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ABSTRACT

Education in Afghanistan is burgeoning and new educational systems are being introduced to promote students’ learning achievement, not least in teacher training colleges (TTC). As a matter of fact, TTCs play a vital role in improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. Therefore, the Ministry of Education has a big responsibility in increasing teachers’ pedagogical knowledge and equipping them with various learner-centred techniques. Cooperative learning (CL), which is the field of the present study, focuses on students’ social interactions in the classrooms and their learning in a cooperative manner.

The Ministry of Education is dedicated to develop teachers’ knowledge, skills and attitudes as regards active learning methods in schools. CL is one way to increase students’ involvement in their own learning. This study aimed at exploring teacher educators’ and teacher-students’ perceptions about CL as well as to investigate some CL practices in English teaching at TTCs. Two types of structured data collections tools were used in this study; questionnaires for teachers and students as well as a classroom observation form. In general, this study ended up with many interesting findings. Nearly everyone in the current study emphasized upon the importance of CL in promoting students’ English learning achievement and believed that it also improves students’ social relationships. It was also found that CL diminishes students’ language anxiety and makes them feel more comfortable when interacting with one another in group works. A certain number of CL methods were also practiced in English classrooms. In fact, the study revealed that the teachers and students in TTCs are adopting the change from conventional teaching and learning approaches to modern ones like CL, which is a positive initiative for a big change towards a productive educational system in Afghanistan. However, teacher educators still need to learn a lot about CL in order to apply it effectively in their classrooms. Their improper application of CL activities in their classes is the indicative features of their insufficient CL knowledge as well as their unfamiliarity with many other CL methods except a few.
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INTRODUCTION

Background
After the establishment of a new government in Afghanistan the first and foremost focus has been on promoting educational capacity of Afghan people. The Afghan state in collaboration with different organisations is investing millions of dollars for the improvement of the educational system from pre-school to teacher training colleges (TTCs) and universities. Each year large numbers of teachers are being trained with modern teaching approaches through seminars and workshops held either in provinces or the capital city, Kabul. Likewise, thousands of teachers are being graduated from TTCs. In spite of all this training, teaching in Afghanistan is still mostly lecture-based (Ministry of Education, 2010). Therefore, the ministry wants to train teachers in a constructivist and democratic way of teaching and learning where students are in focus and active in their own learning. Besides, the ministry aims to encourage graduated students both from TTCs and universities towards a teaching career with gradual promotion and salary increment as incentive (ibid). Since 2010, changes and refinements in education can be witnessed because of the employment of young teachers trained professionally in teacher training programs.

Problem Area
However, TTCs have followed traditional methods for a long time and it may take generations to switch to the modern ones. For achieving this ambition, the Ministry of Education has updated the curriculum exposing active learning approaches. Cooperative learning (CL) is one of them. In all TTC classes in Afghanistan teacher-students are taught a subject called ‘Teaching Methods’. This subject emphasizes on social interaction of students and cooperation in learning, but in a theoretical way. Moreover, this subject is taught in a lecture-based manner, where teacher-students rarely get a chance to practice different teaching methods they are taught in the class. They are only asked to give a short explanation or summary about the methods that they have studied. Actually, teacher-students might learn better by practise than by theory. It might also be good to train teacher-students theoretically and practically in a learner-focused style. As Tan et al (2006) contend that when students interact with each other in the classroom, they will have lots of opportunities to get utmost use of what is taught or what is meant to be learnt. However, in the last semester of their studies in TTC, teacher-students are sent for teaching practice in schools. Again, they need practical works within the classroom when they study methodologies, so that they could apply the theory into practice, when they go for teaching practice in schools.

In addition, teacher educators’ teaching styles have big impact on teacher-students to shape their pedagogical knowledge and performance (Izadinia, 2006). When students graduate from universities and then become employed as teachers in TTCs they do not have enough pedagogical skills of teaching, and instead follow their university professors’ teaching methods or maybe learn by experience eventually. Kroksmark (1995) discusses many important issues about teaching and teachers in his article. According to him the teachers are of two kinds: 1) A teacher who is graduated from a university and learns the teaching skills gradually by experience 2) a teacher who is trained to be a teacher with professional knowledge of teaching and teaching methodologies (ibid). As noted earlier, majority of Afghan teachers or teacher educators receive seminars and workshops about modern methodologies. Even if they are not trained as teachers in universities, they can learn about teaching professions during their teaching career either through experience or special programs held by the Ministry of Education.

English is one of the main subjects taught in all levels of education in Afghanistan; from kindergarten to university level. Since English is a foreign language, it requires more practice
and more interaction amongst students in discussions and dialogue to make the learning process productive and fun. Interactions occur when students are put in pairs or small groups within a CL environment where they can discuss different issues that the teacher poses in the classroom. Therefore, cooperation in learning means that students should socially interact with each other and be accountable for their own learning as well as help their group mates to learn and meet their goals. They should not be passive, but active in learning and accomplish the tasks provided by the teachers.

Since English language is studied by majority of Afghans and is gaining more and more importance, I found it interesting to explore about the teacher educators’ and teacher-students’ ideas in education about CL and how they may or may not practice it in English classrooms. Moreover, male teachers are more exposed to the trainings than the females. These trainings are usually held in the capital city of the country, Kabul, so the female teachers from other provinces are rarely allowed by their families to travel there by themselves. As a result, they lose lots of opportunities for improving their pedagogical knowledge through the programs held by the Ministry of Education and different organisations. Therefore, it may be interesting to learn about how CL is viewed and practiced from a gender perspective, too.

Aim
The aim of this study is to explore the understanding and practice of CL in English classes in TTCs.

Research Questions
This study is conducted to seek answers to the following questions:

1- What is the perception of teacher educators and teacher-students as regards CL in English language classes of TTCs?
2- What kind of CL practices is used in English language classes?
3- Are there any difference between the way male and female teacher educators and teacher-students perceive or practice CL?

Outline of the Study
After the introduction part, comes the literature review, where general characteristics of CL, different CL methods, and application of CL in English classes in TTCs are discussed and compared. After that, the data collection procedure and the limitation of this study are elaborated in details. Then, the findings of the study are presented in tables and figures and the most striking points are commented. The result of the current study and its implications in TTCs are discussed and finally the study ends with a conclusion.
LITERATURE REVIEW

What is Cooperative Learning? General Definitions and Characteristics
CL is a learning strategy where students are divided into small groups to cooperate with each other in their learning process (Slavin, 1991). CL methods are used for giving students’ more chances to learn, incorporating two important things: goals of the groups and individual accountability. In presence of these two factors, implementation of CL meets desirable results (ibid).

In fact, CL is comprised of different learning methods and share some commonality in purpose compared to conventional classroom instructional methods (Shackar et al, 2002). In CL, the environment of the whole class organisation changes. For instance, the responsibility of students and teachers, communicative strategies, type of tasks as well as setup of the class, take a new pattern. However, such changes are not maintained in the same way in different CL instructional modes (ibid). In CL groups, students are encouraged to work together upon a given task and complete it while focusing on their group goals. Each group member takes active participation in dialogues, discussions and argumentations helping his/her teammates to grasp and comprehend the contents of group assignments. This way, all students in a group play their part and collaborate with each other towards the accomplishment of their group goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). CL groups are effective and successful when every single member of the groups strives to accomplish the group goals. In fact, group success depends on individual members’ contributions (Johnson et al, 2000). Nonetheless, every CL activity might not be successful if used improperly. In such circumstances, students’ learning achievement will be held back and they will not be able to learn something. Therefore, teachers should have enough information about CL approaches and the way they are to be used in the classroom (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

According to Johnson & Johnson (2002) five vital principles should be taken into account when one wants to implement CL methods in the classroom. They are all discussed in the following texts:

Positive Goal Interdependence
Sense of relatedness to one another in CL group works is important and it means that goals cannot be accomplished in case students in the group are lagging behind in their learning or accomplishment of the tasks they are assigned to. Therefore, cooperation between the individuals is advantageous for the success of the group. Here, students work collaboratively in order to increase the learning achievement of their fellow teammates till all of them learn the material they are to learn (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). “Within every cooperative lesson, positive goal interdependence must be established through mutual learning goals” (ibid, p. 96). This is of course the most significant issue which helps CL activities succeed (ibid).

Individual Accountability
Individual accountability refers to the contribution of every single student in a CL group activity, which can be revealed through assessing each student (Johnson et al, 1998). Students are assessed by quizzes or by providing some explanation about what they have informed their teammates. The reason is that in CL activities the aim is to integrate the learning achievement of every student to make them able to perform better (ibid). It is of great importance for students to know if anyone in the group requires help to complete his/her individual tasks. If team members do not contribute in group works they may fail to taste the flavour of achievement. In fact, individual responsibility in task completion increases by positive relationships amongst students (Johnson & Johnson, 2002).
Face-to-face Integrative Oral Discussions
In face-to-face discussions students are urged to discuss and find ways for deciphering problems, meaning of concepts, explaining one’s learning to other group members relating their current learnt lessons with the ones that they have studied before (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). “Accountability to peers, ability to influence each other's reasoning and conclusions, social modelling, social support, interpersonal rewards and personal as well as a professional relationship, all increase as face-to-face interaction among group” (ibid, p. 97). In addition, face-to-face social interactions help students to uplift their cognition. Critically seeing one another’s ideas and contentions and giving feedback to each other lead to better learning as well as building good relationships (Johnson & Johnson, 1998).

Social Skills
Students who have not experienced social interactions in CL groups, but who only are together in a group may not succeed. They should first be instructed how to interact with their group mates and get familiarized with the requirements of a CL group activity (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Johnson & Johnson, 2002). According to Johnson et al (1998) and Johnson & Johnson (1999), students should be taught how to make decision, trust each other and communicate with their teammates as well as how to overcome disagreements through cooperation. In fact, in CL groups students’ relationships with other students grow stronger if they are individually given feedback by the teacher on their social interactions in the classroom (Johnson & Johnson, 2002).

Improvement of students’ social skills in CL groups was studied and confirmed by Ning (2013) amongst Chinese tertiary students of English as Foreign Language (EFL). He found that students participated more actively in CL group works and showed more responsibility in fulfilling the part of the task belonging to them when socially interacting with each other.

Group Processing
Group processing involves students’ reflection about the progression of their group works and planning for the improvement of their working procedure (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). Moreover, group processing encompasses students’ understanding and reflection about what they did or did not learn from the contribution of other group members. In case of meeting any problems, students work jointly to find solutions. For students to identify and analyze the problem with their mates, of course, requires some time and skills (ibid). In addition, group processing is used to strengthen the ways students can better increase one another’s learning outcomes and understanding in a comprehensible manner (Johnson et al, 1998).

Cooperative Learning Methods and Activities
As noted earlier, CL is comprised of various methods and almost all of them are shown in Annex 1 with implications in different linguistics areas. Some of them, the most frequently used in English classrooms are as follow:

One CL method is Learning Together (LT). In LT method, students are divided into small heterogeneous groups of students, i.e. students with different level of achievement or different social and ethnic backgrounds (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005). They share the same goal using the same materials. Students in LT groups are encouraged to reflect on what they have learned and give answers to questions asked by the teacher (ibid).

Likewise, Student Team-Achievement Divisions (STAD) is a well-researched CL method (Slavin, 1991). This CL activity is comprised of four students with different level of achievements. After the teacher has conducted a lesson, each group of students works together. They ensure whether all colleagues in the group have understood what the teacher explained or not. At the end of the activity each student in the group is individually assessed with quizzes and the average scores of all group members is granted to the group as a reward.
In English context, STAD is appropriate in learning linguistic rules and structures (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005).

Similar to STAD is another method which is called Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT). The only difference is that instead of quizzes, tournaments are used at the end of a week (Slavin, 1991). In this tournament students try to win marks to their groups competing with other groups. Students compete with students at their own level of achievement and win rewards for their own teams. TGT is also used for learning linguistic rules and structures as in STAD (ibid).

However, Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) is used differently. In CIRC method, students work together on reading and writing tasks in pairs while listening to their teacher’s instructions (Slavin, 1991). In this method, students are put in pairs to practice reading passages with each other, summarizing texts, learning words, reading and correcting one another’s writing (ibid).

Conversely, in Group Investigation (GI) approach students select their own group members and make small heterogeneous groups where they work based on the problem presented by their teacher (Slavin, 1991; Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005). They search and investigate topics and divide those topics into parts. Then each group member is responsible to complete one part of the assignment and share with the group mates in order to make a complete presentation to the class (ibid).

Jigsaw is another CL method, which is usually used in reading where students play expert-novice group discussions and presentations (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005). In jigsaw method students work in groups of six where they work on the part of assignment they are assigned to. Students read their parts to the class and come together with the ones who have the same part of the text in ‘expert groups’. Then they explain their topic to the expert group members that they have met. After that, they join back their own group mates and teach whatever they have learned from the expert group (Slavin, 1991).

Constructive Controversy (CC) is another CL method, where students are divided into groups of four based on heterogeneity (Shaaban & Ghaith 2005). Again each group is subdivided into pairs, in which they switch roles. Then they turn to their other two teammates who were working together separately and share their knowledge through group discussions and social interactions. Moreover, CC technique helps language students to get more proficient by discussing about cultural and normative issues with each other, which are normally central topics in CC method (ibid).

Different to all other CL techniques is Complex Instruction (CI). CI method is used in the classroom where students work on “higher-order thinking skills through group work activities organized around a central concept or big idea” (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005, p. 18). In this approach students should incorporate higher cognitive skills and take active participation in discussions. CI also gives student the sense of how “to be smart” and make them believe that they have potential cognitive skills in learning. In language classrooms, CI plays crucial role in enhancing different linguistic skills (ibid.).

Another alternative method is Cooperative Learning Structures (CLS). CLS is a combination of different variations of CL methods called ‘structures’, which are used for organizing communicative class activities benefiting from “…generic and content-free ways. Examples of these structures are: Round Robin, Mixer Review, Talking Tokens, and many other structures” which come with various forms (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005, p.19). These sub-methods of CLS are used in brainstorming for a writing task, pre-reading, learning words and their spellings, group argumentation, helping students to engage in dialogues and many other purposes (ibid).
Cooperative Learning and English as a Foreign Language

Since the focus of this research is on the use of CL approaches in EFL classes, effort has been made to compare and discuss research findings from different researchers of CL.

According to Zhang (2010) usage of CL methods in learning languages is becoming prevalent due to its positive impact on students success and their chances to interact with each other in a communicative way. CL improves students’ motivation to practice the target language in order to be more proficient in the foreign language. In CL language classes, students meet with multiple opportunities to converse in the target language. Besides, in CL group discussions, students’ hesitation about the proper or improper use of language decreases considerably compared to only interacting with their teacher. Therefore, students’ listening and speaking skills improve when talking and listening to each other in a cooperative environment (ibid).

In order to make the learning situation in language classrooms enjoyable, any kind of coercion and uneasiness should be eliminated (Zhang, 2010). It is in the nature of CL activities to lead students towards an enjoyable CL world. Moreover, students’ level of anxiety and fear drops when they present their learnt material to the class after learning everything they present (ibid). Zhou (2012) in an experimental study in China confirmed that students’ language anxiety dropped remarkably (59.4%). However, in another study at an American university and three Taiwanese colleges, Duxbury & Tsai (2010) studied the impact of CL on decreasing EFL learners’ language anxiety amongst 385 male and female EFL students. They found that there was “no statistically significant relationship between cooperative learning attitudes and foreign language anxiety” (p. 9). They found that the Taiwanese students’ anxiety in foreign language rises when they are interacting in CL groups. Still they recommend CL in foreign language classes to be used because of its extensive language use opportunities between students (ibid).

CL methods can be used in any subject area in EFL classrooms including listening, reading, and writing and other language skills (Shaaban & Ghaith, 2005). For instance, many studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of CL on students’ EFL reading comprehension and vocabulary learning by many researchers in different countries and at different levels of education (e.g. Ghaith, 2003; Ghaith & Abd El-Malak, 2004; Ghaith & Bouzeineddine, 2003 in Lebanese schools and colleges; Mohseny & Jamour, 2012; Pan & Wu, 2013; Tuan, 2010, in Iran, Taiwan and China respectively). All these authors have confirmed positive impact of CL on reading comprehension from school to university levels.

In an experimental study, which involved 78 first year EFL learners studying in a reading class in a Taiwanese university, Pan & Wu (2013) found that CL increased students’ reading skills dramatically. Their findings also showed that both competent and less competent students in English reading improved their reading comprehension in CL groups compared to students who were taught by conventional teaching methods. Another finding showed that CL boosts students’ motivation in EFL learning. Moreover, students participated more actively in CL group activities and it was found that they were extrinsically motivated and spent most of their time on reading English texts. On the whole, 86% of EFL students reflected that CL promoted both their reading skills and self-confidence. Besides, they added that their score rate increased when they interacted with their peers in a cooperative manner (ibid). Impact of CL on students’ motivation was also studied by Zhou (2012) amongst Chinese college students who were not majoring in English. The researcher used STAD, TGT, Jigsaw, LT and GI CL techniques. He found that students became more motivated in EFL and showed eagerness in learning English. His study also showed that students “listening, speaking and reading” skills improved and students also showed improvement in “communicative skills and social relationships” (Zhou, 2012, p. 1321). Likewise, in another study in Vietnam, Tuan (2010) incorporated CL methods like think-pair-share and Jigsaw. He
found that 89.19% of EFL students strongly confirmed that CL group activities increased their reading comprehension. He also found that within a period of seven weeks teaching and using CL activities, students’ contribution in group activities increased more than 40%. Besides, students’ absenteeism dropped by 11%. In presenting cooperatively studied reading task, it was found that 22% of low-achievers were actively participating in presentations and their failure in examination decreased considerably (Tuan, 2010).

Furthermore, a study of grammar achievement in EFL, 62 female Iranian university students majoring in different fields by Ghorbani & Nezamoshari’e (2012) revealed that both proficient and less proficient students benefited from grammar instruction in CL activities. In general, the superiority of CL was proven over traditional approaches in EFL classrooms (ibid). Similarly, significance of CL was confirmed over traditional methods by Hijazi & Al-Natour (2012) in EFL context in two Jordanian secondary schools for girls in Amman. In this study these two researchers found students in CL groups outperformed students who had received instruction by conventional methods.

Cooperative Learning and Training of English Teachers
Teacher training is viewed as a prominent and vital action for producing skilled teachers equipped with various teaching methods (Izadinia, 2012). She also adds that teacher-students are influenced by their teacher educators’ teaching styles and insights as regards teaching. Teacher educators are “role models” for teacher-students (ibid, p. 4). Therefore, active learning is a very important issue to be considered in teacher training in order to enhance quality of education. Further, active learning aims to improve learning achievement of students with different levels emphasizing socially active intervention of students in their own learning (Niemi, 2002). CL is one of the elements of active learning, which emphasizes on “…the importance of cooperative action, collaborative problem-solving, and sharing as tools for attaining deeper process of learning and in many cases also achieving better results” (Niemi, 2002, p. 765). This happens only when learners socially interact with each other and share their creative ideas in a cooperative way (ibid). Utilization of CL methods in a successful manner is a bit problematic because it requires more time for fulfilling difficult tasks, continuous practice and maybe need for incentives. To change the image of teachers from being the center in teaching and learning requires a change in the way teachers are trained and prepared. For instance, in teacher training the time for implementation of CL should be extended in teacher training colleges (Sharan, 2002). For understanding the essence of CL approaches, teacher-students should see and practice CL techniques for themselves in real situations. Doing so, they will learn how to play their parts in accomplishing a group task in small groups within the allocated time. Besides, they will learn how differently CL may be used in the classroom. In case of not having adequate knowledge of CL, including its advantages and disadvantages, teacher-students might not be able to conduct it in their own classrooms in a desirable way in the future. Therefore, teacher-students should be equipped with a wide variety of CL methods and be taught how to organize the classes appropriately for CL environment. They should learn how to involve students in group works, supervise and create group activities in their future teaching (ibid). On the whole, teacher-students should learn about “what”, “how”, “when”, and “why” as regards implementation of CL approaches (Sharan, 2002, p. 71).

In summary, this literature review reveals that CL has positive impact on students’ learning on the whole. CL with its variety of methods and structures can be used in different level of education starting from elementary schools to university and colleges. Learning in a cooperative and communicative way leads students towards a constructive and cognitive learning style where students socially interact with each other in discussions. Further, CL promotes students social relationships with other students who come with different backgrounds and nourishes their attitudes to be positive towards learning as well as about
their relationships. Extensive research on the impact of CL on English learning indicates that students’ English language skills are considerably improved when students practiced those skills in a cooperative way.
METHODS

In this study, a quantitative research approach was adopted. Such approach provides numerical data by administering structured data collection tools (Cohen et al. 2010). Therefore, two structured data collection tools were used based on the research questions of this study. First, two questionnaires were devised; one for teachers and one for students and then a structured observation form for classroom observations. According to Cohen et al. (2011) a questionnaire is an extremely valuable and helpful tool for data collection and considerably eases the information gathering process for a study. Besides, questionnaires are useful for collecting data on factual issues or individuals’ views (Denscombe, 2010). In addition, quantitative data is easy to be compared and analysed quickly due to being pre-coded (Cohen et al, 2010).

As advised by Cohen et al. (2010), this questionnaire used different types of multiple choice questions to collect accurate information regarding CL practices and the beliefs about it in TTCs. For instance, there were a few dichotomous questions with only two options as well as lots of multiple choice questions which had several options and alternatives where the respondents could select one or several answers. Likewise, in order to find the level of agreement of respondents with CL, Likert scale statements were used where each respondent could select one variable (ibid).

Moreover, a systematic observation approach was used for collecting statistical data for the current study, too. This type of observation involves “looking and noting systematically people, events, behaviours, settings, artefacts, routines and so on” based on a structured schedule (Cohen et al. 2010, p. 456). Classroom observations helped the researcher to find out whether teachers practiced CL in reality and whether students were given opportunities to interact with each other. Also, it helped the researcher to validate the data collected through questionnaires. Actually, observations made it possible to make an interesting comparison between actual CL practice of teachers and what they had responded in the questionnaires. Since the observation did not yield as much as expected, its findings were used as complementary issues to the findings of the questionnaire.

As an ethical rule, it is important to inform the directors of the organisations about the purpose of a study and ask if they allow the researcher to conduct his/her research there (Bell, 2010; Bryman, 2012; Cohen et al. 2010). Therefore, before conducting the research, the head of the TTCs as well as the teachers were asked for permission to distribute the questionnaires and do the classroom observations. Moreover, for putting a stop to the hesitation of teachers for letting me observe their classes, they were ensured that observation is for study purposes and not for evaluation; in addition some information about the probable benefits of the research result was provided. After getting their consent, the data collection process commenced.

Moreover, to ensure the privacy of the respondents’ responses to the questionnaires, they were allowed to respond the questionnaires at home. In fact, “the absence of the researcher” helped the participants to take their time and answer the questions as they wanted in order “to avoid the potential threats or pressure to participate caused by the researcher’s presence” (Cohen et al. 2010, p. 404).

Data Collection and Analysis

The data collection for this study took place in September 2013. Before initializing data collection, the questionnaires were translated into Dari and then piloted to ensure increased the reliability. When piloting, some minor ambiguities were sensed in translation and were clarified later on. Obviously, “A pilot study has several functions, principally to increase the reliability, validity and practicability of the questionnaire” (Cohen et al, 2010, p. 402).
Further, a pilot study helps the researcher to make each one of the questions understandable and clear for the research participants (ibid).

120 teacher-students were selected randomly, while English teacher educators were selected as a whole. Then, 150 questionnaires (see annex 3) were distributed by five assistants to and responded by 30 English teachers (16 male, 14 female) and 120 students (60 male, 60 female). First, two questionnaires (one for teachers and one for students) were disseminated to six TTCs in six provinces (Saripul, Balkh, Baghlan, Kunduz, Takhar and Badakhshan). Moreover, 10 classroom observations were conducted in five TTCs with a structured form (see annex 3). During the observation, the activities were recorded every five minutes and comments were made in the provided space in the form. The research participants were ensured anonymity; Cohen et al (2010) argue that ensuring respondents’ complete anonymity and confidentiality at start is of great importance. In fact, it might have encouraged them to be honest about their responses to the questionnaires. Moreover, the problem of non-response was limited by giving the respondents plenty of time to fill out the questionnaires and all of them fully participated in this study. Here, assistants were very helpful in collecting the questionnaires, before the researcher himself travelled to the provinces for classroom observations.

Finally, to facilitate the analysis process, the collected raw data were entered into an Excel sheet. Then all the data were calculated, refined and presented in tables according to the questions in the questionnaires and the statements in the observation form. Thereafter, data were entered in tables based on male and female variables, and percentages calculated. In addition, teachers’ understandings of CL and the CL methods they practice were compared according to their age and years of experience. Afterwards, data tables were organized according to the research questions, and striking points were commented under different headings.

**Limitation**

The current research is limited from a number of aspects. For instance, an issue of concern is the generalisation of the findings because only six provinces were covered in this study. So, the results are limited to the selected provinces. In fact, the findings only represent those specific areas where samples have been selected (Bryman, 2012).

In addition, another limitation could be with the questionnaires because they were distributed to the participants by the assistants and responded at home. Here, “the presence of the researcher is helpful in that it enables the queries and uncertainties to be addressed to immediately”, which also helps ensuring all questions to be answered (Cohen et al. 2010, p. 404). When the researcher is not present during the dissemination of questionnaires, participants will not be able to ask for further clarification about the ambiguous issues. Therefore, when creating questions and their alternative answers, a simpler and understandable language was used. Again, interview could have helped the researcher to avoid possible ambiguities or to explore participants’ thoughts about CL face-to-face. In fact, interview makes it easy to investigate about different attitudes and feelings of people (Denscombe, 2010).
FINDINGS

Research Participants
Research participants in this study were comprised of 16 male and 14 female teachers, 120 students from 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} grades majoring in English (30 male and 30 female students in each group). All teachers had BA degree. Half of them had received short term CL trainings (20 or less than 20 days) conducted by different organizations for example British Council. A majority (77\%) was quite young (under 30) and almost all of them (83\%) taught in classrooms with more than 30 students\textsuperscript{1}. Their teaching experience ranged from one to over 10 years. Only 7\% of them (one male and one female) had more than 10 years of experience.

What is CL? Teachers’ and Students’ Perceptions
As seen in table 1, both teachers and students had similar views as regards CL. The findings show that majority of male and female teachers (63\% and 57\% respectively) believed that CL is one of the elements of active learning and so thought half of the female students too. Also, a considerable percent of teachers and students said that CL is a method where students do group works. Unlike many students, most of the teachers also thought that CL is a way to improve communication skills. Whether CL gives opportunities for less competent students to participate in activities, female teachers (50\%) were more confirmative than males (31\%).

Table 1: Teacher educators’ and teacher-students’ understanding of CL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think of CL?</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active learning</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talented students help poor students</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher helps poor student</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills improve by discussions and dialogue</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor learners get a chance to participate</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students build positive attitudes and trust</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes communicative skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When teachers’ perceptions about CL were compared according to their age, almost all the young teachers unlike the old ones thought that CL is a method which helps students to learn a language actively by engaging in group discussions. One of the teachers commented in the questionnaire: “CL is a method which makes students more active in learning and understanding.” One student had written that “CL helps all students including low-achievers, medium-achievers and high-achievers to learn from daily lessons” while another one wrote “CL is a method which increases students’ self-confidence and makes them more talented”.

Advantages
From this research it was found that both teachers and students from both sexes were of the opinion that students should learn English language by engaging in CL activities where they could feel free to interchange ideas and learn from one another. It was also found that almost all of the teachers believed that ‘CL boosts students’ overall English language achievement’. A great majority of students were of the same view, except some of the females who were not sure about it (see table 12 in annex).

It was also found that CL promotes students’ social skills when they interact with each other in a cooperative way according to both teachers and students as seen in table 2.

\textsuperscript{1} Sometimes the number of students was more than 60 in the observed classrooms. The actual class size recommended by the ministry of education was only 25 students in one class, though.
Table 2: The role of CL in promoting teacher-students’ social relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL promotes students’ social relationships.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56 Male 64 Female              53 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44 Male 36 Female              43 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0 Male 0 Female                2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 Male 100 Female            98 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the teachers believed on CL’s contribution for developing students’ social skills and so believed majority of students too. Assumingly, when students develop their social skills, they may solve their problems by sharing them with their group members in a cooperative manner. Therefore, cooperation with a partner or engaging in dialogues and group discussions may help English learners to feel free about the way they practice English and thereby reduce their language anxiety, which is confirmed in table 3. This way they will find more opportunities to practice their language skills in an enjoyable way which almost all students in this study consieded as a positive contribution of CL (see table 13-16 in annex). Around 80% of each group of teachers and students were very optimistic as regards this effect of CL.

Table 3: The role of CL in reducing teacher-students’ language anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL decreases teacher-students’ language anxiety.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44 Male 43 Female              22 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38 Male 43 Female              57 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>12 Male 0 Female                12 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 Male 7 Female                 7 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0 Male 7 Female              2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 Male 100 Female            100 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disadvantages

According to Slavin (1996) learning through cooperation helps each and every student. So, both competent and less competent students will learn equally (ibid). This was revealed when teachers were asked if they lose control of students’ learning achievement in case of using CL. Most of them did not think they did, especially the females had not problem in this regard. Contrarily, around 30% of students said that their teachers cannot always make them to benefit equally from learning, which was also reported by the same number of male teachers. They thought that when talented and less talented students are put together, the talented students will not learn anything. Table 4 gives a clearer picture of different views.

Table 4: Disadvantage of Cooperative Learning
Similarly, when teachers and students were asked if CL helps only low achievers and not high achievers, a majority of them had similar ideas and believed that both groups of students learn equally during CL activities. However, few teachers and students considered CL to cause talented students to lag behind in learning as pictured in table 5 below.

**Table 5: CL only benefits poor students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL mainly benefits poor students while talented students underachieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How is CL practised in TTCs?**

CL comes with different types of methods as elaborated in the literature review. Teachers use various forms with different frequency according to the findings of this study. It was found that all teachers except two used CL in their classrooms. A majority of both male and female teachers (20 of them) indicated that they use CL on occasional basis, while only eight said that they use it regularly in a typical week. It was also reported by most of the students. However, some of the male and female students (10% and 25% respectively) complained that they rarely experience CL in their classrooms (See table 17 in annex).

As illustrated in figure 1, teachers used CL in all areas of English teaching, but more often in speaking. The frequent use of CL in speaking classes was also confirmed by many male students (57%) but not to the same extent by the female students. Two classroom observations with male and female teachers, respectively, also confirmed this use of CL. Students frequently indicated that they experience CL more in reading classes, which contradict teachers’ claims to some degree. Even when teaching English Teaching Methods (ETM), teachers’ and students’ responses were dissimilar.

[Figure 1: Areas in which CL is practiced](https://example.com)

**What kind of CL practices?**

Of the collected data from teachers and students, it appears that a certain variety of CL methods are used in English classrooms in TTCs. In this case, figures 2 and 3 give clearer illustrations.

---

2 ‘Other’ shows very little CL practice in linguistics and phonetics, which are only taught in 14th grade as well as non existence of CL in the classrooms.
Figure 2: CL methods practiced in English classrooms according to teacher educators and teacher students

As illustrated in figure 2, it seems that LT\(^3\) was one of the most common CL methods used by quite a few teachers, while GI\(^4\), CC\(^5\) and Jigsaw\(^6\) were seldom practised. The commonality of LT was also accepted by about 40% of students. The second most opted CL method by teachers was CIRC\(^7\), which, however, was experienced less frequently by students. A majority of students said that STAD\(^8\) is amongst the most common method used by teachers, but less number of teachers said so. However, the teachers and students reported that CI\(^9\) method is also practiced to some degree. None of the teachers used TGT\(^10\) in their classrooms and only very few students said that they have experienced this method.

When the findings were compared from a gender perspective, no significant result was found according to the male and female teachers’ and students’ responses (see figure 3 and 4 in annex). However, some female students (8%) said that their English teachers use none of the CL methods (see figure 4). This was also confirmed through classroom observation in two classes. In addition, one of the female teachers wrote: “I divide students in groups of six and give each student a small portion of the new lesson. Then I ask them questions about their lesson to answer cooperatively and comparatively”. Besides, one male student said: “Our teachers mostly use lecture-based methods” and a female student wrote: “Our English teachers divide us into groups of four or six and give each group different topics to discuss. Then one or two students from each group explain the result.” It was also found that mostly young teachers used CL activities, while old ones did not do so very often.

The teachers who conducted CL activities in 10 observed classrooms only partially met CL principles. It was found that out of 10 teachers, eight followed some of the characteristics of CL methods such as GI and CLS\(^11\), while two of them never met any CL standards. For instance, teachers set group goals, but only two of them divided the topics for individual students. Others gave a size-to-fit-all topic for students. Six teachers gave only some instruction on how to work cooperatively, so weak students often struggled a lot.

---

3 Heterogeneous groups work, same materials, same goal.
4 Students select group members; group task divided for each individual, then group presentation.
5 Pair work in groups of four; pairs switch roles and share with the group.
6 Reading groups of six; each group member is assigned a task and work with other group, members with similar task; share with original group.
7 Pairs to practice reading, summarising, correct each other’s writings.
8 Groups of four discuss the lecture; individual assessment; quizzes.
9 Heterogeneous small groups discuss material to improve higher-order thinking skills.
10 Same as STAD but tournament for pairs rewards for the team.
11 Variation of CL methods like ‘Think-pair-share’
Accrediting the above comments, table 6 shows that nearly all of the teachers believed that using CL in English classes equips students with new methods for teaching. Similarly, a majority of students thought so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using CL in English classrooms equip teacher-students with new approaches for teaching.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all observed classes, students’ sense of individual responsibility was evident when cooperating with each other, though some teachers did not allow them to cooperate. Moreover, cooperation of teammates was more common in male teachers’ classes (4) than females’ (2). In all male teachers’ classes, students were more active and were allowed to contribute with constructive ideas, but only two of the females allowed their students to do so. However, students in male teachers’ classes chose their own teammates. Also, three of the female teachers mostly used CL methods with a little variation (CLS) (See table 20-23 in annex).

According to a majority of students, CL should be used in TTCs both for the purpose of improving their English competence and also for learning how to use its various techniques when teaching English in schools. Only 6% of 120 students disagreed to use CL in improving their English (see table 18 and 19 in annex).

When teachers were asked if they cooperate with each other, they had different ideas. Male teachers (69%) mostly helped their colleagues in the examination of students, whereas females (57%) mostly helped their fellow teachers in the preparation of daily lessons. Two teachers wrote that they share their knowledge and experience with others, while another one said that she helps others in preparing supplementary materials. Another one also wrote that she cooperates with her colleagues when necessary (see figure 5 in annex).

**Gender and CL**

Conducting CL activities involve heterogeneity from every aspect, especially gender (Tuan, 2010). The findings of this study revealed that a great percent of both teachers and students agreed to boys and girls working together cooperatively regardless of age. Female teachers were more positive about gender heterogeneity than males. Some of the male teachers either disagreed or were unsure to the idea of boys and girls working together. A great percent of students had no problem with gender mix in CL and believed that it is a must to involve everyone in learning. On the whole, a large percent of teachers and students partly or completely recommended gender mix in CL activities. Nevertheless, during the class observation in four mixed classrooms, it was found that gender mix was never considered and students from both sexes worked separately. Moreover, according to my observation it seemed that heterogeneity as regards talent was considered only in four (two Male, two, Females) classrooms observed.

**Assessment practices**

As seen in table 7, CL group activities were assessed diversely in English classrooms of TTCs. Teachers assessed students by asking them to present a summary of their work individually, giving quizzes to each of them or only by asking group leaders to present their group works on behalf of their groups.
Table 7: Assessment of CL activities practiced in English classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CL Assessment</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual presentation of CL group task</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes or tests to individual students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group leaders present the group task</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assessment is done</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 7, 44 of male teachers do individual assessment of students’ works while most of the females (43%) only assess students through group leaders. This was also reported by most of the female students. Second option of teachers for assessment was quizzes or tests at the end of a CL activity which was also confirmed by students and eight class observations. In addition, one female teacher said: “I collect the result of group works in written and after assessing them at home, I will return to students”. Besides, 10% of female students stated that they are never assessed by teachers at the end of CL activities.

Students were rewarded for success in different forms. For instance, male teachers (49%) mostly gave class activity marks for students which were also reported the same by majority of the students. Unlike male teachers, most of the females (43%) gave students bonus marks12 plus class activity marks. However, praising students for their good work was common too according to the teachers and students (see table 10 in annex).

In case of failure in cooperative group tasks, students experienced some kind of reaction from their teachers like class activity mark reduction, which was reported by a sizable number of students and male teachers. A great percent of male and female teachers (56% and 43% respectively) accounted that when students fail to complete the given group task, they provide more feedback for better improvement. However, in classroom observation in four classes it was found that students gave feedback to each other, when they fail to complete a task. Also, majority of the students acknowledged teachers’ claims, but some of them stated that teachers show no reaction even if they fail. However one of the female students wrote: “Some of the teachers scold us when we fail to complete our task. If an activity fails, they say that we have failed and we should be ashamed...” (see table 11 in annex).

Further elaboration of the most important findings of this chapter will be done in the discussions section. It will also be discussed what those findings mean and what will be their implication in TTC and school education in Afghanistan.

---

12 Sometimes students get additional marks as gifts or incentives for more improvement in their learning.
DISCUSSION

Teachers’ and Students’ Understanding of Cooperative Learning

According to the respondents of the current study, CL plays a crucial role in students’ English language achievement. Quite a few of the research participants were positive about it. However, their perceptions differed in a number of cases. Most of the teachers and students believed that CL is the same as ‘active learning’. Here, I contend that teachers’ attendance to several methodological training workshops focused on active learning and learner-centred methods have influenced their thoughts about CL. Also, they may have studied about active learning and its elements in the university, but have not understood them appropriately. Further, in every English class in the universities, students are taught both pedagogy and English teaching methods for two semesters. They are even sent to schools for teaching practice, as I have experienced during the last semester of my university studies. Therefore, one cannot say that English teachers do not know any methods when they become teachers because they come with some theoretical knowledge about teaching.

In addition, more than half of the female teachers reported that CL improves students’ communicative skills, while lower number of students (around 20%) believed so. Here, it seems that teachers do not tell students what CL is or the students may not have experienced that CL improves their communication skills. It can also happen that the students may have misinterpreted the term in the questionnaire. Therefore, clarifying the significance of learner-centred approaches like CL might lead a new generation of Afghan teachers towards cooperative approaches of teaching and learning. This change can be initiated from TTCs where students are meant to be trained as future professional teachers and thereafter be employed as school teachers.

Again, many teachers, mainly the females, thought that CL creates opportunities for poor students to participate in activities, while fewer students had this view. During the classroom observation, it was noticed that less talented students were not given any chance to participate. According to my experience CL may help poor students, if applied effectively and, consequently, the learning can be fun and productive for all students.

Another finding of this study shows that almost all teachers and students indicated that CL increases students’ overall language achievement. Even if not always practised, the study has shown a firm belief in the merits of CL, and, with more practice, these beliefs may get stronger and gradually change teaching and learning styles in TTCs. For a long time, teachers in Afghanistan have been practicing traditional methods of teaching at all educational levels and it is/was considered natural for the Afghan teachers to follow the disciplinary standards of behaviourism. However, the Ministry of Education strives to train teachers with new methodologies in order to improve the quality of education in TTCs and sub-TTCs in accordance to international standards (Ministry of Education, 2010). Besides, some other organizations like the British Council have trained English teacher educators as master trainers in teaching English with a wide range of methods which also included CL. I have been to many workshops of this organization and received extensive training in learner-focused approaches of teaching. They introduced many CL methods in a practical manner and then we had to cascade our newly gained knowledge to other English teachers in schools to increase the learning outcome of students in English.

For nearly all teachers and students, CL had a social meaning because it creates more opportunities for students to socially interact with each other, especially those who are poor in English and are afraid of making mistakes when communicating. Generally, CL promotes students’ social relationships and creates a sense of trust amongst them as revealed in this study. This way, students will be motivated both extrinsically and intrinsically in learning, particularly, when they are allowed to express themselves in a group of other students, when
individual responsibility is required or when they experience positive interdependency, aspects that are emphasized by Johnson & Johnson (2002). But, as Sharan (2010) writes, “[y]et the effect of CL is not automatic. As everyone knows, in any context, just placing students in groups does not guarantee that they will work smoothly together…” (p. 202), especially when students come from culturally diverse backgrounds. It means that the selected CL activities should improve a sense of responsibility in students and increase their cooperation with one another. Otherwise, group discussion would become useless because at that time only talented students would do all the work. In fact, “Achievement is a we thing, not a me thing, always product of many hands and heads” (John Atkinson; quoted in Johnson & Johnson, 1999, p. 72).

Proper use of CL methods might help the students to be supportive of one another’s learning achievement, too. For instance, when teachers are familiar with the effective ways of using CL methods in the classrooms, they can make learning fun and enjoyable. This idea was also supported by quite a few students. As a matter of fact, social interaction of students gives them plenty of opportunities to be critical in their learning and solve their problems through discussions and dialogues (Wang, 2007). As long as the teacher’s inputs are considered essential, students’ own problems are also very important to be considered. It is the responsibility of the teacher to give proper structure to activities in which students participate in problem-solving (Wood, 2004).

Majority of the research participants also believed that CL reduces students’ language anxiety, which was also found in many other studies discussed in the literature review. It was contradicted only by Duxbury & Tsai’s (2010) who found that CL increases students’ language anxiety. I argue that when students work with each other, they will feel quite safe to participate in discussions especially when the topic is general students of all educational achievement levels will be encouraged to show interest in learning. Conversely, when interaction is only with teachers, students will start worrying about their improper use of language and thereby may experience reduction in their marks. As a result, they will lose confidence as well as become de-motivated.

However, some of the male teachers (around 30%) were afraid of putting talented and less talented students in the same group. Besides, many students were of similar opinion; this idea was also supported by the findings of classroom observation. Therefore, teachers might have failed to help students according to their different needs in learning. It can also be rationalized that both talented and less talented students may be so demanding because the former may not want to repeat what they already know and the latter struggle in learning, demanding more guidance and support from the teachers or talented students. This is how sometimes teachers might find it difficult to keep everybody satisfied in learning and control students’ learning achievement accordingly. However, Slavin (1996) contends that when talented students cooperate with less competent ones, they learn more themselves. Therefore, there will be no room left for complaint about not being able to help students to learn equally.

Supporting Slavin’s conclusion, most of the teachers and students stated that CL does not only benefit underachievers, but also helps high achievers to learn from mutual cooperation. Slavin (1996) further argues that CL’s “[e]ffects are equally positive for high, average, and low achievers” (p. 71). Here, one may ask whether research participants were positive to CL only theoretically considering the above finding regarding control of achievement level of students. Again, this could be due to the ineffective ways of implementing CL methods, which was actually noticed during classroom observation. When students are not given proper instruction on how to work cooperatively, do not get clear objectives or topics are not individually assigned, they may feel less responsible in their learning. It was also noticed in the observed classes that teachers mostly just gave a topic to
the groups, but did not say who was responsible for what. Such factors may cause both teachers and students to be negative to CL.

**CL Methods and Different Areas of English Teaching**

Nearly all teachers said they use CL, but to a higher extent than the students had experienced. It appears that teacher have not understood CL appropriately. They might have thought that any group activity means CL. Besides, most of the English teachers claimed that they use CL mostly in speaking activities. To practise CL in speaking classes seems to be an easy and natural way to practice language skills. However, students said that they experienced CL more in reading than speaking activities. This time, students seem to have misunderstood CL. As per my experience, the way teachers are supposed to teach reading in TTCs is very difficult. Teachers often make students find the meaning of the words from dictionaries or learn the main idea of the texts at home. The next day when they come to the class, they are asked about the spelling and the meaning of the new vocabulary as well as the main idea of the lesson. So there seems to be no cooperation amongst students in reality.

It was also found that LT, STAD and CIRC were the most commonly used methods by English teachers. Again students had experienced fewer opportunities of these CL methods than the teachers had claimed, a finding that was confirmed during the classroom observation. In general, teachers seem to have exaggerated their knowledge and practice of CL probably because they did not want to appear less knowledgeable. However, one can assume that familiarity of teachers with various kinds of methods can give them confidence and help them decide how to deal with many problems in the classrooms. Knowing different methodological alternatives for teaching can add to a teacher’s efficaciousness. In fact, it shows a teacher’s creativity about how to use his/her skills to switch from one method to another in case one does not work.

Similarly, it was also revealed that using CL in the classroom can give students constructive ideas about teaching and equip them with various types of techniques. This way, teachers can add some merit in teacher students’ future teaching career by using various methods and convince them that CL as one of the elements of active learning invites students towards a productive learning environment.

Furthermore, students emphasized the importance of dialogue in CL activities and believed that it would keep them more active in the class, not just improving their arguing skills, but also involving a lot of language practice in English classes. As discussed in the literature review, all CL methods emphasize on mutual cooperation, discussion and dialogues between students. According to Freire (1997) dialogue and communication are considered to be of great importance without which there would be no learning and thereby no education.

The majority of the students emphasized strengthening their English through CL activities as well as learning how to use them in teaching when they become teachers. Commonly, students follow their teachers’ footsteps and may use the same teaching style as their teachers. Therefore, teachers should use methods which give students more chance to learn how to teach. In Afghan schools a majority of teachers still use traditional teaching methods and they lack essential pedagogical skills. As noted above, a change can be brought through extensive teacher training programs in which students learn new skills and develop a sense of cooperation, so that they can also help other teachers as well as students.

Teachers were also found to cooperate with each other in some limited areas such as examination of students and in preparation or planning of lessons. According to my experience, teachers mostly help each other in monitoring the final examination of students but otherwise seldom share their knowledge or experience with one another. This is unfortunate since cooperation between teachers can help them to learn new methods.

Regarding gender mixed groups, female teachers were much more positive than male teachers and, similarly, female students were much more positive than male students towards
co-education. However, the difference was quite small and only a few were negative. This is positive since teacher-students soon will be teachers and their views can change the stereotyped views on gender in Afghanistan and thus contribute to gender equality. Moreover, in Afghanistan most of the primary and secondary schools are single-sex while higher education usually is mixed, although some TTCs have separate classes for males and females. This is a culturally sensitive issue, and in mixed classrooms in TTCs, students may feel uncertain because of not having experienced co-education before. However, I have seen how this feeling gradually disappears and students’ hesitance to interact in group discussions and cooperate with each other in their learning vanishes.

The Ministry of Education and the government of Afghanistan are committed to gender parity and gender equality in education in order to meet the universal Millennium Development Goals and Education for All (EFA) by 2020 (Ministry of Education, 2010). The ministry is striving to develop the pedagogical knowledge of teachers in TTCs and facilitate the possibility for students, especially females, to join teacher training programs since the country lacks female teachers at all levels (ibid). Therefore, teacher educators’ positive views about heterogeneity in CL play a crucial role in developing gender equity both in TTCs and schools.

Assessment of CL Activities
The English teachers assessed the students in diverse ways. Male teachers mostly assessed the group work by asking each individual to present his/her group work result. In a similar fashion, giving quizzes and tests to individual students at the end of CL activities was common amongst both male and female teachers. These findings match Johnson et al’s (1998) proposed CL principle of ‘individual accountability’. In CL activities, individual responsibility for accomplishment of the assigned part of the task is of great importance, and it is, of course, difficult or impossible to complete a task without mutual cooperation of students (ibid).

A sizeable number of female teachers (43%) said they only ask the group leaders to present the result of the group work on behalf of their teammates and so did some of the males too (25%). This finding contradicts CL principles because all the students should be involved in discussions and reporting of the result of group work. Otherwise, students may choose talented students to do all the work, and that is not CL. Some students said that teachers never assessed their work. Perhaps, they had been in groups when teachers only asked the group leaders to do the presentations, and they might never have had a chance to express their views.

The respondents of the questionnaires also declared that students get rewarded when they show improvement and active participation. Successful students often received class activity marks for their good work from male teachers while they received both class activity marks and bonus marks from female teachers. According to Johnson et al (2002) “goal and reward interdependence tend to be additive — achievement is higher when both are present”. It means that when students feel responsible in reaching their group goals in a cooperative manner and then receive a reward or try not to lose the reward, they will try to learn more (ibid). Besides, students get motivated when they get teachers’ praise for better achievements and higher marks (Schunk, 2011).

On the other hand, this study revealed that students get feedback for further improvement when they have failed to accomplish a task. Hattie (2008) argues that one of the most helpful and effective processes in teaching and learning is feedback. It has a big impact in deepening students’ knowledge and taking them to higher achievements. The more students

---

13 In TTCs students get 10 marks for their daily participation in classroom activities, which are totaled with the final examination marks (maximum 100) at the end of a semester.
commit errors, the more they learn through maximized comments and feedback received from the teacher (ibid). In fact, teachers’ feedback gives insight to the students and teaches them how to judge their work, thinking about its critical aspects by monitoring their own learning (Black et al, 2003). Conversely, punishment causes non-learning and de-motivates students (Schunk, 2011). I contend that negative reactions from teachers hinder students’ learning and create animosity in them. One of the students in the questionnaire had written that her teachers scolded her when she cannot accomplish a given task. Students cannot and should not tolerate such disgrace even if they experience failure in learning. Instead, they need teachers’ positive feedback and encouragement, so that they could strive to decrease their learning deficiencies in the future.

On the whole, the findings of this study confirm to a large extent the presence of CL practice in TTCs and previous research findings. It was really interesting to learn how research participants viewed CL positively, especially the females. A certain number of CL practices were also prevalent in English classrooms, which is a good sign for a change in education system of Afghanistan. However, the overall result of the current study indicates that much still remains for teachers and students to do and learn before they really have embraced or adopted CL as a teaching and learning method. More importantly, teachers have a big responsibility in learning about every aspect and characteristic of CL methods, so that they could use it in an effective manner to promote students learning achievement in English.
CONCLUSION

This study contributed to many interesting findings as analysed in the discussion part. In general, the most important result could be the research participants’ positive views as regards CL and their appreciation of social interaction of students in educational context. Though they had different perceptions of CL to some extent, they agreed on many important issues. For instance, almost all teachers and students agreed that CL promotes students’ language achievement, develops their social relationships, reduces their language anxiety, equips them with various new methods to be used in their future occupation as teachers and so on. Through these findings the research questions have been responded and the aim of this study fulfilled.

TTCs should be in the forefront of developing pedagogical knowledge of future teachers according to the developmental programs of the Ministry of Education (2010). Teacher educators’ competence in various teaching approaches could lead to consequential improvement in teaching and learning of schools. Such evolution can take place through extensive and effective teacher training programs for teacher-students. Moreover, one of the main aims of the Ministry of Education is to exchange the conventional teaching styles in schools with active learning and learner-centred approaches.

The data in this study and many other studies discussed in the literature review show, that CL as well as many other learner-focused approaches of teaching, leads to higher learning achievement, especially in language learning. CL was found to be an effective way for engaging all students in their own learning regardless of sex, age and achievement levels.

Familiarization of teacher educators with different methods of CL and how to use them in the classroom is of great importance. According to the findings of this study, only three CL methods were prevalent in English classes, which are not sufficient to expose the diverse features of CL for students. In this case, students can easily get bored if the same methods are practised repetitively. Therefore, diversification in the use of methods in the classroom can make students see teaching from new perspectives. Besides, it will create a sense of thirst or interest in students to practice their language skills as well as learn new teaching approaches. As Marton & Pang (2006) indicate, without variation in teaching only little learning occurs and thereby teachers’ instructions have no profound effect on students’ learning.

On the other hand, according to the existent literature, effectiveness of CL techniques has to do with the individual responsibility and mutual cooperation of students. However, my classroom observations revealed how poorly or ineffectively teachers conducted CL activities. It means that teacher educators need CL exclusive trainings in order to learn more about its different principles, methods and their effective use in the classroom.

One problem evidenced in this study is that teachers and students conceptualized CL differently because they did not have a clear-cut definition. The big differences in the views are particularly attributed to male and female teachers. However, they had one commonality in their thoughts and that was: CL is the same as ‘active learning’. The question in relation to this idea was made deliberately, in order to know whether teachers and students have a full picture of CL or not. In this study female teachers showed more awareness about CL than male teachers did.

On the whole, the findings of this study were consistent with the previous studies illuminated in the literature review. Moreover, the reliability of this study would be guaranteed if it is replicated on a congruent condition with the same or similar research population. However, the collected data can only be generalised to the urban TTCs of six provinces selected in the current study. For further studies as regards the effects of CL on students’ learning achievement, many other researches could be done in different fields like for example, science or mathematics.
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## ANNEXES

### Annex 1:
Modern Methods of Cooperative Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Developer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ESL/EFL Primary Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>Mid 1970s</td>
<td>Learning Together</td>
<td>Reading, Writing, Speaking, Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVries &amp; Edward</td>
<td>Early 1970s</td>
<td>Teams-Games Tournament (TGT)</td>
<td>Language Rules and Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharan &amp; Sharan</td>
<td>Mid 1970s</td>
<td>Group Investigation (GI)</td>
<td>Writing, Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Constructive Controversy (CC)</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aronson, Blaney,</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Jigsaw Procedure</td>
<td>Reading, Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikes, Stephan &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapp; Slavin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavin</td>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD)</td>
<td>Language Rules and Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>Complex Instruction (CI)</td>
<td>Social Skills, Culture, Reading, Language Rules and Mechanics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavin, Leavey, 7</td>
<td>Mid 1980s</td>
<td>Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagan</td>
<td>Mid 1980s</td>
<td>Cooperative Learning Structures</td>
<td>Speaking, Listening, Reading, Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Ma Farnish</td>
<td>Mid 1980s</td>
<td>Curriculum Packages: Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC)</td>
<td>Reading, Writing, Spelling, Vocabulary, Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 2:

Table 8: English Teachers Educators' Profile (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Experience in Years (Y)</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>CL Training</th>
<th>Duration (D=day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1or&lt;1Y</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2-5Y</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Gender heterogeneity in CL group works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys and girls can participate in CL groups regardless of age.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Type of rewards given to teacher-students in case of success their CL activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class activity mark</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonus marks+class activity mark</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Reaction of teacher educators in case of failure in teacher-students' CL activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in activity marks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback improvement</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage to learn from other groups’ presentation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give another chance to repeat their work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No special reaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 12:</strong> Teacher educators’ agreement with CL as a learning achievement booster</td>
<td>CL boosts teacher-students’ overall English language achievement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 13:</strong> Working with a partner increases students' participation</td>
<td>When I am working with a partner, I feel free to ask for help or ask questions.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 14:</strong> The use of CL activities as an enjoyable way for learning a foreign language</td>
<td>Cooperative group discussions are an enjoyable way for learning a foreign language.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 15:</strong> CL’s role in students' more practice in English</td>
<td>Cooperative learning helps me to practice English a lot.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: CL group discussions’ role in teacher-students’ learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can learn better when working cooperatively in group discussions.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Male 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Frequency of the use of CL methods in English classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>How Often?</th>
<th>Teacher Educators’ Responses (%)</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is CL methods used in English classrooms?</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: The use CL in TTCs for improving language skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should use CL in teacher training college for strengthening our language skill</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Male 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: CL practice in TTCs for learning its use in language teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Teacher-students’ Responses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We should use CL in teacher training college in order to learn its use in language teaching.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Male 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: The way teacher educator organized CL group works during class observation; numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>To a high degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher organises heterogeneous groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher sets a group goal for students to accomplish in cooperation with each other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher instructs students how to interact cooperatively with each other within their groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher provides a sub-divided topic to all groups &amp; each member chooses one part</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Prevalence of CL characteristics in group activities during class observation; numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>To a high degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each student shows responsibility for completing the part of task belonging to him/her</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each student takes active participation in dialogues &amp; discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each group member helps his/her teammates to learn the contents of their group assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each student contributes with constructive ideas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each student provides feedback to his/her teammates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Methods which were used in the classroom during class observation; numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>To some degree</td>
<td>To a high degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work in pairs to practice reading skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work in pairs to practice writing skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students select their own teammates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each group of four members work in two separate pairs &amp; then they join again to share their thoughts through discussions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in each CL groups engage in higher-order learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher uses a variation of different CL methods in order to engage students in social interactions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Assessment of student-teachers at the end of a cooperative group work by teacher educators during class observation; numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students are assessed individually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving quizzes from the teacher</td>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>To some</td>
<td>To a high degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: CL methods used in English classrooms according to Teacher Educators

Figure 4: CL methods used in English classrooms according to teacher-students

Figure 5: Cooperation of teacher educators with each other
Annex 3:
Questionnaire for English Teachers

Sex: □ Man  □ Woman
Age: ____________
Level of Education:
   a) BA      b) MA      c) PhD

Teaching Experience in TTC:
   a) 1 year or less  b) 2-5 years  c) 6-10 years  d) more than 10 years

1- Average number of students in your English classrooms:
   a) less than 15  b) 20-30  d) more than 30

2- Have you participated in any workshop or training where ‘Cooperative Learning’ (CL) was introduced?
   a) Yes  b) No

3- If YES, how many days or months? Please specify:
   ____________________________________________________________________________

4- What do you think of ‘Cooperative Learning’? You have more than one option.
   a) I think it is a method where students work in groups
   b) I think it is one element of active learning
   c) I think it is a method where talented students help poor students
   d) I think it is a method where teachers help poor students to learn
   e) I think it is a method where all students can improve one another’s language skills through discussions and dialogue
   f) I think it is a method that gives poor learners a chance to participate in activities
   g) It is a method that build positive attitudes and trust
   h) It is a method that promotes communicative skills
   i) Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________________________________

5- Do you use CL methods in your classroom?
   a) Yes  b) No

6- If NO, why not? You can select more than options from the following list:
   □ Too large number of students in class
   □ Too short class periods
   □ CL is time-consuming
   □ I am not familiar with CL methods
   □ Class becomes noisy
   □ Students have too poor English
   □ Students are not interested in CL
   □ Planning CL activities requires a lot of time
   □ Students achieve less in CL
   □ Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________________________________

7- If YES, how often do you use CL when teaching English?
   a) Regularly  b) Sometimes  c) Rarely
8- In which one of the following areas do you use cooperative learning? You may choose more than one
   a) Reading
   b) Writing
   c) Grammar
   d) Listening
   e) Speaking
   f) Phonetics
   g) Linguistics
   h) English Teaching Methods
   i) None

9- Please select the CL methods that you use in your classrooms when you teach English.
   a) [LT] I divide students into small heterogeneous groups with different level of achievement and different backgrounds to work together cooperatively using the same materials as well as sharing the same goal.
   b) [STAD] After giving a lecture I divide students in groups of four to work together in order to discuss about my lecture. Besides, students should make sure that everyone in the group has learnt the lesson. Finally, I assess them individually with quizzes.
   c) [TGT] I use the same method above (b), but instead of quizzes I conduct a tournament at the end of the week. At this tournament, individual member of groups compete in pairs with the students from other groups at their own level and win rewards for their own team.
   d) [CIRC] In teaching reading or writing I put students in pairs in order to practice reading skills, make summary from texts, learn words or during writing session they read and correct each other’s drafts.
   e) [GI] I let students to select their own group members and make small heterogeneous groups and then I give them a problem to solve. Then they divide their own chosen topic in parts and each member takes one. After that individual students should complete the part of the assignment by his/her own and then share with the group to make a presentation to the class.
   f) [Jigsaw] In teaching reading I divide students in groups of six and assign each group member to a part of sub-divided group assignment. Students who have similar parts of the assignment come together to learn the material about their part in a cooperative manner. Then they join back their original group to teach their teammates about their part.
   g) [CC] I divide students in groups of four and again students work in pairs within the same group separately. Each pair discuss about the given topic switching roles and turn back to other pair in their group to share their knowledge through discussions.
   h) [CI] I divide students in small groups and give them a general topic that students with different level of achievement can contribute to group discussions in order to learn the material cooperatively and improve their higher-order thinking skills.
   i) [CLS] I use from variation of methods above in the classroom in order to engage students in practicing different language skills like Think-pair-share CL structure where students think about a topic individually for a moment and then share with their partners or group members.
   j) Other, please specify:__________________________________________________
   k) None of the above
Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

10- CL boosts teacher-students’ overall English language achievement
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

11- Using CL in English classrooms equip teacher-students with new approaches for teaching.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

12- Boys and girls can participate in CL groups regardless of age.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

13- The disadvantage with CL is that the teacher loses control of students’ learning achievement.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

14- CL mainly benefits poor students while talented students underachieve.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

15- CL promotes students’ social relationships.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

16- CL decreases students’ language anxiety.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  e) Strongly disagree

17- How do you assess your students when they work in groups?
   a) By asking them to individually present each one’s part of accomplished task
   b) By providing ready-made quizzes or tests to each individual group member
   c) By asking the group leader to present the accomplished task on behalf of the group
   d) Other, please specify: ________________________________________________
   e) No assessment is done

18- How will you reward your students when you recognize their cooperative group activity successful?
   a) I give them class activity mark
   b) I praise them amongst the other groups
   c) I give them bonus marks + class activity mark
   d) Other, please specify: ________________________________________________
   e) No rewards are given

19- How will be your reaction when students’ cooperatively done project fails?
   a) Their class activity marks will be reduced
   b) They will be given more feedback and consultation for more improvement in the future
   c) They will be encouraged to learn from other groups’ presentation
   d) They will be given another chance to repeat their work
   e) Other, please specify: ________________________________________________

20- I cooperate with my teacher colleagues as regards.
   ____ Preparation of lessons
   ____ Examination of students
   ____ Assessment of students
   ____ Other, please specify: _____________________________________________
   ____ I never cooperate with my colleagues
Questionnaire for Students

Sex: □ Male □ Female

Grade: a) 13th b) 14th

1- What do you think of ‘Cooperative Learning’? You have more than one option.
   a) I think it is a method where students work in groups
   b) I think it is one element of active learning
   c) I think it is a method where talented students help poor students
   d) I think it is a method where teachers help poor students to learn
   e) I think it is a method where all students can improve one another’s language skills through discussions and dialogue
   f) I think it is a method that gives poor learners a chance to participate in activities
   g) It is a method that build positive attitudes and trust
   h) It is a method that promotes communicative skills
   i) Other, please specify: ____________________________________________

2- Please select the CL methods that your English teachers use in your classrooms when they teach English. You may select more than one.
   a) [LT] They divide students into small heterogeneous groups with different level of achievement and different backgrounds to work together cooperatively using the same materials as well as sharing the same goal.
   b) [STAD] After giving a lecture they divide students in groups of four to work together in order to discuss about their lecture. Besides, students should make sure that everyone in the group has learnt the lesson. Finally, they assess students individually with quizzes.
   c) [TGT] They use the same method above (b), but instead of quizzes they conduct a tournament at the end of the week. At this tournament, individual member of groups compete in pairs with the students from other groups at their own level and win rewards for their own team.
   d) [CIRC] In teaching reading or writing our English teachers put students in pairs in order to practice reading skills, make summary from texts, learn words or during writing session they read and correct each other’s drafts.
   e) [GI] English teachers let students to select their own group members and make small heterogeneous groups and then they give students a problem to solve. Then we divide our own chosen topic in parts and each member takes one. After that individual students should complete the part of the assignment by his/her own and then share with the group to make a presentation to the class.
   f) [Jigsaw] In teaching reading our English teachers divide students in groups of six and assign each group member to a part of sub-divided group assignment. Students who have similar parts of the assignment come together to learn the material about their part in a cooperative manner. Then they join back their original group to teach their teammates about their part.
   g) [CC] Our English teachers divide students in groups of four and again students work in pairs within the same group separately. Each pair discuss about the given topic switching roles and turn back to other pair in their group to share their knowledge through discussions.
   h) [CI] Our English teachers divide students in small groups and give them a general topic that students with different level of achievement can contribute to group
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discussions in order to learn the material cooperatively and improve their higher-order thinking skills.

i) [CLS] Our English teachers use from variation of methods above in the classroom in order to engage students in practicing different language skills as in Think-pair-share CL structure where students think about a topic individually for a moment and then share with their pairs and at the end with their group members.

j) Other, please specify:_____________________________________________________

k) None of the above

3- How often do your English teachers use CL when teaching English?
   a) Regularly   b) Sometimes   c) Rarely

4- In which one of the following areas do your English teachers use cooperative learning? You may choose more than one
   a) Reading   b) Writing   c) Grammar   d) Listening   e) Speaking   f) Phonetics   g) Linguistics   h) English Teaching Methods   i) None

5- Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: CL boosts teacher-students’ overall English language achievement
   a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

6- Using CL in English classrooms will equip teacher-students with new approaches for teaching.
   a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

7- Boys and girls can participate in CL groups regardless of age.
   a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

8- The disadvantage with CL is that the teacher loses control of students’ learning achievement.
   b) Strongly agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

9- CL mainly benefits poor students while talented students underachieve.
   a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

10- I can learn better when working cooperatively in group discussions.
    a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

11- In cooperative learning activities I learn a lot from disagreements and criticisms.
    a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree

12- When I am working with a partner, I feel free to ask for help or ask questions.
    a) Strongly agree   b) Agree   c) I don’t know   d) Disagree   c) Strongly disagree
13- Cooperative learning helps me to practice English a lot.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  c) Strongly disagree

14- I feel less anxious when I am working with other students in a group.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  c) Strongly disagree

15- CL promotes students’ social relationships.
   a) To a large degree  b) To a small degree  c) I don’t know  d) Not at all

16- We should use CL in teacher training college for strengthening our language skill.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  c) Strongly disagree

17- We should use CL in teacher training college in order to learn its use in language teaching.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  c) Strongly disagree

18- Cooperative group discussions are an enjoyable way for learning a foreign language.
   a) Strongly agree  b) Agree  c) I don’t know  d) Disagree  c) Strongly disagree

19- How do your English teachers assess you at the end of a cooperative group work?
   a) By asking us to individually present each one’s part of accomplished task
   b) By providing ready-made quizzes or tests to each individual group member
   c) By asking the group leader to present the accomplished task on behalf of the group
   d) Other, please specify: ________________________________________________
   e) No assessment is done

20- How will your English teacher reward you when s/he recognizes your cooperative group activity successful?
   a) S/he gives us class activity mark
   b) S/he praises us amongst the other groups
   c) S/he gives us bonus marks + class activity mark
   d) Other, please specify: ________________________________________________
   e) No rewards are given

21- How will be your English teachers’ reaction in case your cooperatively done project fails?
   a) Our class activity marks will be reduced
   b) We will be given more feedback and consultation for more improvement in the future
   c) We will be encouraged to learn from other groups’ presentation
   d) We will be given another chance to repeat our work
   e) Other, please specify: ________________________________________________
   f) No special reaction
### Class Observation Form

**Class no:**

**Subject:**

**Date:**

**NO of teacher-students in class:**

**Teacher Educator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher organises heterogeneous groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher sets a group goal for students to accomplish in cooperation with each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher instructs students how to interact cooperatively with each other within their groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher instructs students how to solve disagreements through communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher provides a sub-divided topic to all groups &amp; each member chooses one part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Each student shows responsibility for completing the part of task belonging to him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Each student takes active participation in dialogues &amp; discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Each group member helps his/her teammates to learn the contents of their group assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Students work in pairs to practice reading skills e.g. summarizing &amp; vocabulary learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students work in pairs to practice writing skills e.g. reading &amp; editing each other’s drafts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students select their own teammates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Each group of four members work in two separate pairs &amp; then they join again to share their thoughts through discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students in each CL groups engage in higher-order learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher uses a variation of different CL methods in order to engage students in social interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Each student contributes with constructive ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Each student provides feedback to his/her teammates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Each student reflects on how to plan &amp; improve his/her work in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>At the end each student reflects on what s/he has learnt from a friend &amp; what s/he has taught to him/her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Students are assessed individually receiving quizzes from the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Successful students are praised and rewarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
پرسشنامه برای استادان انگلیسی موسسات تربیت معلم

جنسیت: □ مرد □ زن

نام: ___________________________

آیا عضو انجمن تربیت معلم هستید؟ □ از بخش اخیر □ از بخش دوره‌بندی

دهجات تحصیل:
الف: لیسانس یا کمتر □ یا □
ب: ماستر □
ج: دکتر □

تاریخ تولد: ___________________________

افزایش تربیت معلم در صنف انگلیسی‌شناسی:
الف: کمتر از 15 نفر □
ب: بیشتر از 15 نفر □
تاریخ تولد: ___________________________

آیا به کدام ورکشاپ‌های تربیتی که در آن «آموزش اشتراکی» معرفی شده باشید اشتراک نموده‌اید؟
الف: بلی □
ب: نه □

در صورتی که پاسخ شما "بلی" باشد، لطفاً واضح بفرمایید که مدت چند روز یا ماه بوده.

از «آموزش اشتراکی» چی پیشنهاد دارید؟ شما می‌توانید بیشتر از یک گزینه را انتخاب نمایید.
الف: فکر می‌کنم آموزش اشتراکی یکی از می‌تواند است که یکی از نحوه‌های تدریس است که در آن محصلین کار با یکدیگر انگیزه‌انگیز می‌شوند.
ب: فکر می‌کنم آموزش اشتراکی یکی از روش‌های "آموزش اشتراکی" است.

آیا در صنف از می‌توانید آموزش اشتراکی استفاده می‌کنید؟
الف: بلی □
ب: نه □

در صورتی که پاسخ شما نخیر باشد، چرا؟ شما می‌توانید از لیست زیر یا چندین گزینه را انتخاب کنید.
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

الگی اشتراکی وقت گیر است □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

ساعت‌های دوره‌بندی کوتاه □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

آموزش اشتراکی وقت گیر است □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

مانند این‌که از دیداری این با آموزش اشتراکی استفاده کنید □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

آموزش اشتراکی وقت گیر است □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

در صنف فعالیت‌های ایرادی انجام می‌شود □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

حضور محصلین به آموزش اشتراکی عاتیگیر می‌سازند □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

جهت طرح و پلان فعالیت‌های آموزش اشتراکی به وقت زیاد نیاز است □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

محصلین می‌توانند آموزش اشتراکی کمتری از آموزش □
الف: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □
ب: زیاد بودن محصلین در صنف □

دیل دیگری اگر داشته باشید لطفاً بنویسید:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:

بیانیه کلی:

ملاحظه:
در صورتیکه پاسخ شما به سوال پنجم "بلی" باشد، لطفاً واضح سازید آیا از آموزش اشتراکی در جریان تدریس زبان انگلیسی به کدام اندازه استفاده می‌کنید؟
الف: به طور منظم
ب: بعضی اوقات
ج: ندرتاً

8.
در کدام یکی از ساحات ذیل از آموزش اشتراکی استفاده می‌کنید؟ می‌توانید بیشتر از یک گزینه را انتخاب نمایید.

Reading
Writing
Grammar
Listening
Speaking
Phonetics
Linguistics
English Teaching Methods

9.
لطفاً از میتود‌های آموزش اشتراکی ذیل که شما هنگام تدریس زبان انگلیسی در صنف استفاده می‌کنید، انتخاب نمایید.

a. من محصلین را در گروپ‌های نامتجانس تقسیم می‌کنم که در آن محصلین با سویه ها و سوابق مختلف در فعالیت‌های گروهی به همکاری یکپارچه کار می‌کنند. همه اعضای یک گروه از عین موارد تمرینی استفاده می‌نمایند و جهت رسیدن به یک هدف با هم کار می‌کنند.

b. بعد از ارایه درس جدید محصلین را به گروه‌های چهار نفری تقسیم می‌نمایم تا به همراه با هر گروه یک چهار نفر در امکان تشکیل گروه‌های چهار نفری پیدا کنند. در امکان پذیرایی اند. در اخر محصلین را به شکل افتراقی با پرسش‌های ارائه‌شده به گروه‌های ارائه‌شده منابع نامناسب نمایند.

c. وقتی تدریس در یک گروه چهار نفری پایان می‌گیرد، محصلین را به گروه‌های چهار نفری می‌سازم و اعضای هر گروپ را به گروه‌های دو نفری تقسیم می‌نمایم تا با هم در مورد پرسش‌های مصاحبه ای در مشیتی که به آنها تعلق دارد تکمیل می‌کنند. در اخر وظیفه تکمیل شده را با عضوی اساتید دیگر به اتاقی اان را انتخاب نمایند.

f. هنگام تدریس مضمون Reading محصلین را به گروه‌های شش نفری تقسیم می‌نمایم و به هر محصل یک قسمت مضمون معرفی می‌نمایم. سپس محصلین به طور جداگانه در کلاس درس به یکدیگر پرسیده و پاسخ می‌دهند. در اخر محصلین هر اکنون به یک انتخاب بین دو گروه خود می‌پردازند. در اخر وظیفه تکمیل شده را با عضوی اساتید دیگر به اتاقی انتخاب نمایند.

g. هنگام تدریس مضمون Writing محصلین را به گروه‌های شش نفری تقسیم می‌نمایم و به هر محصل یک قسمت مضمون معرفی می‌نمایم. سپس محصلین به طور جداگانه در کلاس درس به یکدیگر پرسیده و پاسخ می‌دهند. در اخر وظیفه تکمیل شده را با عضوی اساتید دیگر به اتاقی انتخاب نمایند.

h. هنگام تدریس مضمون Phonic محصلین را به گروه‌های شش نفری تقسیم می‌نمایم و به هر محصل یک قسمت مضمون معرفی می‌نمایم. سپس محصلین به طور جداگانه در کلاس درس به یکدیگر پرسیده و پاسخ می‌دهند. در اخر وظیفه تکمیل شده را با عضوی اساتید دیگر به اتاقی انتخاب نمایند.

i. هنگام تدریس مضمون Linguistics محصلین را به گروه‌های شش نفری تقسیم می‌نمایم و به هر محصل یک قسمت مضمون معرفی می‌نمایم. سپس محصلین به طور جداگانه در کلاس درس به یکدیگر پرسیده و پاسخ می‌دهند. در اخر وظیفه تکمیل شده را با عضوی اساتید دیگر به اتاقی انتخاب نمایند.
اجرای کدام روش مختلفی از استفاده می‌کنید؟

1. استفاده از معده‌های آموزش استراحتی در صنوف انگلیسی تدریس آموزی‌های عجیب تدریس آموزان را با شویه‌های جدید تدریس آماده می‌سازد.
2. استفاده از روش‌های ارائه صحبت‌های آموزشی تدریس آموزن‌ها را با شیوه‌های جدید تدریس آماده می‌سازد.
3. ارائه صحبت‌های آموزشی تدریس آموزن‌ها را با شیوه‌های جدید تدریس آماده می‌سازد.
4. ارائه صحبت‌های آموزشی تدریس آموزن‌ها را با شیوه‌های جدید تدریس آماده می‌سازد.
5. ارائه صحبت‌های آموزشی تدریس آموزن‌ها را با شیوه‌های جدید تدریس آماده می‌سازد.
6. ارائه صحبت‌های آموزشی تدریس آموزن‌ها را با شیوه‌های جدید تدریس آماده می‌سازد.

لطفاً میزان موافقت خود را با جمله‌ای زیر نشان دهید:

آموزش اشتراکی سطح دانش‌محصلی نتیجه‌تر است و تدریس را تسریع می‌نماید.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

اگر از کدام روش دیگری استفاده می‌کنید لطفاً واضح نموده نشان دهید:

هر یکی از روش‌های فوق را استفاده نمی‌نمایم.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

دختران و پسران بدون نظر آن‌ها می‌توانند در دسته‌های آموزش اشتراکی سهیم شوند.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

نقصی که در آموزش اشتراکی وجود دارد اینست که استاد کمتر موفق به بالا بردن سویه تحصیل محصلین می‌گردد.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

 تنها محصلین ضعیف از آموزش اشتراکی مستفید می‌شوند.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

آموزش اشتراکی روابط اجتماعی محصلین را ارتقا می‌دهد.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

آموزش اشتراکی اضطراب محصلین را در زبان انگلیسی کاهش می‌دهد.

1. کاملاً موافق هستم
2. موافق هستم
3. نمیدانم
4. مخالف هستم
5. کاملاً مخالف هستم

فعالیت‌های گروهی محصولین را چگونه ارزیابی می‌کنید؟

1. از آنها می‌خواهم تا قسمتی از وظیفه که مربوط به آن‌ها می‌شود به شکل انفرادی ارائه نمایند.
2. با ارائه پرسش‌های آماده به هر عضو گروه
3. از سرگروه می‌خواهم که نتیجه کار گروپی خود را به شکل جماعی به ارائه بدارد.
4. اگر کدام‌یکی از شیوه‌های دیگری را که شما استفاده می‌کنید، لطفاً نموده واضح نشان دهید:

هیچ گونه ارزیابی صورت نمی‌گیرد.

1. نمره فعالیت صنفی برای اشتراکی می‌گیرند.
2. بین گروه‌های دیگر از آن‌ها تمرین به عمل می‌آورم.
3. نمرات تشویقی و فعالیت‌سازی می‌باشند.
4. اگر از کدام‌یکی از شیوه‌های دیگر استفاده می‌کنید، لطفاً نموده واضح نشان دهید:

زمانی که فعالیت‌های دیگری و تاوانی محصولین به موقعیت می‌انجامد، چگونه به آن‌ها امتیاز می‌دهید؟

1. نمره نهایی صنفی برای اشتراکی می‌گیرند.
2. بین گروه‌های دیگر از آن‌ها تمرین به عمل می‌آورم.
3. نمرات تشویقی و فعالیت‌سازی می‌باشند.
4. اگر از کدام‌یکی از شیوه‌های دیگر استفاده می‌کنید، لطفا نموده واضح نشان دهید:
(19) در صورتی که فعالیت گروپی و تعاضب محصلین به ناکامی می‌انجامد، عکس عمل شما چگونه خواهد بود؟

ا) از نمرات فعالیت صنفی شان کاسته می‌شود

ب) به آنها رهنمایی لازم صورت خواهد گرفت تا در آینده به موفقیت دست یابند

(20) من با استادان همکار خود در بخش (هایی) دیگر همکاری می‌کنم:

در آماده‌گیری درس

در امتحان محصلین

در ارزیابی محصلین

در یک دیگر

در هیچ مورد با همکاران خود همکاری نمی‌کنم.

بخاطر همکاری شما در زمینه ارائه جواب‌های دقیق تان سپاسگزارم.

تشکر