

## Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English at Elementary Schools Level

Basmeen Sikandar

MPhil scholar Northern University Newshehra  
Email: basminsikandar@gmail.com

Muhammad Naeem Shah

MPhil scholar Northern University Newshehra  
Email: mnaeemshah4@gmail.com

Fehmina Anjum

MPhil scholar Northern University Newshehra  
Email: fanjum1989@gmail.com

Received on: 07-04-2022

Accepted on: 10-05-2022

### Abstract

This study aims at investigating the effectiveness of cooperative learning strategies at Elementary School level. The objectives of the study were (i) to assess the higher achievements in both groups, (ii) to examine the individual relationship amongst the students in both groups, (iii) to find out the retention period of the concept learning in both groups, (iv) to measure the opinion or attitude of the student's towards teachers in both groups, (v) to comparison of Boy's and Girl's outcome related to above objectives. This study were experimental in nature "pre-test post-test equivalent group design" was used. The population of the study was comprised of the entire Government boy's and Girl's Elementary schools grade-VIII English students of district Nowshera. Sample of the study were 100 students of Government Girls middle School Batakzai and Government middle School Kheshgi Payan selected randomly. Twenty five each were assigned to control group and experimental group on the basis of pre-test and through paired random sampling. Duration of treatment was four weeks. Data were collected personally by the researcher. Data was analyzed by t-test and percentage. On the basis of finding, conclusions and recommendations were made. The study was significant for English Teachers, students and curriculum developer. It was concluded from the results that cooperative learning had significance effect on both boys and girls student's achievement. It was concluded from the result that Cooperative learning methodology had significance relationship to develop the concept of boy's as well as girls learners. The study revealed that cooperative learning had significant effect on the performance of both boys and girls students of Grade-VIII. It is therefore recommended that all the students should be thought through cooperative learning strategy. In this way student's academic performance can be increased. The report stated a wide range of constructive results

---

---

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

---

throughout implementation of Cooperative learning approach. Consequently, teachers may employ Cooperative learning methodology to enhance the academic achievements of the learners.

**Keywords:** Cooperative Learning Strategies, Academic Achievement, Elementary School Level.

### **Introduction**

In the field of education, cooperative learning is a popular area of debate. Cooperative Learning is a method of learning in which two or more than two learners collaborate to achieve a common goal. Across all grade levels and topic areas, integrated cooperative learning techniques have been shown to maximize academic success. Small-group learning, often known as cooperative learning, is an educational approach in which small groups of learners participate on a common goal. The job might be as complex as designing a new type of school or as basic as working together to solve a multi-step arithmetic problem. In some cases, group members collaborate without having specific roles assigned to them, while in other cases, each group member is personally responsible for a portion of the job (Tran, 2019).

According to Mehra (2008) cooperative learning presents a number of problems, including regulating noise levels, relinquishing control over learning, measuring student progress and settling disagreements. Organized debate and assessment on group process can help learners know how to deal together successfully, and planned debate and assessment on group experience can support learners prevent certain issues.

According to Johnson and Johnson (2009) when utilizing cooperative basis groups, the teacher's responsibility is to: (a) arrange a time for them to meet on a regular basis (such as the start and finish of each week or the start and finish of each class session), (b) to establish four diverse groupings of three or four students, (c) Create precise agenda with clear goals that give foundation group a schedule to perform whenever they gather, (d), Have learners evaluate the efficacy of their basic groups on a regular basis, and (e) Ascertain that the five fundamental components of effective cooperative groups are in operation.

The greater a cooperative organization survives, the more social benefits it will offer for one another, the more loving connections it will develop, the more impact member will have over one another and the more dedicated it will be to one another's success. Regular cooperative base groups include an environment wherein loving and respectful relations may be formed, raise performance, personalize the academic education, providing the social help required to promote participation, and improves student quality of life (Hancock, 2010).

### **Related Researches**

Mehra (2008) conducted a study on comparison of cooperative learning teaching with conventional lecture teaching in order to see how cooperative learning improves learners' learning motivation and English reading comprehension in English as Foreign language learning classrooms. His results concluded that RCL teaching has a very positive impact on the learning motivation of the students in terms of their self-efficacy, dedication, increasing in interest and learning capability. This study was carried out in an English reading course using a quasi-experimental design and consisted of a pretest – posttest comparison group.

Ledlow (1999) Cooperative learning activities and tasks provide students a specific

---

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

assignment, such as taking handling a problem, producing models, or looking at different aspect of a given problem. Teachers also provide some recommendations for how students should collaborate to a limited extent. They are as follows: Consider using or modifying a previous framework or system, such as Formulate Share-Listen-Create, Think-Pair-Share, Academic Controversy, or Jigsaw.

Thornton (1999) conducted a research work, where the target was to share the understandings of the creators in the direction of a new learning strategy. The University of Vigo's fourth-year design students were taught via collaborative learning (Jigsaw). When the number of learners isn't very huge, the outcomes of the experiences demonstrate that beneficial understanding is a useful replacement towards the old schooling way of addressing at the college. According to the researcher, understudy did not exhibit much excitement for the new learning approach at first, but the opposition of the learners softened after they began the activity. The Jigsaw approach has shown to be an excellent tool in enhancing the learning process and allowing understudy to engage successfully in learning exercises.

Kosar (2003) compared the benefits of traditional learning with cooperative learning on primary schools pupils' exam results in the field of social study. The learners who were chosen as samples were separated into control and experimental groups based on the basis of pretest, the learners in experimental group were taught using cooperative learning style for two weeks. When the researchers examined the findings of the both the groups, after the treatment, it was found that the learners who were taught using cooperative learning style performed better as compare to the learners of control group in terms of test scores.

Talebi and Sobhani (2012) conducted a study on the effect of cooperative learning on speaking skills of English language learner. The study comprised a sample size of 40 learners of English language who were learning at an IELETS Centre in Marshad, Iran. Control and experimental groups were created randomly by the researcher, and before the start of the experiment, an oral interview of both the group i.e. control group and experimental group was done. The experimental group received cooperative learning, whereas the control group received speaking training three times per week. After a month of observation, the study determined that the experimental group's mean score was much higher as compare to the control groups.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Cooperative learning is an effective way for students to learn and process information quickly with the help of others. The goal of this study is to use this strategy for elementary level students, work together to achieve the objectives of the learning subject. It is essential that each student understands their cooperative learning group role. The study was conducted to assess the higher achievement of students learning, to assess retention period of the concepts learning, to find out the relationships amongst the students and to assess student attitude towards teachers.

### **Objectives**

The research study aimed at:

- To assess the higher achievements in both groups.
- To examine the individual relationship amongst the students in both groups.
- To find out the retention period of the concepts learning in both groups.

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

- To assess the opinion or attitude of the student's towards teachers in both groups.
- To comparison of Boy's and Girl's outcomes related to above objectives.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses were as:

H<sub>0</sub>1. There is no significant difference between the achievements of the experimental and control groups students.

H<sub>0</sub>2. There is no significant difference between the relationships amongst the experimental and control groups students.

H<sub>0</sub>3. There is no significant difference between the retention periods of the concepts between experimental and control groups.

H<sub>0</sub>4. There is no significant difference between the attitude of the experimental and control groups students towards teachers.

H<sub>0</sub>5. There is no significance difference between boy's and girl's outcomes.

**Method and procedure**

**Population**

All the government boys and girls school Grade-VIII students in district Nowshera were the population of the study.

**Sample**

One class from Government Middle School Khesghi Payan and one class from Government Girl's Middle school Batakzai Khesghi Bala were selected randomly. 50 students of Grade-VIII from boys and 50 students of Grade-VIII from girls schools were selected randomly. The sample was divided into two groups; experimental and control groups of both schools. There were four groups, two experimental and two controls of boys and girls. The number of students was 25 in each group.

**Research Design**

The research was experimental. The participants were divided into two groups: experimental and control. The pre-test and post-test equivalent group design was used to measure the effectiveness of treatment that involved two equivalent groups.

The symbolic representation of research design (Farooq & Tabassum, 2017).

$R_E = O_1$	T	$O_2$
$R_C = O_3$		$O_4$
$dR_E =$	$O_2 - O_1$	
$dR_C =$	$O_4 - O_3$	
$D = dR_E - dR_C$		

Where

---

---

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

---

R<sub>E</sub> = Randomly Selected Experimental Group

R<sub>C</sub> = Randomly Selected Control Group

O<sub>1</sub> & O<sub>3</sub> = observation of pre test

O<sub>2</sub> & O<sub>4</sub> = observation of Post-tests

T = Treatment (teaching by experiential learning model)

d = difference between mean scores of Pre-test and Post-test

### **Research Instrument**

Data was collected by the following tool.

#### **Achievement Tests**

Two types of achievement tests were developed one test was prepared for pre-test and other test was prepared for post-test and retention-test, which was used to examine knowledge retention of learners conducted after 30 days of experiment. These were used as research instruments both experimental and control group. These tests comprised of multiple choice items.

#### **Structured Interview**

Structured interviews are a series of standardized interview questions designed to assess candidates on a range of qualities important to the organization. The questions were of two types related to attitude and relationship. This tool was used to find out the attitude of the students towards teachers and relationship of the individual students.

#### **Treatment**

Teacher developed lesson plans for delivering the lecture. Control group were taught with the lecture/reading method, while experimental group were taught with Cooperative Learning Strategies.

#### **Schedule of the Teaching**

Control Group was taught through lecturer method, which is called the traditional method. Two weeks were the period of this type teaching. The Experimental Group was taught through cooperative teaching method for two weeks. In both groups the topic of teaching was same. The teaching duration was one hour daily for both groups.

#### **Material**

Test was made from English text book of grade-VIII. Three chapters 6, 7 and 18 were taught to experimental group. Pre-test and post-test were administered

#### **Procedure**

This is pretest posttest experimental research study. The sample was divided into half, 25 students in each group. Achievement pretest was developed and administer on each group before the actual treatment. The achievement marks of the sample students were tabulated. Then the selected lesson was taught through the cooperative strategies to the experimental groups. Achievements test was administered on the group and marks were recorded in the shape of tables.

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

Second tool was developed to find out the attitude and measure the relationship between students. This tool was structured interview. For attitude the researcher used the questionnaire but in this study the researcher use the structured interview because the sample is elementary level students. It may be difficult for them to answer the questions in the questionnaire.

The researcher developed lesson plans from the selected lessons of text book for both the experimental and control groups having the same learning outcomes but control group was taught through lecture/reading method, and experimental group was taught through cooperative learning strategies of teaching. Teacher conducted activities by using 4ps (preparation, presentation, practice, performance) format of lesson plan. As English is not the mother tongue in Pakistan for first two days only warm up activities were conducted in order to motivate them. This created a lot of interest in students and slowly other skills activities were conducted, duration of the class was sixty minutes. The researcher tried to establish the same conditions of teaching for both the groups. Almost all the factors, such as time duration, class timings, treatment length, course content, and teachers' qualification were the same. The teachers (four teachers) were having same designation CT at (Government Middle School Kheshgi Payan and Government Girls Middle school Batakzai Kheshgi Bala). Duration of treatment was four weeks. Activities of these teachers were observed by the researcher as well as other language experts. Further, performance of students was also noted.

**Data Collection**

Data was collected using tests which were delivered to the sample learners. A structure interview was used to find out the attitude of the students towards teachers and relationship of the individual students.

**Data Analysis and Findings**

Statistical methods and analyses are often used to communicate research findings and to support hypotheses and give credibility to research methodology and conclusions. Statistics was used for data collection, analysis, interpretation, explanation and presentation. Statistics play a vital role in researches. Use of statistics guided the researchers for proper characterization, summarization, presentation and interpretation of the result of research. In this research number of functions, including measuring correlation, comparing means of variables and predicting change in variables. The types of statistical tests were use in this research include percentage and t-tests.

**H<sub>0</sub>1.** There is no significant difference between the achievements of the experimental and control groups students.

**Table 1 Significant difference between the achievements of boy's experimental group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Pre Experimental	25	19.16	1.74	24	9.43	0.000000002	Very Large

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

Post Experimental	25	24.04	1.83
-------------------	----	-------	------

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1 Table Value = 2.063**  
 Table 1 depicts that the calculated t-value 9.43 was greater than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that Cooperative learning method has significance effect on students' academic achievement of boy's experimental groups.

**Table 2 Significant difference between the achievements of boy's control group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Pre-Control	25	18.88	1.71	24	1.83	0.079	Very Small
Post-Control	25	19.44	2.14				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1 Table Value = 2.063**  
 Table 2 depicts that the calculated t-value 1.83 was lesser than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that traditional method has no significance effect on students' academic achievement of boy's control groups.

**Table 3 Significant difference between the achievements between girl's experimental group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Pre-Experimental	25	19.16	1.74	24	21.3	0.000000000000000004	Very Large
Post-Experimental	25	24.28	1.59				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1 Table Value = 2.063**  
 Table 3 indicates that the calculated t-value 21.3 was larger than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that Cooperative learning method has significance effect on students' academic achievement of girl's experimental groups.

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

**Table 4 Significant difference between the achievements between girl’s control group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Pre-Control	25	18.96	1.88				
				24	1.93	0.064	Very Small
Post-Control	25	19.52	1.82				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1** **Table Value = 2.063**  
 Table 4 depicts that the calculated t-value 1.93 was lesser than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that traditional method has no significance effect on students’ academic achievement of girl’s control groups.  $H_0$ . No significant difference between the relationships amongst the experimental and control groups students.

**Table 5 Significant difference between the relationships of boy’s experimental group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	Correlation	Effect Size
Pre Experimental	25	19.16	1.74		
				0.74	Very Large
Post Experimental	25	24.04	1.83		

Table 5 illustrates that correlation value was 0.74 which is high positive correlation; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that Cooperative learning methodology has significance relationship with the development of concept of learners. The standard deviation before treatment was 1.74 and after treatment it was 1.83. It indicates that data before treatment was less spread then after the treatment. The mean value regarding academic performance of experimental group in pretest was 19.16 while in posttest it was 24.4. It means that due to cooperative learning methodology academic achievement of experimental boy’s group increased significantly.

**Table 6 Significant difference between the relationships of boy’s control group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	Correlation	Effect Size
-------	---	------	----	-------------	-------------



*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

Pre-Control	25	18.88	1.71	0.70	Large
Post-Control	25	19.44	2.14		

Table 6 illustrates that correlation value was 0.70 which is positive correlation; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that traditional method has significance relationship with the development of concept of learners. The standard deviation before treatment was 1.71 and after treatment it was 2.14. It indicates that the data before treatment was less spread then after the treatment. The mean value regarding academic performance of control group in pretest was 18.88 while in posttest it was 19.44. It means that due to traditional method of teaching academic performance of control boy’s group increased slightly.

**Table 7 Significant difference between the relationships between girl’s experimental group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	Correlation	Effect Size
Pre-Experimental	25	19.16	1.74	0.745	Very Large
Post-Experimental	25	24.28	1.59		

Table 7 concludes that correlation value was 0.745 which is high positive correlation; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that Cooperative learning methodology has significance relationship with the development of concept of learners. The standard deviation before treatment was 1.74 and after treatment it was 1.59. It indicates that the data before treatment was more spread then after the treatment. The mean value regarding academic performance of experimental group in pretest was 19.16 while in posttest it was 24.28. It means that due to cooperative learning methodology academic achievement of experimental girl’s group increased significantly.

**Table 8 Significant difference between the relationships between girl’s control group students**

Group	N	Mean	SD	Correlation	Effect Size
Pre-Control	25	18.96	1.88	0.69	Large
Post-Control	25	19.52	1.82		



*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1**

**Table Value = 2.063**

Table 10 depicts that the calculated t-value 3.94 was larger than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between the retention periods of the concepts between boy's control groups. The standard deviation after treatment was 2.14 and after retention test it was 2.01. It indicates that the data after treatment was more spread then after retain for some time. The mean value regarding academic performance of control group in posttest was 19.44 while in retention test it was 18.16. It means with traditional method of teaching academic performance of control boy's group significantly decrease after one month of conducting posttest.

**Table 11 Significant difference between the retention periods of the concepts of girl's experimental group**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Post-Experimental Girl's	25	24.28	1.59	24	1.70	0.1002	Very Small
Retention	25	23.52	1.98				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1**

**Table Value = 2.063**

Table 11 depicts that the calculated t-value 1.70 was smaller than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is no significant difference between the retention periods of the concepts between girl's experimental groups. The standard deviation after treatment was 1.59 and after retention test it was 1.98. It indicates that the data after treatment was less spread then after retain for some time. The mean value regarding academic performance of experimental group in posttest was 24.28 while in retention test it was 23.52. It means with cooperative learning methodology of teaching academic performance of experimental girl's group slightly decrease after one month of conducting posttest.

**Table 12 Significant difference between the retention periods of the concepts of girl's control group**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Post-Control Girl's	25	19.52	1.82	24	2.26	0.032785	Large
Retention	25	18.4	1.95				

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n-1**

**Table Value = 2.063**

Table 12 depicts that the calculated t-value 2.26 was larger than table value 2.063 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between the retention periods of the concepts between girl's control groups. The standard deviation after treatment was 1.82 and after retention test it was 1.95. It indicates that the data after treatment was less spread then after retain for some time. The mean value regarding academic performance of control group in posttest was 19.52 while in retention test it was 18.4. It means with traditional method of teaching academic performance of control girl's group slightly decrease after one month of conducting posttest.  $H_0$ . No significant difference between the attitude of the experimental and control groups students towards teachers.

**Table 13 Significant difference between the attitude of boy's experimental and control groups students towards teachers**

S.No	Questions	N	Control		Experimental	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
1	You like the English subject	50	17 68%	8 32%	21 84%	4 16%
2	English is easy subject	50	14 56%	11 44%	20 80%	5 20%
3	My mother tong is not English language	50	25 100%	0 0%	25 100%	0 0%
4	English teacher is not good	50	8 32%	17 68%	20 80%	5 20%
5	I like my English teacher	50	18 72%	7 28%	20 80%	5 20%
6	I know how to write English	50	16 64%	9 36%	23 92%	2 8%

Table 13 reveals that 68% control and 84% experimental students like the English subject, 56% control and 80% experimental students think English is easy subject, 100% control and experimental students did not recognize English as their mother language, 68% control and

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

80% experimental students think that English teacher is good, 72% control and 80% experimental students like their English teacher and 64% control and 92% experimental students know how to write English. The above interpretation shows that boy's experimental group has more positive attitude then control group.

**Table 14 Significant difference between the attitude of girl's experimental and control groups students towards teachers**

S.No	Questions	N	Control		Experimental	
			Yes	No	Yes	No
1	You like the English subject	50	12 48%	13 52%	20 80%	5 20%
2	English is easy subject	50	15 60%	10 40%	18 72%	7 28%
3	My mother tong is not English language	50	25 100%	0 0%	25 100%	0 0%
4	English teacher is not good	50	7 28%	18 72%	21 84%	4 16%
5	I like my English teacher	50	18 72%	7 28%	19 76%	6 24%
6	I know how to write English	50	17 68%	8 32%	25 100%	0 0%

Table 14 reveals that 48% control and 80% experimental students like the English subject, 60% control and 72% experimental students think English is easy subject, 100% control and experimental students did not recognize English as their mother language, 72% control and 84% experimental students think that English teacher is good, 72% control and 76% experimental students like their English teacher and 68% control and 100% experimental students know how to write English. The above interpretation shows that girl's experimental group has more positive attitude then control group.

H<sub>05</sub>. No significance difference between boy's and girl's outcomes.

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

**Table 15 Significance difference between boy's and girl's outcomes of control group**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Post-Control Boy's	25	19.44	2.14	48	1.42	0.88	Very Small
Post-Control Girl's	25	19.52	1.82				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n<sub>1</sub>+ n<sub>2</sub> -1 Table Value = 2.010**  
 Table 15 indicates that the calculated t-value 1.42 was smaller than table value 2.010 which were significant at level (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that there has no significance difference between boy's and girl's outcomes of control groups. The standard deviation after traditional method was 2.14 of boy's and 1.82 of girl's. It indicates that the data after traditional method of boy's was more spread then girls. The mean value regarding academic performance of control groups in posttest of boy's was 19.44 while of girl's it was 19.52. It means with traditional method of teaching academic performance of control boy's group more or less the same as control girls group.

**Table 16 Significance difference between boy's and girl's outcomes of experimental group**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Post-Experimental Boy's	25	20.04	1.83	48	0.49	0.624	Very Small
Post-Experimental Girl's	25	24.28	1.59				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n<sub>1</sub>+ n<sub>2</sub> -1 Table Value = 2.010**  
 Table 16 indicates that the calculated t-value 0.49 was smaller than table value 2.010 which were significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that there has no significance difference between boy's and girl's outcomes of experimental groups. The standard deviation after cooperative learning methodology was 1.83 of boy's and 1.59 of girl's. It indicates that the data after cooperative learning methodology of boy's was more spread then girls. The mean value regarding academic performance of experimental groups in posttest of boy's was 20.04 while of girl's it was 24.28. It means with cooperative learning methodology of teaching academic performance of experimental boy's group slightly less than experimental girls group.

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

**Table 17 Significance difference between boy’s outcomes of experimental and control group**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Post-Control Boy’s	25	19.44	2.14	48	8.15	0.00000000013	Very Large
Post-Experimental Boy’s	25	24.04	1.83				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n<sub>1</sub>+ n<sub>2</sub> -1 Table Value = 2.010**

Table 17 shows that the calculated t-value 8.15 was greater than table value 2.010 which was significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there was significance difference between boy’s outcomes of experimental and control groups.

**Table 18 Significance difference between girl’s outcomes of experimental and control group**

Group	N	Mean	SD	df	t-value	Significance (2-tailed)	Effect Size
Post-Control Girl’s	25	19.52	1.82	48	9.80	0.000000000000000000005	Very Large
Post-Experimental Girl’s	25	24.28	1.59				

**Significance level = 0.05, df=n<sub>1</sub>+ n<sub>2</sub> -1 Table Value = 2.010**

Table 18 shows that the calculated t-value 9.80 was greater than table value 2.010 which was significant at (0.05) level; hence the null hypothesis is rejected. It means that there was significance difference between girl’s outcomes of experimental and control groups.

**Discussion**

The present study revealed that cooperative learning has significant effect on academic achievement of both boys and girls students in the subject of English at elementary school. The results of present study are similar to Parveen and Batool (2012) study. Parveen and Batool (2012) concluded that cooperative group had more fruitful performance than tradition teaching.

The present study was carried out to investigate the effectiveness of cooperative learning strategies in the subject of English at elementary schools level. According to Hancock (2010) some challenges of using cooperative learning include releasing the control of learning, managing noise levels, resolving conflicts, and assessing student learning. Carefully structured activities can help students learn the skills to work together successfully, and structured discussion and reflection on group process can help avoid some problems.

Cooperative learning changes students' and teachers' roles in classrooms. The ownership of

### *Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

teaching and learning is shared by groups of students, and is no longer the sole responsibility of the teacher. The authority of setting goals, assessing learning, and facilitating learning is shared by all. Students have more opportunities to actively participate in their learning, question and challenge each other, share and discuss their ideas, and internalize their learning. Along with improving academic learning, cooperative learning helps students engage in thoughtful discourse and examine different perspectives, and it has been proven to increase students' self-esteem, motivation, and empathy (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

The longer a cooperative group exists, the more caring their relationships will tend to be, the greater the social support they will provide for each other, the more committed they will be to each other's success, and the more influence members will have over each other. Permanent cooperative base groups provide the arena in which caring and committed relationships can be created that provide the social support needed to improve attendance, personalize the educational experience, increase achievement, and improve the quality of school life (Hancock, 2010).

According to Shapiro (2010) Cooperative learning refers to the type of methods in which the students work together with each other and help one another. While in contrast the group contingencies directs to rewarding students on performance of a group, research conducted on the achievements of cooperative learning concluded that they give best results when used together with group contingencies, group contingencies when used within cooperative learning enables the students that are members of group to explain their concepts and skills to the other members of group.

All the government boys and girls school Grade-VIII students in district Nowshera were the population of the study. This study was delimited to students of Grade-VIII girls and boys students of Government Schools to analyze the effect of cooperative learning strategies. One class from Government Middle School Kheshgi Payan and one class from Government Girl's Middle school Batakzai Kheshgi Bala were selected randomly. 50 students of Grade-VIII from boys and 50 students of Grade-VIII from girls schools were selected randomly. The sample was divided into two groups; experimental and control groups of both schools. There were four groups, two experimental and two controls of boys and girls. The number of students was 25 in each group.

A Test and Structured interview was developed for government elementary school students of English subject. There were 30 items in the test. The researcher personally developed and administered the test (pre-test and post-test) to the respondents. The researcher also developed the lesson plans and delivered. Data collected through test (pre-test and post-test) and structured interview from students was tabulated, analyzed and finally interpreted item wise for each statement. For statistical analysis formula of t-test was used applied.

#### **Conclusions**

- It was concluded from the results that cooperative learning had significance effect on both boys and girls student's achievement.
- It was concluded from the result that Cooperative learning methodology had significance relationship to develop the concept of boy's as well as girls learners.
- It was concluded from the result that Cooperative learning methodology had significant effect on the retention periods of the concepts on both boys and girls.



### *Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

- The result of the study showed that experimental boys and girls group had more positive attitude than control group of both boys and girls students.
- The results show that after the treatment with Cooperative learning there was a slight difference between the mean scores of male and female. Teaching through Cooperative learning significantly effected the academic performance of both male and female students of experimental group.

#### **Recommendations**

- The result of present study showed that there was a slight difference between the mean score of male and female teaching through Cooperative learning significantly effected the academic performance of both male and female students of experimental group. It is there for recommended that teachers may teach through cooperative learning methodology. In this way they can increase the academic performance of the students as well as they can show good results in their subjects.
- It was concluded from the result that cooperative learning methodology had significance effect to develop the concept of male and female learners. Hence it is recommended that teachers may adopt the cooperative learning methodology while teaching English at elementary level.
- The education department should arrange in-service training for the teachers to become aware of the concept and methodology of cooperative learning. The concept of cooperative learning may be included in the curriculum of teacher training for pre-service course. The school management should also make it possible to provide all the necessary A.V aids that are helpful to implement Cooperative learning methodology.
- The study was limited only to 100 students. Future researches may be conducted on larger sample to inspect new confirmations on the effects and advantages of Cooperative learning.
- The current experimental study was carried out to assess the effects of Cooperative learning methodology to teach English subject. Similarly studies may also be conducted in other disciplines like social studies, general science and the social sciences etc.

#### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank all of the participants for their contributions.

#### **References**

1. Farooq, R. A., & Tabassum, R. (2017). *Understanding research in education'Pakistan Lahore*. Majeed Book Depot.
2. Hancock, D. (2010). *Tame, messy and wicked risk leadership*. Gower Publishing, Ltd.
3. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning* (5th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
4. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38 (5), 365-3-379.
5. Kosar, R. (2003). *An experimental study on effects of cooperative learning on social studies achievement among 7th class student*. (Unpublished MA dissertation). PAF College of Education for Women, Rawalpindi.
6. Ledlow, S. (1999). *Cooperative learning in higher education*. To Chinese tertiary learners. *Effective*

*Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Strategies in The Subject of English ...*

---

- Education*, 2(2), 99–116.
7. Mehra, V. (2008). Effects of cooperative learning on achievement and retention in mathematics of seven graders with different cognitive styles. *Indian Education Review*, 44, 4-30.
  8. Parveen, Q., & Batool, S. (2012). Effect of Cooperative Learning on Achievement of Students in General Science at Secondary Level. *International Education Studies*, 5(2), 154-158.
  9. Shapiro, E. S. (2010). *Academic skills problems: Direct assessment and intervention*. Guilford Press.
  10. Talebi, F. & Sobhani, A. (2012). The impacts of cooperative learning on oral proficiency, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 75-79.
  11. Thornton, P. (1999). Reading together. In D. Kluge & S. McGuire (Eds.), *JALT Applied Materials: Cooperative Learning* (pp. 23-36). Tokyo, Japan: Japan Association for Language Teaching.
  12. Tran, V. D. (2019). Does cooperative learning increase students' motivation in learning?. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(5), 12-20.