2015; A. Siegel, 2016; Tin, 2014). Therefore, as proposed by Mahmud (2019), Meihami & Khanlarzadeh (2015), Snodin (2015), Suswandari (2017) and Syahri & Susanti (2016) teachers should facilitate learners with more experientially materials to have better results in classroom activities. To specify, the method used in teaching activity should be contextualized following students needs such as learners' knowledge and experiences.

By and large, online CL becomes an umbrella presupposing intellectual work by students, or students and teachers jointly in this pandemic Covid-19 era. It has a need of a small number of pupils to collaborate on a frequent task, holding up, and supporting each other to enhance their learning target. Cooperative characteristic is the one that is very important in doing the tasks. Aside from training their cooperative characteristics, this method also a student-centered activity as he/she works with his/her friends and tries to solve all the tasks in group. As such, it highlights teaching as a social process, not an individual process (Crone & Portillo, 2013; Darmon et al., 2012; Maphosa & Wadesango, 2017; Slavin, 2015). Positive interdependence and individual accountability are essential features of in doing online CL. However, this study proved that the two features are not really essential as the exclusion text consideration given. Although students involved and shared ideas in group, learning achievement still deviates from teacher expectations. Learning obstacles were still faced by students in coping with a reading text. Yet, interestingly, students' reading achievement was better as text consideration, so- called local-culture-based text was given to the students.

More importantly, as found in this study, pupils, ability in predicting the ideas of the text is better than they are given unfamiliar context. As they have better prediction, the questions regarding the ideas of the texts can be handled well. This occurred as the pupils have knowledge background to understand the texts as teaching materials used by teachers in classroom activities. This findings highlights (Smith et al., 2021) pointing out that there are some factors which effect reading comprehension. One of the factors is background knowledge of teaching material (the text) used by the teachers. This factor may affect their understanding of the whole text. Apart from understanding, the use of local-culture-based materials might sharpen pupils' prediction toward the texts. Thus, to add the two essential features of implementing the online CL, one feature to involve is that text familiarity which in the context of this study is so-called local-based-culture text.

CONCLUSION

Hitherto, aside from face to face, in context of educational approaches, CL becomes an umbrella of presupposing intellectual and collaborated works of online teaching-learning activity. Its essential principles are the requirement of well-established employment. Yet, in the real practice, the principles are not the guarantees of successful learning. In particular, this study empirically proved that although pupils are given CL in their online learning, their reading achievement are not better than those given online CL along with local-based-culture texts. Thus, being cooperative does not solely guarantee successful learning. Content and text familiarity are essential aspects to cope with. Yet, based on this experience, teachers are strongly recommended to use CL along with local-culture based material. It does not only help to engage pupils but also fosters their knowledge construction in learning. Theoretically speaking, it is also advocated that teachers can incorporate local culture-based materials in target- language learning as it prevents pupils from linguistics and culture loads that might hinder their learning. Then, while this research yielded positive results and came up with meaningful insights in English- target language teaching and learning, it has two major limitations. Firstly, the results cannot be generalized to other language skills. Other skills such as writing, speaking, and listening are interestingly to explore the effectiveness of this method of teaching. Secondly, since this study employed posttest-only control group design only involving college pupils' level, future study might potentially include other levels utilizing cross-sectional sampling technique. Thirdly, since this study is only concerned with teaching and learning, a more challenging study in the future could imaginably cover the language acquisition. For this to occur, longitudinal study is definitely indispensable.

REFERENCES

Alkhannani, B. M. (2021). The Effectiveness of Collaborative Teaching and Learning and Engaging Students as Partners on English Language Teaching in Saudi Arabia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(10), 1288–1294. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1110.17 The

Awada, G., & Gutie, M. (2019). Effect of Cooperative Learning Instruction and Blogs on Apprehension of Intercultural Communication. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239519838217

Baloche, L., & Brody, C. M. (2017). Cooperative Learning: Exploring Challenges , Crafting Innovations. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *43*(3), 274–283. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2017.1319513

Best, J. W. (1981). *Research in Education*. New Jersey. Prentice Hall.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (2005). *Educational research: an introduction* (Fourth Edi). New York: Longman. Inc.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principle and Interactive Approach to language pedagogy.* New York: Longman Inc.

Chan, J. Y. H. (2013). The Role of Situational Authenticity in English Language Textbooks. *RELC Journal*, *44*(3), 303–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688213500583

Chang, W., & Benson, V. (2020). Jigsaw teaching method for collaboration on cloud platforms. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *59*(1), 24–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1792332

Chen, J., & Lin, T. (2020). Do Cooperative-Based Learning Groups Help Students Learn Microeconomics?, *July-Septe*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020938699

Clapper, T. C. (2015). *Cooperative-Based Learning and the Zone of Proximal Development.* https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878115569044

Cocks, M., Vetter, S., & Wiersum, K. F. (2017). From universal to local: perspectives on cultural landscape heritage in South Africa. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, *24*(1), 1–19.

Couper, G., & Watkins, A. (2016). Teaching the Sociocultural Norms of an Undergraduate Community of Practice. *Tesol Journal*, *7*(1), 4–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.187

Crone, T. S., & Portillo, M. C. (2013). Jigsaw Variations and Attitudes About Learning and the Self in Cognitive Psychology. *Teaching of Psychology*, *40*(3), 246–251.

Darmon, C., Buchs, C., & Desbar, D. (2012). The Jigsaw Technique and Self-efficacy of Vocational Training Students: A Practice Report. *Eur J Psychol Educ*, *27*(3), 439–449. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0091-4

Dinamika, S. G., & Hanafiah, R. (2019). Syntactical Error Analysis on Report Text. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, *4*(2), 120–129. https://doi.org/: http://dx.doi.org/10.33369/joall.v4i2.7681

Dinçer, S. (2018). Content Analysis in for Educational Science Research: Meta-Analysis, Meta?Synthesis, and Descriptive Content Analysis. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, *7*(1), 176–190. https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.363159

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fadilah. (2019). An Analysis of Error on the Use of Simple Past Tense in Writing Narative Text of 42 State SMK in Jakarta. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Komunukasi*, *11*(1), 15–24. Retrieved from http://ejournal.bsi.ac.id/ejurnal/index.php/wanastra%0AAN

Fernandez-rio, J., Sanz, N., Fernandez-cando, J., & Santos, L. (2016). Impact of a Sustained Cooperative Learning Intervention on Student Motivation. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy ISSN:*, *22*(1), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2015.1123238

Fitria, N. T. (2018). Error Analysis Found in Students' Writing Composition of Simple Future Tense. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies on Humanities*, *1*(3), 240–251. Retrieved from http://journal.unhas.ac.id/index.php/jish

Fitria, T. N. (2020). Spelling Error Analysis in Students' Writing English Composition. *Journal GEEJ*, *7*(2), 240–254.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education 8th Edition*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Golnaz, M. (2019). Learner Perceptions of Emotions in the Foreign Language Classroom: a One-year Study of the Connections between Anxiety, Enjoyment, Performance and Individual Differences in Adult Education [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. *Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona*.

Hajar, A. (2017). Identity, Investment and Language Learning Strategies of Two Syrian Students in Syria and Britain. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *30*(3), 1–15.

Heaton, J. B. (1975). *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman.

Hummel, H., Geerts, W., Slootmaker, A., & Kuipers, D. (2015). Collaboration Scripts for Mastership Skills: Online Game about classroom Dilemmas in Teacher Education. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *23*(6), 670–682. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2013.789063

Ismail, A. A. S., & Allaq, K. A. (2019). The Nature of Cooperative Learning and Differentiated Instruction Practices in English Classes. *SAGE Open*, *April-June*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019856450

Istiqomah, B. B. W., Rahmawati, H., Prastuti, E., Eva, N., & Ardani, T. A. (2021). Jigsaw On Line Model as the Improvization of Learning Methods in the Covid-19 Pandemic. *Psychology and Education*, *58*(1), 5408–5416. Retrieved from www.psychologyandeducation.ne

Jabeen, F., & Shah, S. K. (2011). The Role of Culture in ELT: Learners' Attitude towards the Teaching of Target Language Culture. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *23*(4), 604–613. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260045647

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1993). *Cooperation in the Classroom.* Edina.Minn: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R, T. (1991). *Learning Together and Alone*. Allin and Bacon: Massa Chussetts.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2014). Cooperative Learning in 21st. *Anales de Psicología*, *30*(3), 841–851.

Kadarisman, E. (2015). *From Description to Explanation: Essays in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics.* Linguistic Society of Indonesia.

Kalee, S., Rasyid, Y., & Muliastuti, L. (2018). Error Analysis on the Use of Letters Students in Indonesian Papers Written by Thai Students. *Journal of English Language Studies*, *3*(1), 113–124. Retrieved from http://jurnal.untirta.ac.id/index.php/JELS%0AError

Kao, S., Carkin, G., & Hsu, L. (2011). Questioning Techniques for Promoting Language Learning with Students of Limited L2 Oral Proficiency in a Drama- Oriented Language Classroom. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16*(4), 489–515. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.616399

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). *Founding Of Behavior Research*. New York: Holt. Rinchart and Winston Inc.

Klang, N., Olsson, I., Wilder, J., Lindqvist, G., Fohlin, N., & Nilholm, C. (2020). A Cooperative Learning Intervention to Promote Social Inclusion in Heterogeneous Classrooms, *11*(December), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.586489

Laal, M. (2013). Positive interdependence in collaborative learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *93*, 1433–1437. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.058

Lange, C., Costley, J., & Fanguy, M. (2020). Collaborative Group Work and The Different Types of Cognitive Load. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *58*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1788970

Liebech-lien, B. (2020). The bumpy Road to Implementing Cooperative Learning: Towards Sustained Practice through Collaborative Action. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1780056

Limberg, H. (2015). Principles for Pragmatics Teaching : Apologies in the EFL Alassroom. *ELT Journal Volume*, *69*(3), 275–285. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv012

Limberg, H. (2016). Teaching How to Apologize : EFL Textbooks and Pragmatic Input. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(6), 700–718. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815590695

Lindahl, K., & Watkins, N. M. (2015). Creating a Culture of Language Awareness in Content-Based Contexts. *Tesol Journal*, *6*(4), 777–789. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.223

Mahmoud, M. M. . (2015). Culture and English Language Teaching in the Arab World. *Adult Learning*, *25*(3), 66–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/1045159515573020.

Mahmud, Y. S. (2019). The Representation of Local Culture in Indonesian EFL Textbooks: Rationales and Implications. *Indonesian EFL Journal (IEFLJ)*, *5*(2), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v5i2.1727.Received

Maphosa, C., & Wadesango, N. (2017). Questioning ' Questioning ': Examining the Use of Questioning as an Interactive Teaching Tool in Higher Education. *Journal of Communication*, *7*(1), 111–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/0976691X.2016.11884889

Marhamah, R., Daud, B., & Samad, I. A. (2017). Integrating Target Language Culture into Teaching-Learning EFL. *English Education Journal (EEJ*, *4*(488–502).

Meihami, H., & Khanlarzadeh, M. (2015). Pragmatic Content in Global and Local ELT Textbooks : A Micro Analysis Study. *SAGE Open*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015615168

Michelson, K. (2017). Teaching Culture as a Relational Process through a Multiliteracies-based Global Simulation. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *31*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2017.1338295

Miska, C., Szőcs, I., & Schiffinger, M. (2017). Culture's Effects on Corporate Sustainability Practices : A Multi-domain and Multi-level view. *Journal of World Business*, *53*(2), 263–279.

Motteram, G. (2016). Membership , Belonging , and Identity in the Twenty-first Century. *ELT*, *70*(2), 150–159. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw001

Namaziandost, E., & Shatalebi, V. (2019). The Impact of Cooperative Learning on Developing Speaking Ability and Motivation Toward Learning English. *Journal of Language & Education*, *5*(3), 83–101.

Nicholas, A. (2015). A Concept-based Approach to Teaching Speech Acts in the EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal Volume*, *69*(4), 383–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv034

Pimlott, Z., & Tikasingh, T. (2020). Student Perceptions of Working Collaboratively during Undergraduate Study to Produce a Knowledge Repository Based on Wiki Technology. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *58*(4), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1758744

Reed, B. S., Said, F., Davies, I., Bengsch, G., & Reed, B. S. (2019). Arabic Complementary Schools in England: Language and Fundamental British Values. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *33*(1), 50–65.

Saekhow, J. (2015). Steps of Cooperative Learning on Social Networking by Integrating Instructional Design Based on Constructivist Approach. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *197*(February), 1740–1744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.230

Saito, E., Takahashi, R., Researcher, F., Wintachai, J., & Anunthavorasakul, A. (2020). Issues in introducing collaborative learning in South East Asia: A critical discussion. *Mangement in Education*, *20*(10), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620932367

Scager, K., Boonstra, J., Peeters, T., & Vulperhorst, J. (2016). Collaborative Learning in Higher Education: Evoking Positive Interdependence. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *15*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.16-07-0219

Setiyorini, T. J., Dewi, P., & Masykuri, E. S. (2020). The Grammatical Error Analysis Found in Students' Composition. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya*, *10*(2), 218–233. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.10.2.2020.218-233

Shahamat, A., & Mede, E. (2015). Integration of Collaborative Learning in Grade K-5 EFL classrooms. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary , Elementary and Early Years Education*, *44*(66), 682–697. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2014.1002516

Shin, J., Eslami, Z. R., & Chen, W. (2011). Presentation of local and international culture in Current International English-language Teaching Textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *24*(3), 253–268. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2011.614694 PLEASE

Siegel, A. (2014). What should we talk about ? The authenticity of textbook topics. *ELT Journal*, *68*(4), 363–375. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu012

Siegel, J. (2015). Using Speech Act Sets to Inform Study Abroad Instruction. *The Language Teacher*, *39*(6), 3–9.

Siegel, J. (2016). Pragmatic Activities for the Speaking Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 1–8.

Slavin, R. E. (2015). Cooperative learning in Elementary Schools. *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, *43*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2015.963370

Smith, R., Snow, P., Serry, T., & Hammond, L. (2021). The Role of Background Knowledge in Reading Comprehension: A Critical Review. *Reading Psychology*, *42*(3), 214–240.

Snodin, N. S. (2015). Rethinking Culture Teaching in English Language Programmes in Thailand. *RELC Journal*, *47*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688215609231

Sun, P. P., & Yuan, R. E. (2017). Understanding collaborative language learning in novice-level foreign language classrooms: perceptions of teachers and students. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *26*(2), 189–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2017.1285790

Susanti, Y. P., & Subekti, A. S. (2020). Jigsaw Strategy for Cooperative Learning in an English Reading Class: Teacher's and Students ' Beliefs. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *8*(2), 102–114.

Suswandari. (2017). Incorporating Beliefs, Values and Local Wisdom of Betawi Culture in a Character-Based Education through a Design-Based Research. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, *6*(3), 574–585. https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2017.3.574

Syahri, I., & Susanti, R. (2016). An Analysis of Local and Target Culture Integration in the English Textbooks for Senior High School in Palembang. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *5*(2), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.15640/jehd.v5n2a11

Taguchi, N. (2012). The Effects of Practice Modality on Pragmatic Development in L2 Chinese. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12123.x

Taguchi, N., & Cmu, B. H. (2011). Pragmatic Development as a Dynamic , Complex Process : General Patterns and Case Histories. *The Modern Language Journa*, *95*(4), 605–627.

Tajeddin, Z., & Pezeshki, M. (2014). Acquisition of Politeness Markers in an EFL Context : Impact of Input Enhancement and Output Tasks. *RELC Journal*, *45*(3), 269–286.

Teng, F. (2020). Autonomy, agency , and identity in teaching and learning English as a foreign language. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *00*(00), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1712913

Tin, T. B. (2014). A look into the local pedagogy of an English language classroom in Nepal. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(3), 397–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813510387

Topçiu, M., & Myftiu, J. (2015). Vygotsky Theory on Social Interaction and its Influence on the Development of Pre-School. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, *2*(3), 172–179.

Troussas, C., Giannakas, F., Sgouropoulou, C., & Voyiatzis, I. (2020). Collaborative activities recommendation based on students' collaborative learning styles using ANN and WSM. *Interactive Learning Environments, Publiished*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1761835

Wang, Y., & Chen, N. (2012). The collaborative language learning attributes of cyber face-to-face interaction: the perspectives of the learner. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *20*(4), 311–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494821003769081

Yang, S. J., Zhang, J., Su, A. Y. S., & Jeffrey, J. P. (2011). A collaborative multimedia annotation tool for enhancing knowledge sharing in CSCL. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *19*(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2011.528881

Yang, W., & Li, H. (2019). Changing Culture, Changing Curriculum: A case Study of Early Childhood Curriculum Innovations in Two Chinese Kindergartens. *The Curriculum Journal*, *30*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2019.1568269

Zhu, W. (2012). Polite Requestive Strategies in Emails : An Investigation of Pragmatic Competence of Chinese EFL Learners. *RELC Journal*, *43*(2), 217–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212449936