

Effect of Cooperative Learning on the Elementary School Students' Achievement in the Subject of English

Bazgha Saleem Khan¹, Dr. Romena Ali² & Dr. Vagiha Naz³

¹*Visiting Lecturer, Institute of Education & Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore. Email: bazghamoinqazi.phd@gmail.com*

²*Visiting Lecturer, University of Education, Multan Campus, Pakistan. Email: rominaali0900@gmail.com*

³*Lecturer in Education, Govt. Zainab Associate College, Multan, Pakistan. Email: wajeehanaz79@gmail.com*

Abstract

The present study investigated the effects of the STAD model of cooperative learning (CL) on the achievement of students in the subject of English at the level of elementary. Thirty (30) subjects were selected as the treatment group (experimental group) and another Thirty (30) subjects belonged to the control group (traditional group) for carrying out this study. The data were analyzed by using the SPSS 22 version (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) where the mean score of both the pretest and the posttest was calculated. The effect of the STAD model / technique was compared with the gain score of the control (traditional group), as an experiment. Amidst the data analysis, an independent sample t-test was applied and then the effect of the treatment group was calculated. Significant difference was seen between the scores of the control group and treatment group.

Keywords: *Cooperative Learning, Students Achievements, STAD Model, English Achievement Test, Elementary level*

Introduction

Teaching is a multifarious, integrated blueprint of activities directed for specific goals and tasks. It is also viewed as a therapeutic set of instructions that specifically deliver a subject or a handful of skills. It brings about

variations in life that flourishes expression, training, specificity, and adequacy in students. It gives a sufficient ethical and educational platform for an environment. What, it consists of, is a facilitator as a teacher, students as learners, and content as a curriculum which is in form of pictorial representation, facts, skills, and information, to impart deliberately (Parker, 2013). The richest part of this research comprises teaching practices, reflections, theory, and pedagogical skills. Methodologies have their importance, which may be distributed among the richest parts of the theory, research, practice, and pedagogical skills. The teaching has distributed immense values, choices, techniques, and strategies, during classroom sessions either on the classroom level or outside the classroom level.

Choices about methodologies of a particular subject, are contingent mainly on philosophical foundations, educational psychology, multidisciplinary administration, prescribed curriculum, and customized classroom settings with a broader extent of an assigned topic, consequently, measuring results and evaluation of this kind of format (Antil, 2013). Sunil (2012), elaborated on the diversification of such teaching methodologies, which are effective from the communicative skills to desired learning outcomes. Multiple options are used to operationalize this kind of diversification considering the individualistic backgrounds of students, their previous knowledge, the medium of instruction, and an environment where they have been getting knowledge and achieving their respective instructional goals.

Since, there are many ways of learning, simulating details of a topic, representation of individualistic abilities, and development of attitudes and skills found among students. If a teacher uses blends in his / her pedagogical skills that suffice knowledge in respect of understanding, synthesizing, criticizing, evaluating, and reflecting which, does not only help students to retrieve information but also assimilate information with new knowledge and experiences, coming through the sensory motors (Sullivan, 2022).

If Bloom's Taxonomy (2001), is remembered, which supports six levels for classifying learning objectives of education but, here, author is introducing eight levels in addition to, remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, creating, while including reflecting, and

retrieving.

While mapping the old version of Taxonomy with the newer one, it intensifies instructional goals in correspondence with the creation of plans and finally, execution of achievable objectives for learners. The key difference between the author is that he/she makes them more active and responsible for the evaluation purpose of learning, correctly (Sullivan, 2022).

Sunil, (2012) specified that testing is to questioning, hence, students are evaluated for their intended learning outcomes. He also stated that testing is a form of exam, which can be separated into two main domains, lower-order thinking testing and other is higher-order thinking testing. The first one contains facts, similarities, familiarities, uninterrupted, direct, close ended and focused, whereas, the higher order thinking testing is explanatory, descriptive, consultative, advisory, explicatory, analytical, creativity based and open-ended.

For instance, the best form of testing is when, a learner remembers basic operations, facts, information, and terminologies related to the topic. But it becomes the evaluator, creator, reflector, and retriever, to formulate his / her opinion on an issue. Here, Cooperative learning is introduced as a good pedagogical approach for improving the performance of the students. It aims at, the participation of all which is carried through continuous reinforcement and encouragement of each participant, in order to get achievement, guidance, assistance, mentoring, distribution, encouragement, and explaining (Artiyup et al., 2012).

Rational of Study

The sole purpose of cooperative learning is to establish organized learning groups, thereupon, each member of the group possesses the capability for supporting each other throughout this process of learning. Since, it is a conceptual method which is adopted through a selection of group members for learning, cooperatively. Many pedagogical techniques are, therefore; is catching the attention of many stakeholders, curriculum developers, authors, researchers, novice teachers, and educators (Gibbs et al., 2011).

This research article will be improving problem-solving skills, collaborative activities, adjustable attitude, high self-assurance,

self-enthusiasm, sense of high esteem among students. It will also be addressing diverse cultures and a better environment for situation related problems (Storm, 2015).

Organ et al., (2013) also formulated the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD), which was one kind of CL method i.e. STAD, a very important way of teaching through approaches across multiple subjects and grades. This model highlights whenever there is a situation, creative or divergent thinking is expected. As, the tasks are completed, learning objectives are achieved, instructor are promoted for optimistic interaction among his / her learners, thereupon, a climate of facilitative learning is established to attain affective and cognitive outcomes.

Objectives of the Study

The following research objectives of the study were formulated:

1. To see the effect of the CL Model (STAD), on students' achievement, in the subject of English.
2. To perceive the reflections and perceptions of the students about the CL Model (STAD).
3. To suggest/recommend, CL Model (STAD), as, the best strategy across all grade levels.

Literature Review

Lancaster et al., (2019) announced this learning methodology way earlier than World War II onset. From their viewpoint, the output was readable and also examined mechanism through which understanding was developed in each individual.

Manning et al., (2016) exposed that cooperative learning was a fact towards advancement and assessment of diverse, cultured classroom settings. (LT)-Learning Together and (ACC)-Alone Constructive Controversy, (TGT)-Teams-Games-Tournaments were the contribution of DeVries et al., (2017), whereas, Group Investigation, Jigsaw Procedure was developed by Aronson et al., (2018) & Slavin, (2018) approximated (STAD)- Student Teams Achievement Divisions, (TAI)-Team Accelerated Instruction and (CIRC)-Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition and lastly, structures of CL (Cooperative Learning), was formulated by Kagan, (2019).

Resultantly, great applicability of these approaches became the face of CL. This whole mechanism maximized effectiveness, positive interaction, and submissive but impactful contribution to every research study that came under the liability of it. Constant communicative skills, familiarity with intrapersonal and interpersonal management, and situation-based group processing became the way to success among this era's students (Tarim, et al., 2017).

Collaboration referred this kind of teaching method as, an artistic way of group work where a lesson plan is enforced by a teacher. Students in this environment are not allowed to communicate with each other and only listen to comments/views for a specific assignment (Lancaster, 2018).

Allyan et al., (2015) evaluated the effectiveness of the CL methodology with the use of Jigsaw II and Learning Together approaches, as, independent variables and for the dependent variable, he administered an achievement test for the subject of English phonics.

Maslow, (2010) also viewed 158 studies, a meta-analysis that reflected, good scores in achievement tests with the use of CL. He managed around eight techniques for using cooperative learning, effectively:

1. LT is abbreviated from Learning Together and LA as, Alone,
2. CC, abbreviated from Constructive Controversy,
3. JP abbreviated from Jigsaw Procedure,
4. STAD, abbreviated from Student teams Achievement Divisions,
5. TAI, abbreviated from Team Accelerated Instruction,
6. CIRC, abbreviated from Cooperative Integrated Reading & Composition,
7. TGT, abbreviated from Teams-Games-Tournaments, &
8. GI, abbreviated from Group Investigation.

McHale (2002) was of the view, what an umbrella meant to us, it, covered all the parts whether it was related to the body, content, life, or any other general phenomenon, it fitted them all? Did you ever think of, what it was meant here, in this article, this term stood for working in group form of teams, they were students for a common assignment, project or agenda, etc., under uniform conditions for all. In addition to every team member's involvement, the process of accountability among them was also

individualistic, and did not depend on the group. What counted most, every other member of the group remained vigilant, careful, and adhered towards achieving the group goals (Saleem, 2022).

Simsek (2018) set up this term as a tool in, an active tool, to keep the student engaged and participative in a careful way, to execute their skill purposively. Such, systematic peer grouping within the setting of a classroom fostered a good impact, as, a researcher.

Different varieties of CL, were used across various grades, classroom set-ups, and diverse cultures of students, anyhow, the manifesto remained constant, i.e., working together but accountable alone. Whereby, to reach up their academic goals, the strength of using tools, polls, and appliances, might have been different but kept environment friendly, and aligned with the standards of age, gender (Winston, 2012).

According to Walberg (2022) CL, attracted the author due to its genuine sharing of equal opportunity for all group members, he gave a comparison of his work with the CL structures to see significant difference in the achievement level. Most teaching techniques were expanded to the following two styles to utilize them effectively:

1. Teacher-Centered Style
(High-end technology use & Low-end technology use).
2. Student-Centered Style
(High-end technology use & Low-end technology use)

Therefore, conclusively, the word umbrella was interchangeable with CL due to its, all properties, attributes, fundamentals, determinants, and characteristics. Multifaced cooperative learning was well depicted, and the structured and modern format of the classes was to be taught under the same circumstances. Only, teacher's role was apprised organizing, odds & ends of the multiple tasks, effectively (Doymus, 2013).

The impact was reported high in respect of each type of CL model that improvised the information, detail, orientation, confidence, motivation, and applicability of acquired learning. Thus, the researcher, opted for the subject of English grammar while using, CL's STAD model, which gathered learners, to learn, to get accountable, to support their groupmates/teammates to accomplish their respective but associative goals, and likewise, rewards (Khan, 2022).

Significance of the Study

Cooperative learning stated that it was like if someone said that they sink/swim together so, are the lessons were structured to maximize their own as well as each other's learning. Such, as learning together that measured and shared common goals. Each member/mate of the group strived for success as it was cooperatively done. The work was formatted in small groups, which were very different from each other meaning thereby, heterogeneous (Kagan, 2022).

Significantly, Joint success was celebrated and evaluated through performance-matching criteria with clear instructions established under the same terms and conditions. Since, this study helped a lot to novice teachers, preservice teachers, stakeholders, administrators, authorities, and governmental bodies who were hard to get convinced to adopt the new teaching strategies which resolved many controversies and found in a way of teaching different subjects, way better than traditional teaching.

Many guidelines for the students at level of elementary helped in adopting strategies which, further enhanced capacity for learning among students and professionals. These, expectations from the teachers to the learners flourished educational context. Kagan, in resources for Teachers (1994) identified that much-needed elements for the CL STAD Model were positivistic Interdependence, Individualistic Accountability, Equity in Participation, and immediacy while doing Interaction. He also wrote the guidelines for future editors/authors of textbooks that how to maximize and substantiate the content areas. At the cost of these researches, better decisions were made to carry out such strategies which improved comprehension, spoken, reading, writing, and creativity for every subject. CL interventions attracted communities from every walk of life such as educational psychologists, curriculum experts, stakeholders, educational counselors, and career organizers, etc. this study unfolded, better qualities and creativities among students, who faced learning problems in every subject, including the subject of English. As the researcher knew that daily use of English was very limited because of its foreign language / second language (L2), therefore; she focused on the applicability cum generalizability of CL interventions, to bring about changes in the real life. Ultimately, this method became more socialistic, independent, comprehensive, practical, adhesive, and creative and was being used more

frequently. (Khan, 2022)

Problem Statement

In the present research article, the researcher supported this methodology as, it was very much effective for micro-teaching, initiating self-confidence, self-efficacy, and self-believing towards the traditional way of teaching (Ting & S. H., 2017). Implementation of the CL model, not only minimized difficulties faced by the traditional teachers but, also catered diverse cultures of the different communities. Thus, the implementation of CL revealed, professionalism that was persuaded by theory, practice and performance which made it more usable and generalizable. It, certainly increased analyzing ability, retaining power, and retrieving capability that resolved complex cognitive issues (Etrike, 2022).

Hence, the present study aimed to “*evaluate the effect of Cooperative Learning on the achievement of students in the subject of English at the elementary level*”. Here, CL Model (STAD) was conducted to attain the desired scores in their achievement test, specifically, in grammar, the subject of English. Therefore, it was very necessary to operate any CL methods in form of intervention to evaluate the effects/impact of quality results in the English subject or any else (Saleem, 2022).

Hypotheses

The present study's null hypotheses were as under:

1. There was no significant difference found between the mean gain score of the experimental group and the control group.
2. There was no significant effect of treatment on the gain scores of the experimental group (the students taught by using the STAD method).

Delimitations of the Study

1. It was delimited to private sector schools (boys and girls), from District Lahore, only.
2. It was delimited to explore the impact of the CL Model (STAD), only in the subject of English at the elementary level through achievement tests.
3. It was delimited to the same school's students and teachers of the

same grade level i.e. elementary level.

Research Methodology

Two homogenous groups, one control and the other experimental, were assessed, completely. Complete such six heterogeneous groups were made of equal numbers of members/participants, for the experiment group. Each group had five team members, who were selected based on their scores in the pretest i.e. Achievement test for English. The researcher employed an achievement test, first, then scored it for the subject of English. It was conducted by the school administration on a routine schedule. Later, the researcher exposed CL, STAD Model, and technique under the supervision and assistance of the class teacher, and the expected period (time), was almost one complete month means, a total of thirty days with the experimental group.

Whereas, the other traditional group also named as, controlled one, whilst, the same teacher taught this group, in a traditional method of teaching. Rehearsal quizzes, which had around 30-multiple-choice questions (from the material/parts which have just learnt during the class), were exposed in each session of class time and the calculated duration was 15 minutes, other than the teaching/learning time of class. The purpose was to explore the understanding of heterogeneous, experimental group mates with the 30 multiple choice questions, daily as, it was from the material/parts just learned in the class.

Likewise, the group mates were told how they got to interact purposefully, with each other. This, also helped them to understand the importance of helping each other. Participants from the treatment/experimental group were excited to learn through the STAD Model/technique and also stimulated their group mates to work together at every level of diversity whether it was communicative or on practicing quizzes. Rest, it was assured to brief all participants that how they were going to answer a question. Lastly, they were seated back in their allotted group in rows, and same like before, quizzes were given to them all.

The only difference was that no conversation or help was allowed at this stage. it was strictly observed that one did his / her task by himself/herself as they were directed by the researcher. Once, they got finished their respective task which was quizzes, it was further categorized

by the class teacher but, this was customized by the researcher. Likewise, the quizzes were handed back to them for proofreading and maintaining quality, so, that improvement of the team through their scores can be recorded, earlier.

Here, it was compulsive to appreciate those group participants who, presented improvement (previously, did low scores), to enhance their self-esteem and confidence. Similarly, all the best-performing mates were appreciated which, brought better team results, too. Moreover, their achievement was posted on the Best Team Bulletin Board (BTBB), throughout the week so, that they become more energetic till they again were exposed to the next STAD Model/techniques quiz. On the other hand, the control group was doing their job, the way, they had been doing it earlier. Conclusively, achievement test in the subject of English was administered to experimental as well as, the control group, whether, there exists difference in the scores of achievement test (posttest), the first one exposed to the STAD model/technique and other with the traditional method.

Population

There was a total population of elementary students (n=180), from 3rd grade of (unnamed), private school from district Lahore.

Sample

In terms of accessible population, two sections, out of six sections of the elementary students from the third grade, were selected wherein, the convenient sampling technique was employed. and finally, selected two sections, which, consisted of 30 students in third grade at the elementary level. Each section had thirty students, as the experimental group and the other section had the same number of students but, the control group. STAD Model/technique was used for the experimental group, to evaluate the effect of the independent variable.

Date Gathering Instruments

For accomplishing the gain score on the post-test, the English Achievement Test (EAT-grammar), as, a tool was administered, for the English subject that consisted of twenty-five (25) items of Multiple-Choice Questions, out of total hundred and sixty (160) items, with four (4),

options. The more focused area was grammar, mainly tenses. Whole targeted content was developed in a documented blueprint which enabled the researcher to construct test items. This was pilot-tested and reported as, reliable.

Data Analysis Technique

The experimental group underwent the STAD Model/technique for one month with the use of the SPSS 22 version (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). For the comparison of two (02) groups i.e. traditional/control group and experimental/treatment group, an independent sample t-test was applied. There were fifteen (15) (50%) male students & fifteen (15) (50%) female students and both had same percentages i.e. 50%.

Table 1

Means for both Groups in Pre-test and Post-test (n=30)

<i>Tests</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
Pre 1	STAD	30	2.710	1.1472	-.418	57	.688
	TL	30	2.712	1.0142			
Pre 2	STAD	30	2.823	1.0353	-1.301	57	.174
	TL	30	3.243	1.0214			
Pre 3	STAD	30	2.533	1.0115	-.363	57	.720
	TL	30	2.933	1.1273			
Pre 4	STAD	30	2.830	0.8112	-.684	57	.498
	TL	30	3.027	1.0626			

Note: *M=Mean, df= Degree of freedom, STAD= Student Teams Achievement Divisions, TL=Traditional Learning, SD=Standard Deviation, p > 0.05.*

An Independent Samples t-test was applied, to see inter-group differences in the subject of English (EAT-Grammar), on achievement test of students.

Table 1 showed, there existed no significant difference exists between mean scores of traditional/control group and experimental/treatment group. Since, the scores of the students, on achievement test also did not execute difference in pretests 1, 2, 3, and 4, significantly, in the subject of English (EAT-Grammar).

In accordance with the table work, standard deviation (SD) referred the change in performance scores of the student which did not have good dispersion of results. Therefore, t-value and P-value of the achievement test could not produce difference in the mean scores of traditional/control group and experimental/treatment group, significantly.

Table 2

Difference between the control group and experimental group during four weeks.

<i>Tests</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
Pre 1	STAD	30	2.711	1.1473	-.419	57	.689
	TL	30	2.713	1.0145			
Post1	STAD	30	2.824	1.0351	-1.302	57	.175
	TL	30	3.244	1.0211			
Pre 2	STAD	30	2.534	1.0116	-.364	57	.721
	TL	30	2.934	1.1277			
Post2	STAD	30	2.831	0.8113	-.685	57	.499
	TL	30	3.028	1.0622			
Pre 3	STAD	30	2.711	1.1475	-.419	57	.689
	TL	30	2.713	1.0146			
Post3	STAD	30	2.824	1.0357	-1.302	57	.175
	TL	30	3.244	1.0212			
Pre 4	STAD	30	2.534	1.0113	-.364	57	.721
	TL	30	2.934	1.1276			
Post4	STAD	30	2.831	0.8117	-.685	57	.499
	TL	30	3.028	1.0621			

An Independent Samples t-test was applied, to see inter-group differences in the subject of English (EAT-Grammar), on achievement test of students. Table 2, showed, there existed no significant difference between change scores of pre-tests 1, 2, 3, and 4, of traditional/control group and experimental/treatment group, in the subject of English (EAT-Grammar). Since, the scores of the students, on achievement test executed difference in posttests 1, 2, 3, and 4, significantly, which reflected as, actual

number of responses.

Since, P-value for the posttests 1,2,3 & 4, respectively reflected significant for change scores of the treatment group, at the statistical significance level as, $P < 0.001$, that clearly rejected the first hypothesis “*There is no significant difference between the mean achievement score of the treatment group and control group*” and likewise, second hypothesis “*There is no significant effect of treatment achievement scores of treatment group*”.

Conclusion

In accordance with findings of the research study, it had been pointed out that at the onset of the experiment, when the pretest was administered, both groups had the same gain scores on the achievement test for the subject of English. That showed, no significant difference was found between these two groups of students on achievement scores of pretests for the subject of English 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. The participants of the experimental group were split into six heterogeneous groups, consisting of five members in each. As, these, a heterogeneous selection of groups was made based on previously attained scores on the pretests in the subject of English. Moreover, the researcher also had the reference record of the previous term's achievement test score which, was conducted by the school as, per schedule. Soon, the participants of the experimental group were exposed to treatment i.e. STAD Model/technique, with the assistance of a class teacher. The total period of intervention was full thirty days for the experimental group, on the other hand, the traditional teacher was traditionally teaching the traditional group/control group.

Concludingly, a significant gain score difference was found in posttest 1,2,3,4, between these two groups in their achievement test. Soon after, administering the achievement test for the subject of English in respect of both groups, the calculated difference between the two was at the level of significance i.e. $P < 0.001$, while using the STAD Model/technique for the experimental / treatment group and control for the other. As a result, the STAD model/techniques not only developed innovation but also developed the motivation of the students that working together gives insight, confidence, and vision for a futuristic approach. Due to the friendly disposition of the STAD model/technique, learners also

cherished the active learning environment which, ultimately, adored the professional skills of preservice, novice teachers, practitioners, and researchers.

Since, the sole purpose of any academia, was to motivate learners, and rejuvenate learning strategies, the CL (cooperative learning model i.e. Student Teams Achievement Division, (STAD), proved the same by arousing motivation in every student regardless, one group of learners is dull and other is active, in their past achievement records.

Furthermore, Goodlad et al., (2022) discouraged the trend of not being expressive, not asking questions, having no gossip/reflection about the sessions, listening to every word warily, and copying/writing what, the teacher spoke in the class.

In this regard, if, it was expected that learners become reasoned, adherent to the philosophy, progressive in case of any divergence, expressive for the situation, and confident/fluent communication, maximum freedom needed to be given. Thereupon, speculation of such methodologies was to let them handle their lifestyle, togetherness, engagements, priorities, and situations by themselves along with information handling. According to Gibby et al., (2015) the results of the presented article were aligned with CL, which, showed evidence of retention of subject matter for a longer period, compared to the traditional method.

Certainly, CL manifested as, the safest strategy/method, not a controversy, might be introduced to replicate knowledge, comprehension, retention, reflection, understanding, creativity, curiosity and diversity, etc. at all grades, cultures, subjects, faculties, and disciplines (Jolliffe, 2015).

Recommendations

Globally, CL (cooperative learning) may be supported due to its uniqueness, sharpened nature, and distributive responsibility. The essentials of this strategy are time, funds, and training sessions which persuade opportunities at every grade / academic level either from the public sector or private sector. The salient features of the teaching policy need to be restructured, revise and modernize through this strategy i.e. cooperative learning (Deutsch, 2000).

Logically, the traditional learning settings are replaced with this

new technology aligned with the curriculum. It provides the importance of a compatible environment for the learner. In some places, it generates eco-socio-friendly balance in an environment wherein, learners learn multiple skills like situation-based skills, problem-solving skills, inquiry-based skills, and emergent skills, etc. However, language skills get refined as the frequency enhances in respect of reading, replicating, reflecting one's thoughts, writing, uttering, listening, and speaking for EFL students (Cheng, 2016).

CL (cooperative learning), replaces the existing way of traditional learning by sharpening and defining the individualistic cum collectivistic approach to learning. Many disadvantages are seen in terms of cooperative learning; thereupon, some critics also view that only the method of teaching does not cover learners' needs as, diverse topics demand diverse modes of teaching as well, learning. As the time duration of a period during class time is very short and limited, therefore, it does not cover the whole content and the teacher tends to get along with the traditional teaching method, throughout the calendar year. Probably, it could be a mastery of a unit topic, a chapter, or a demonstration of a traditional teacher who survives students with the same teaching style (Bertucci et al., 2020).

It is very much thought-provoking for all the stakeholders of the society including teachers, learners, vendors, administrators, publishers, contractors, curriculum developers, and all kinds of beneficiaries who have connections with the profession of teaching, and learning or they may incorporate any other body (Bibi, 2012). The main theme of CL (cooperative learning), is to maximize the learner's capacity, intelligence, and cognitive and neurotic ability since, it engages them all, in all activities. The extent of fundamental reasoning developing through this method is assessed by the generalization and application of the phenomena. Prospective teachers/researchers need to explore such interventions for their academia and later, their applicability.

Harmoniously, generous and positive attitudes are developed on the part of teachers and learners with the use of this technique. CL, cooperative learning is a benchmark for success, that is still alive in our society, the only need is to encourage, teach, learn, generalize and apply in our institutions (Bukunola, 2012).

Sheer commitment from the facilitators and likewise, from the

students play a big role which, is very essential for the decision-making of stakeholders to show their openness, brevity, dedication, and impartiality in applying cooperative learning (M.G. & Brooks, 2019).

As, learning is visionary which accentuates the need and want of basic/concrete and abstract ideas, phenomena, concepts, polls, opinions, and criticism. Later, it moves on to bind this with awareness, identification, and mind mapping. This very fact is transferable from obsoleted rites of customary teachers, transforming them into modernized ones (Creswell, 2019).

Modern tutoring shocks the vagueness of previous concept-based subjects like biology, physics, chemistry, astronomy, mathematics, geography, etc. that have been handled and maneuvered only through traditional learning platforms instead of the active learning platform. From activities to content learning, students are directed and engaged through inquiries, options, opportunities, role plays, situations, demos, de various experimentation, to reach phenomena (Arends, 2019).

Ultimately, inimical ways of imparting knowledge restrict them to ask frequent questions, propagation, negotiations, and discussions. With such an attitude, insolence is created at a workplace whether it is a school, madrassah, varsity, university, or lab. It is counted as disrespect for teachers for not being appreciated, and being aloof. Such workplaces do not let them think freely, speak soundly, feel better and behave well, in any spur of the moment. Is not it, embarrassing and stubborn? An education system needs to depict an institution of growing cultures, promoting brains, mapping minds, and flourishing nations, to encourage their learners who are their nation's assets. Off course, for this purpose, our teachers are the machinery and schools are workstations but for perfection/reflection/elevation of communal and societal, educational needs, values, and standards, an executable strategy like CL, may be entailed by the policymakers of the curriculum manuscripts. It may accelerate progress while transforming tradeoffs in adopting new methods which are unpredictable, but realistic in their approach and vision for individual work to teamwork, to attain a common goal (Bayraktar et al., (2011).

References

- Antil, (2013). *Effect of Formula Approach on Students' Achievement and Retention in Algebra*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Benue State University.
- Artiyup, D., voughus, L, M., (2012). *Introduction to education at Westmount research in education, Belmont, CA: Clarksmith Educational Learning*.
- Ab. Etrike. K, A. (2015). *Effect of the plan of capacity learning social studies skills of disabled students: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning*.
- Arends, R. (2019). *Classroom instruction and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Bayraktar, G. (2011). *The effect of cooperative learning on students' approach to general gymnastics course and academic achievements*. *Educational Research and Review*, Vol. 6(1). Pp; 67-71,
http://www.academicjournals.org/article/article1379665111_Bayraktar.pdf
- Bibi, A. (2012). *The comparative effectiveness of teaching English grammar with the help of textbooks and by using group work activities*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://eprints.hec.gov.pk/cgi/search/advanced>
- Bukunola, B. (2012). *Effectiveness of cooperative learning strategies on Nigerian junior secondary students' academic achievement in Basic Science*. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioral Science*, 2(3), 307-325. doi: 10.9734/bjesbs/2012/1628
- Bertucci, A., (2020). *The impact of the size of the cooperative group on achievement, social support, and self-esteem*. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 137(3),256272. M. G., & Brooks, J. G. (2019).
- Creswell, J. W. (2019). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach*. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Cheng, H. (2016).
- Doymus, K. (2013). *Teaching Chemical Equilibrium with Jigsaw Technique*. *Res SciEduc*, 38, 249-260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11165-007-9047-8> Doymus, K., Karacop, Driscoll, M. P. (2013).

- A. & Simsek, U. (2018). Effects of jigsaw and animation techniques on students' understanding of concepts and subjects in electrochemistry. *Education Tech Research Dev*, 58, 671-691. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-010-9157-2> Driscoll, M. P. (2018).
- Gibby. F., Shimrlay S. (2015). *Bulletin of Education and Learning Research*. Vol. III, 9(3) pp. 246-255.
- Goodlad, (2022). *Journal of Education and Learning*. Vol. 9(3) pp. 246-255. 253
- Jolliffe, W. (2015). The implementation of cooperative learning in the classroom. *Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference*, University of Gloomorgan, 14-17 September 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/143432.htm> on 21-08-2010. Krecic, M. J. & Crmec, M.I. (2015).
- Lancaster, (2018). Helping students to put together the pieces of the statistical puzzle with cooperative learning. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 5(2) 117-119. Lilic, A. (2018).
- Manning, M. L. & Lucking, R. (2016). The what, why, and how of cooperative learning. *Clearing House*, 64(3) pp.152-156. Marr, M. (1997).
- Maslow, A.H. (2010). *Motivation and personality (3rd ed.)* New York: Harper & Row.
- McHale.M. (2002). "Cooperative Learning in an elementary physical education program". *J. Phys.Educ., Recreation Dance*; Sep, 73:7:20."
- McMaster, K., & Gibbs (2011). "Effects of Cooperative Learning on the academic achievement of students with learning disabilities: an update of Tateyama-Snizek's Review. *Learning disabilities Res Pract*, 17(2), 107-117 *Cooperative learning: A brief review. Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 13 (1), 7-20
- Organ, B. M. (2013). Cooperative learning in higher education: undergraduate student reflections on group examinations for group grades. *College Student Journal*, 37(1), pp. 40, 49.
- Parker, (2013). An Experimental study on the effects of cooperative

- learning on Social Studies achievement among 8th-grade students. *Unpublished M.A. dissertation, PAF College of Education for Women, Rawalpindi.*
- Saleem, (2022) the effect of a guided inquiry method on pre-service teachers' service teaching self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 6(2) 24-42.
- Sunil, (2012). The effects of reading-writing-presentation and group investigation methods on students' academic achievements in citizenship lessons. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 2(2).
- Storm, (2015). Student participation in the evaluation of cooperative learning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(3) 265-278.
- Sullivan, E. J. (2022). Teaching financial statement analysis: A cooperative learning approach. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 14(1), pp. 107-111.
- Tarim, K. & Akdeniz, F. (2017). The effects of cooperative learning on Turkish elementary students' mathematics achievement and attitude towards mathematics using TAI and STAD methods. *Educational Student Math*, 67, pp.77-91.
- Ting, S. H. (2017) Instructional skills are taught in the "learning by doing" method.
- Vaughan, W. (2018). Effects of Cooperative Learning on Achievement and Attitude among Students of Color. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 95(6), 359-364. doi: 10.1080/00220670209596610
- Winston, V. (2012). Effect of Cooperative Learning on Achievement and Attitude among Student of Color. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95, 220-229.
- Khan, (2022). *Effect of cooperative learning on secondary school students mathematics achievement.* *Creative Education*, 4(2), 98-100. Retrieved from: <http://www.scir.org/journal/ce;> <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.213.42014>. May 10th2014