

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ



**VIEWS ON COOPERATIVE LEARNING
HELD BY FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

A Pro Gradu Thesis

by

Henna Pitkäranta

**Department of English
2000**

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Henna Pitkäranta

VIEWS ON COOPERATIVE LEARNING HELD BY FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TEACHERS

Pro gradu -tutkielma
Englantilainen filologia
Elokuu 2000

96 sivua + 2 liitettä

Kieli on on viestinnän, ymmärtämisen ja yhteistyön väline. Siksi myös vieraiden kielten opetuksessa olisi perehdyttävä yhteistoiminnallisiin työmuotoihin. Tutkielman tarkoituksena onkin kartoittaa suomalaisten vieraiden kielten aineenopettajien käsityksiä ja kokemuksia yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta. Yhden kunnan koululaitoksen yhtätoista englannin ja saksan kielen opettajaa haastateltiin. Haastatteluaineistoa tarkastellaan tutkimusongelmien valossa, joita ovat: 1) käsitykset yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta, 2) kokemukset ja mielipiteet yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta, 3) yleisten ja kuntakohtaisten opetussuunnitelmien merkitys opettajan toiminnassa ja 4) ammatillisen yhteistyön ja jatkokoulutuksen yhteys opettajan ammatilliseen kehittymiseen. Kyseessä on tapaustutkimus ja lähestymistapa tutkielmassa on pääosin kuvaileva.

Opettajien tiedot yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta paljastuivat suhteellisen heikoiksi. He eivät myöskään osanneet nimetä muita yhteistoiminnallisia oppimistekniikoita kuin palapelin. Haastatelluilla oli kuitenkin varsin myönteinen käsitys yhteistoiminnallisen oppimisen vaikutuksista oppijaan ja oppimiseen. Lisäksi useimmat olivat kokeilleet papapeli-tekniikkaa omassa opetuksessaan. Kukaan opettajista ei kuitenkaan ollut käyttänyt yhteistoiminnallista oppimista pitkäjänteisesti. Syynä tähän nähtiin heikohko ja varsin teoreettinen taustatieto menetelmästä sekä ajanpuute. Opetussuunnitelman merkitys varsinaisessa luokahuonetyöskentelyssä ei näyttänyt olevan merkittävä, joskin sen ohjeita pääsääntöisesti noudatettiin. Opettajien ammatillinen yhteistyö oli melko vähäistä, mutta sitä olisi toivottu lisää. Myös jatkokoulutusta arvostettiin ammatillisen inspiraation lähteenä. Koulutusta kuitenkin tarvittaisiin lisää.

Koska opettajat ovat halukkaita kehittämään itseään ammatillisesti, heille olisi myös tarjottava siihen enemmän mahdollisuuksia. Opetusala voisi houkutella uusia tulokkaita, jos ammatillista kehittymistä ja työtyytyväisyyttä tuettaisiin jatkokoulutuksella ja opettajien välisellä yhteistyöllä. Lisäksi uusien opetusmenetelmien käyttöönottoa voitaisiin helpottaa kehittämällä käytännönläheistä opetusmateriaalia, mikä onkin haaste tulevaa tutkimusta ajatellen. Olisi myös kiinnostavaa selvittää, millaiset valmiudet opettajankoulutus tarjoaa erilaisten opetusmenetelmien käyttöön. Tämän lisäksi myös opetussuunnitelman ja käytännön opetustyön kohtaamista voisi tarkastella lähemmin.

Asiasanat: collegiality, cooperative learning, curriculum, foreign language teaching, in-service training.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
1 INTRODUCTION	5
2 A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR COOPERATIVE LEARNING	7
2.1 History of cooperative learning	7
2.2 A definition of cooperative learning	8
2.3 Traditional group work vs. cooperative learning	11
3 COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM	14
3.1 Elements of cooperative learning	14
3.1.1 Positive interdependence	14
3.1.2 Face-to-face interaction	15
3.1.3 Individual accountability	16
3.1.4 Interpersonal and group skills	16
3.1.5 Group processing	17
3.2 Cooperative learning methods	18
3.2.1 Jigsaw	19
3.2.2 Student team learning	20
3.2.3 Learning together	22
3.3 The role of learners	23
3.4 The role of the teacher	24
4 IMPLICATIONS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH: REASONS FOR USING COOPERATIVE LEARNING	27
4.1 Learners' motivation	28
4.2 Achievement	29
4.3 Cognitive skills and learning strategies	29
4.4 Social skills and self-esteem	31
5 PREVIOUS EXPERIENCES OF IMPLEMENTING COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM	32
5.1 Teaching philosophies	32
5.2 Cooperative learning as part of the Finnish national curricula	34
5.3 Teachers as practitioners of cooperative methods	35
5.3.1 Experiences of using cooperative learning	36
5.3.2 Wider sense of cooperation	37
6 PRESENT STUDY: VIEWS ON COOPERATIVE LEARNING HELD BY TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AND GERMAN	39
6.1 Research questions	39
6.2 Subjects	40

6.3 Method	41
6.4 Data collection	42
6.5 Coding of the data	44
7 FINDINGS	45
7.1 Perceptions of cooperative learning	45
7.1.1 Theoretical knowledge: definitions of cooperative learning	46
7.1.2 Practical knowledge: impact and demands of cooperative learning	51
7.3 The teachers' experience on cooperative learning	54
7.3.1 Procedures applied and criticism aroused	55
7.3.2 Attitudes towards cooperative learning	63
7.3.3 National and local curricula vs. teachers' work practices	66
7.4 Collegial cooperation	69
7.4.1 The present situation	70
7.4.2 Indications for improvement	75
7.5 Further education - the key to professional development?	77
7.6 Summary of the findings	80
8 CONCLUSION	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	88
Appendix 1. THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	92
Appendix 2. TRANSCRIPTIONS: 2 SAMPLES	93

I INTRODUCTION

Learners are working intensively. They take actively part in group discussions and are committed to completing the task at hand. These learners also take responsibility for their own and others' learning. They are willing to reflect on their work and gain feedback from group members. Thus, they also support each others' personality growth.

The passage above could be a description of a successful cooperative lesson in which positive interdependence and individual accountability among learners exist. Undeniably, it sounds very appealing. Furthermore, a great number of studies have been carried out to investigate cooperative learning, an application of social psychology to education and it has been found to affect learning and learners in a positive way. However, quite a few of these studies have been conducted, for example, in the United States. Only in a few studies, the usefulness of cooperative learning in the Finnish school system has been scrutinised. Moreover, practically no study has focused on cooperative learning from the point of view of foreign language teaching. On the contrary, most of the research has been conducted in natural sciences and humanities excluding foreign languages. However, language is not only a tool for communication and understanding, it is also an important tool for cooperation. Besides, teachers' experience and perception of cooperative learning have rarely been under investigation, although the teacher has an important role in the implementation process. Whether the process even begins, depends on the teacher.

Therefore, the present study sets out to examine perceptions of cooperative learning as a teaching method held by Finnish foreign language teachers'. In addition, factors affecting the teachers' classroom practices will be viewed. These areas of interest provide the basis for four research problems: 1) Perceptions of cooperative learning, 2) Experiences of and attitudes towards cooperative learning, 3) National and local curricula vs. teachers' practices,

and 4) The importance of collegial cooperation and in-service training for professional growth. These problems will be tackled by the means of the semi-structured interview in order to gain in-depth information about the respondents' thoughts. The present study is supposed to provide insight into opinions and attitudes underlying foreign language teachers' practices. This information might be useful when designing teacher training.

Chapters 2 to 5 review previous research on aspects of cooperative learning. More specifically, chapter 2 introduces a theoretical framework for cooperative learning and chapter 3 defines how cooperative learning has been used in the classroom. Chapter 4 reports reasons for using cooperative learning and chapter 5 discusses the implementation of cooperative learning in the classroom. Further, chapter 6 defines the research design for the present study. Chapter 7 is quite central as it discusses the findings of the present study. Finally, chapter 8 serves as a conclusion.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR COOPERATIVE LEARNING

2.1 History of cooperative learning

The survival of the human species depends largely on its ability to act cooperatively. Thus, the idea of cooperative learning is not a new invention. As early as the first century, Quintilian found students' collaborative efforts advantageous for their learning. In the 17th century Johann Amos Comenius established that students would benefit both by teaching and being taught by other students. Moreover, in the late 17th century extensive use of cooperative learning groups was made by Joseph Lancaster and Andrew Bell and their idea was brought to America in the early 19th century. Decades later, Colonel Francis Parker became famous for his advocacy of cooperative learning. He used cooperative methods successfully in public schools and his instructional methods of promoting cooperation among students dominated American education until the turn of the 20th century. Following Parker, John Dewey favoured the use of collaborative groups as part of a project. However, in the late 1930s, competitiveness began to gain more attention and approval. (Johnson et al. 1990.)

Nevertheless, in the 1940s Morton Deutsch, building on the theorising of Kurt Lewin, formulated his theory of cooperation and competition. Deutsch's work underlies the work of David and Roger Johnson who in the 1970s introduced their method of cooperative learning. The very core of Deutsch's (1962) theory is, in short, that in a cooperative situation, the goals of individuals are promotively interdependent. In other words, individuals are linked together so that there is a positive correlation between their goal attainments. This means that individuals have to work in cooperation in order to reach their goals. Otherwise, none of them can reach their goals.

Accordingly, in a competitive situation there is a negative correlation between goal attainments.

After Deutsch there have been several researchers in the field of cooperative learning. Since the mid 1970s, the Johnsons, Sharan, and Slavin, for instance, have been actively involved in advocating the use of cooperative learning. Research on cooperative learning has mostly been carried out in order to describe the effects of these methods on pupils' learning (for details, see e.g. Johnson and Johnson 1990, Qin et al. 1995, Slavin 1990b, Sharan 1990).

2.2 A definition of cooperative learning

In the field of education, the ideas of behaviorism have to some extent been superseded by humanistic and constructivist views (see e.g. Kohonen 1992a). Similarly, quite from the beginning, cooperative learning has been "an application of social psychology to education" (Slavin 1990a:261) mainly following the principles of cognitivism. According to Kohonen (1990), the profound difference between behaviorism and humanism can be manifested by juxtaposing their views on learning involved. There are three generally acknowledged views on learning: transmission, transaction and transformation of knowledge the first representing the purely behavioristic view and the last the cognitive view (Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994:156-161). This paradigmatic shift in educational theory could be analysed by contrasting the extreme ends of some pedagogically relevant dimensions as in Table 1 (see Kohonen 1990, and Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994). These dimensions are relevant to the theory of cooperative learning in that they describe the very basic cognitive principles underlying methods of cooperative learning.

TABLE 1: Behavioristic and cognitive views on education: a comparison

Dimension	Behaviorism	Cognitivism
1. View of learning	Transmission of knowledge	Transformation of knowledge
2. Power relation	Emphasis on teacher's authority	Teacher as a 'learner among learners'
3. Teacher's role	Providing mainly frontal instruction; professionalism as individual autonomy	Facilitating learning largely in cooperative small groups; collaborative professionalism
4. Learner's role	Relatively passive recipient of information; mainly individual work	Active participation, largely in cooperative small groups
5. View of knowledge	Presented as 'certain'; application, problem solving	Construction of personal knowledge; identification of problems
6. View of curriculum	Static; hierarchical grading of subject matter, predefined contents	Dynamic; looser organisation of subject matter, including open parts and integration
7. Learning experiences	Knowledge of facts, concepts and skills; focus on content and product	Emphasis on process; learning skills, self-inquiry, social and communication skills
8. Control of process	Mainly teacher-structured learning	Emphasis on learner: self-directed learning
9. Motivation	Mainly extrinsic	Mainly intrinsic
10. Evaluation	Product-oriented; achievement testing; criterion-referencing	Process-oriented; reflection on process, self-assessment; criterion-referencing

The main difference between behavioristic and cognitive views lies probably on how the role of the teacher and learners is seen. In the transmission model presented on the left-hand side of Table 1, the person in authority in the

classroom is assumed to be the teacher whose job is to impart knowledge and skills to learners acting as passive recipients of knowledge. Knowledge is seen as definable in terms of right and wrong answers. In contrast, cognitive models see the learner as an active participant in the learning process. Shared partnership, a common purpose and joint management of learning are seen as worth striving at (Kohonen 1992a:30-33, and Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994:156-161). However, as Kohonen stresses, it is not justifiable to criticise one paradigm on the basis of the premises of another paradigm. In other words, pedagogical decisions cannot be criticised or judged without evaluating the relevant theoretical framework or the current socio-cultural and educational contexts.

The broader theoretical framework for cooperative learning having been discussed in general, it seems reasonable to define it on a more concrete level, too. Deutsch (1962:276) was probably the first to define explicitly what a cooperative goal structure¹ is and he described a cooperative situation as one where "an individual can attain his goal if and only if the other with whom he is linked can attain their goals" whereas in the completely opposite situation, a competitive one, "an individual can attain his goal if and only if the others with whom he is linked cannot attain their goals". It is these propositions that constitute the basic theory of cooperative learning.

In summary, the main idea behind cooperative learning is that students work collaboratively to achieve a common goal that is beneficial to all participants (Johnson and Johnson 1974:213-240). In addition, while changing the learning atmosphere, cooperative methods also aim at students who are autonomous, critical, independent and collaborative (Koppinen and Pollari 1993).

¹ A goal structure is, as defined by D. W. Johnson and F. P. Johnson (1991:62), what specifies the type of social interaction, i.e. the ways in which individuals interact, as they strive for their goals. There are basically three different goal structures that can be adopted in a classroom: cooperation, competition and individualistic efforts.

The basic principles of cooperative learning enlisted in Table 1 presumably apply to most cooperative modifications in use today. Following those principles and the theory of cooperative learning put forward primarily by the Johnsons, cooperative learning has widely and successfully been used in the USA and to a lesser extent in other countries. However, as Sahlberg and Leppilampi (1994) point out, the Johnsons' views cannot be adopted as such in the Finnish school system as they have been designed for a very different culture. Therefore, though accepting the very basic principles formulated in the United States, it is necessary to modify the American model to create a cooperative learning program that is suitable for the Finnish school system.

Thus, in the present study, cooperative learning will predominantly be discussed in the way that Finnish researchers, for example, Sahlberg and Leppilampi (1994), Koppinen and Pollari (1993) and Kohonen (e.g. 1990, 1992a, 1992b), understand it. Kohonen, for instance, has studied cooperative learning as a form of holistic and experiential learning. Moreover, he sees cooperative methods as a means of pedagogic integration (F. pedagoginen eheyttäminen). He has actively been introducing cooperative methods to the Finnish school system and is perhaps one of the most influential researchers on cooperative learning in Finland.

2.3 Traditional group work vs. cooperative learning

Superficially, cooperative learning in small groups might seem much like traditional group work. The difference is, however, in the way groups work, not that much in the way they look like. Perhaps the main difference between cooperative learning groups and traditional group work is that the former requires everyone in a group to work and allows little idling. The purpose of traditional group work is often to produce one product to be presented in the name of the whole group. Often, one or two people end up doing most of the

work while others, the so-called "free-riders", only contribute to the group assignment as secretaries at best (Slavin 1990b:16).

In cooperative learning groups, in contrast, every team member is responsible for each others' as well as for one's own learning (see section 3.1.3 Individual accountability). Each team member is also responsible for being able to elicit the results of the group assignment and the process that led to them. Furthermore, the grouping is important in order to ensure the best possible results. Ideally, groups are heterogeneous small groups of 2-4 people where advanced learners help weaker ones, whereas traditional groups are often very homogeneous with little helping taking place. In addition to concentrating on the assignment at hand, members of a home group have (or at least should be) committed to a long-term process.

Some major differences between cooperative learning groups and traditional group work are enlisted in Table 2 (see Johnson et al. 1991, and Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994). Table 2 is clearly dichotomic in order to highlight the importance of these features of group work.

TABLE 2: Traditional group work and cooperative learning: a comparison

Traditional group work	Cooperative learning groups
1. No interdependence; individual work inside the group	1. Positive interdependence: sink or swim together
2. No individual accountability; if one refuses to work, others fail, too	2. Individual accountability; everybody contributes to achieve the common goal
3. Homogenous membership; streaming thinking	3. Heterogeneous membership; beneficial use of different kinds of learners
4. One appointed leader responsible for the assignment	4. Shared leadership
5. Responsible only for oneself	5. Responsible for each other
6. Only task emphasised; no long-term goals	6. Task and maintenance emphasised; commitment to a long-term process

7. Social skills assumed and ignored	7. Social skills directly and repeatedly taught
8. Teacher ignores groups, does not intervene	8. Teacher observes the process; encouragement and intervention when necessary
9. No group processing; no evaluation	9. Group processing occurs; self-evaluation and commenting on the feedback from team members and the teacher
10. Personality growth only supported occasionally	10. Personality growth continuously supported by team members

Table 2 presents the five elements of cooperative learning that are essential for both meaningful and productive cooperative work. These elements will be further described and discussed below (see section 3.1).

3 COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM

3.1 Elements of cooperative learning

Cooperative learning typically consists of several elements essential for smooth small group work and it is these elements that distinguish cooperative learning from other types of instruction. Depending on the source, three to five central components are named. However, the five core elements that most authors list, are: 1) positive interdependence within the group, 2) promotive face-to-face interaction, 3) individual accountability (i.e. personal responsibility) to achieve the group's goals, 4) frequent use of interpersonal and 5) small-group skills and group processing (e.g. Johnson and Johnson 1990). It is only under these conditions, Johnson et al. (1990) postulate, that group work may be expected to be more productive than individual or competitive efforts. Furthermore, Kohonen (1990) emphasises that these skills are not to be expected to be innate but they have to and can be taught.

In the following (sections 3.1.1 through to 3.1.5), these elements of cooperative learning will be briefly introduced. For the most part, the definitions of the components are based on only one source, Johnson et al. (1991), as other sources are few.²

3.1.1 Positive interdependence

Positive interdependence within a group exists "when students perceive that they are linked with groupmates in a way so that they cannot succeed unless their groupmates do (and vice versa) and/or that they must coordinate their

² Even in works by other authors than Johnson et. al., they are, nevertheless, referred to as the source of information.

efforts with the efforts of their groupmates to complete a task” (Johnson et al. 1991:1:10). In an ideal situation where positive interdependence is clearly understood, each group member has a unique contribution to make, which is essential and indispensable for the success of the group.

There are a number of ways in which the teacher can promote positive interdependence. To begin with, a common goal can be set for the group and material can be divided giving each member a part of the facts required to complete the assignment. In addition, each member of the group can be given a specific role in the group and joint rewards can be used. (Johnson et al. 1991.) Thus, as Korpela (1992) stresses, positive interdependence is achieved by structuring the learning goal so that it promotes interaction.

3.1.2 Face-to-face interaction

The second component is promotive face-to-face interaction. In short, it means the interaction patterns and verbal interchange among students within which they promote each other’s learning and success. Positive interdependence promotes face-to-face interaction which, in turn, affects the outcomes of education (Johnson et al. 1991).

During lessons the teacher needs to maximize the opportunities for learners to promote each other’s success by assisting, supporting and encouraging each other in their efforts. Johnson et al. (1991) enlist many positive effects of such face-to-face interaction. For one thing, cognitive activities and interpersonal dynamics occur when students help each other. Second, learners’ social skills develop when helping and assisting takes place. Third, important feedback is provided by verbal and nonverbal responses of team members. Fourth, interaction provides an opportunity for others to pressure

unmotivated team members to achieve. Fifth, interaction enables learners to get to know each other as persons.

3.1.3 Individual accountability

The third element in cooperative learning is individual accountability, that is, personal responsibility, to achieve the goals set by the group. According to Johnson and Johnson (1990), individual accountability exists when the performance of each individual is assessed and the results of that assessment given back to the group and the individual. On the one hand, everyone is responsible for their own learning and on the other hand, everyone is also responsible for the results of the group.

Discussing cooperative learning and group members does not imply neglecting learners as individuals. It is essential to bear in mind that the methods of cooperative learning do not actually aim at forgetting the individual's effort nor at undermining their feelings and sensations. On the contrary, in the words of Johnson et al. (1991), the purpose of the methods of cooperative learning is to help learners develop as individuals, that is, make each member stronger as individual.

3.1.4 Interpersonal and group skills

Interpersonal and group skills are not innate: learners do not instinctively know how to interact effectively. Therefore, as Johnson et al. (1991) claim, the skills required for collaboration have to be directly taught and consciously developed. Besides, learners should be motivated to use interpersonal skills in order for cooperative groups to be effective.

Interpersonal group skills include skills such as communicative and interactional skills, trust and respect for others, negotiation, decision-making skills and ability to resolve conflict situations constructively (e.g. Kohonen 1990, Johnson et al. 1991). Obviously, these skills are not only essential for effective cooperative small group work in the classroom; they are also important in the everyday lives of people.

3.1.5 Group processing

Finally, the fifth and also a very important element of cooperative learning is group processing. In short, it refers to the way learners reflect on the group process, e.g. how they are achieving, which member actions were helpful and which were less helpful. Group processing is thus an important means for developing and maintaining good relationships and a good working climate, facilitating the adoption of cooperative skills and ensuring that learners receive feedback on their efforts.

Indeed, studies have shown (Johnson et al. in press as quoted in Johnson and Johnson 1990:33) that cooperative learning involving group processing has more effective results than does cooperative learning without this group reflecting. However, as Kohonen (1992a:37) notes, this kind of group processing is quite demanding for learners: "to gain new experiences and reflect on them, the learner needs to be both an actor and an observer of his or her own learning". Moreover, learners are supposed to learn simultaneously about the subject being taught.

3.2 Cooperative learning methods

The crucial elements of cooperative learning described above are realised through various cooperative methods that can be adopted in a classroom. According to Kohonen (1993 as quoted by Kuitunen 1993:2), these cooperative methods can be divided roughly in three categories. First, there are **packages included in the curriculum**, such as Slavin's Student Team Learning. These contain fairly solid techniques and present cooperative learning as part of teacher oriented teaching. Second, **Cooperative teaching strategies** by e.g. Kagan can be adapted for various situations. Here, the use of a specific model or strategy depends on the desired outcome of learning. Third, there are **conceptual and flexible models** that are favoured by e.g. David and Roger Johnson, Elizabeth Cohen and Shlomo and Yael Sharan. In these models, group dynamics are emphasised and the five principles of cooperative learning (see section 3.1) guide group work.

Here, however, three frequently used cooperative techniques or methods, will be introduced. These are **jigsaw**, **student team learning** and **learning together**. They will be considered as individual entities, not as part of the classification above. The description will not go into great detail as the purpose of the present study is not to serve as a manual of cooperative methods. Rather, the purpose here is to provide an outline of a few typical cooperative procedures that might also be considered suitable for foreign language teaching. Noticeably, there are other techniques³, too, used in foreign language teaching, such as forward and reverse snowball, rotating circle, crossover, three-step interview and constructive controversy. Moreover, mixed techniques might be used.

³ For a more comprehensive presentation of various cooperative techniques, see e.g. Johnson et. al 1991, Kearney 1993, Korpela 1992, and Slavin et. al. (eds.) 1985.

3.2.1 Jigsaw

In most works on cooperative learning, jigsaw is presented as one of the most widely known and most frequently used methods of cooperative teaching. It has also been used as a basis for many later modifications (for example, synergogy and revolving circle described in e.g. Korpela 1992).

Jigsaw was developed in the 1970s in the United States by Aronson (Aronson and Goode 1980). Tensions between different racial or ethnic groups were still rather acute at the time of desegregation. Thus, the intrinsic motivation for developing a technique of this sort was the willingness to enhance cooperation between different ethnic groups and create an atmosphere of interdependence: "To encourage students to turn to each other as resources, we made sure that success was incompatible with individual competitiveness and that only through cooperative effort among the students in a group could success be achieved. In addition, we tried to provide a format through which students could learn the skills necessary to cooperate effectively" (Aronson and Goode 1980:48).

When doing jigsaw, learners are divided in base or home groups of three to six with resulting groups being, at best, designed to be heterogeneous in terms of ability, race and sex. Each member of a group is given only a part of the lesson. One way is to divide the lesson by having each part on a separate card or a learning sheet. After giving each learner a part to be responsible for, the counterparts from different groups, i.e. the learners having the same assigned part of the lesson, gather in expert groups. In these groups the learners study and discuss their part of the lesson and how best to teach it. The next step is to have the learners return to their base groups and teach their part of the lesson to other members of the group. (Korpela 1992.)

Another variation of this technique is jigsaw II (Slavin 1985), which was designed, among other things, to simplify the preparations required of teachers to use the method. In jigsaw II, learners work in four- or five-member teams. Instead of being assigned unique sections of a lesson, all learners read narrative materials such as a chapter of a book, a short story or a biography. However, each team member is given a special topic to become an expert on. Learners discuss their topics in expert groups and then return back to their home groups to teach the others what they have learned. Finally, the learners take quizzes on the material which result in both individual and team scores. Here, competitive motives are used to facilitate cooperation and learning, which, however, has attracted some criticism (Kagan 1985).

Slavin (1990b) has reported in his summary of research that the results of using jigsaw are mixed: either positive (2 studies), negative results (3 studies) or not significant results (3 studies). However, the use of jigsaw and cooperative learning in general has been found to increase students' liking of their classmates and to increase significantly their self-esteem (e.g. Cole and Smith 1993).

3.2.2 Student team learning

Student team learning methods are cooperative learning techniques developed and researched by Slavin at the Johns Hopkins University. The main idea behind this method of cooperative learning is that the task of students is not to do something as a team but to learn something as a team. In addition to the idea of cooperative work, the use of team goals and team success are emphasised. Team success can only be achieved if all members of the team learn the objectives being taught (Korpela 1992:31).

Student team learning consists of four main methods: student teams-achievement divisions (STAD) and teams-games-tournaments (TGT) for all subject areas and grades in the elementary school, team-assisted individualisation (TAI) for mathematics and cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC) for reading and writing in grades 3-6. Slavin (1985) adds Jigsaw II as one method of student team learning but as it has already been introduced above (see section 3.2.1) it will not be addressed here.

In student teams-achievement divisions, after the teacher has presented the lesson, students meet in small groups to master a set of worksheets on the lesson and then to take a quizz on the material. There is a detailed scoring system that allows students to earn points after the teacher has presented the lesson for their groups. In addition, a "base score" is periodically adjusted for each student; the students earn points for their group for improvement over past performance.

Teams-games-tournaments is basically identical to student teams-achievement divisions, only the quizzes are replaced with academic game tournaments and individual improvement scores are replaced with a bumping system to ensure students' equal opportunity to earn points for their team.

The team-assisted individualisation method is, as pointed out above, aimed at grades 3 through 6, but it has also been used in higher grade levels. Team-assisted individualisation is almost always used without assistance such as aides or volunteers and it employs several principles introduced in Slavin (1990a). Team-assisted individualisation is primarily designed for teaching mathematics. Therefore, it will not be described in more detail here.

The cooperative integrated reading and composition program consists of three principal elements: 1) basal-related activities, 2) direct instruction in reading comprehension and 3) integrated language arts/writing. Positive

results, that is, increased student achievement, have been gained through the use of this method (see e.g. Slavin 1990a). However, it seems that these elements have been designed in view of L1 teaching and henceforth can be assumed to be of relatively little interest from the point of view of foreign language teaching.

3.2.3 Learning together

The last method of cooperative learning to be introduced here is called learning together, or circles of learning, and it is based on the ideas of David and Roger Johnson. Korpela (1992:31) claims that despite the fact that they have studied cooperation for decades, the Johnsons have not provided an easily tangible method for cooperative learning. In the light of present research and other literature, Korpela's remark seems justifiable. However, learning together has been described as closest to pure cooperation (e.g. Slavin 1985), which is the reason for introducing it here.

In learning together students work in small groups to complete a single worksheet for which the group receives praise and recognition. According to Slavin (1985:8), this method of cooperative learning emphasises 1) training students to be good group members and 2) continuous evaluation of group functioning by group members. Furthermore, Korpela (1992) remarks that this method can also be characterised by division of labour and group rewards.

Learning together is not very explicitly definable. In their works (e.g. *Circles of learning* 1990 and *Cooperation in the classroom* 1991) the Johnsons emphasise the use and importance of the five elements of cooperative learning (see section 3.1) and it is these elements which might best characterise the method. Furthermore, these five principles behind the

method provide the basis for most cooperative applications, which makes Learning together worth describing here. However, the definition being ambiguous and very theoretical, it seems laborious to implement Learning together as such in classroom practice.

3.3 The role of learners

The role of learners in cooperative learning has been indirectly described above, when discussing different elements and techniques involved in cooperative learning. However, it might be worthwhile to define explicitly the role that the learner has in the cooperative classroom as compared to more traditional techniques.

To begin with, the learner's learning environment changes, both on a concrete and an abstract level (Koppinen and Pollari 1993:11-25). The physical surroundings undergo a change in that the learners face their fellow students instead of looking at each others' backs. On the abstract level, the learners start to work more together: as Koppinen and Pollari (1993:14) remark, learners use common material and negotiate with their same-aged group members using a language and way of thinking common to that particular age group. This makes understanding easier and learning more interesting.

Also, the learning atmosphere changes to a more safer one. In the optimal learning situation, learners do not have to feel anxious, for instance, they do not have to be afraid of being made fun of for giving a false answer. In addition, Koppinen and Pollari (1993) picture a cooperative classroom in which the relationship between the teacher and learners can be maintained by discussing problems openly and finding a solution to them together.

In addition, when adopting cooperative techniques in the classroom, it is not only the teacher who has to be committed to that approach. Rather, the whole learning group ought to take responsibility for their learning and commit to the long-term process of cooperative learning. Moreover, the more independent and responsible learners become, the more time and opportunity the teacher will have to monitor their progress and concentrate on learners as individuals (Kohonen 1992b:223).

3.4 The role of the teacher

In spite of all the responsibility of learning given to the cooperative learner, the teacher still has quite a few demands if he/she desires to make the cooperative classroom work properly, that is, effectively and productively. For one, Jonhson et al. (1990:41-64) list a number of duties that the teacher should be prepared to do when committing him/herself to cooperative learning. (The short listing that follows is a modification and summary of those presented by Johnson et al.)

First, **planning** includes items such as specifying the instructional objectives, i.e. what the skills and abilities are to be developed, grouping, i.e. deciding on the size of the group and assigning students to groups, choosing and providing appropriate material and assigning roles to students. Second, **arranging a lesson** means defining the objectives of learning collaboratively, promoting students' as well as goal interdependence, explaining the academic task at hand and setting a time limit. The teacher also structures individual accountability as "the purpose of a cooperative group is to maximize the learning of each member" (Johnson et al. 1990:52) and defines explicitly the expected behavior from students and how it will be monitored. Also, the cooperation of groups should be promoted and their cooperative skills intervened when necessary. Third, **monitoring** suggests that the teacher

ensures that everyone makes an effort to reach the group goal. In addition, the teacher monitors how students work and gives assistance when needed. Finally, providing a closure by **assessing and reflecting on group functioning** is an important part of a cooperative lesson. The teacher gives students oral feedback based on his/her observations and finally evaluates their learning by administering a test. Moreover, group members are asked to reflect on their own learning.

To sum up, there is a large number of demands set for the teacher applying cooperative learning techniques; it, indeed, seems probable that the work load of a teacher will not become any lighter by adopting cooperative techniques. On the contrary, the teacher has to be prepared to scrutinise the theory behind those techniques and devote much of her time to planning and, finally, to executing them in the classroom.

The ideal cooperative classroom might be exactly as described above. However, it seems hard to believe that an average teacher trying to cope with an average group of pupils simultaneously being pressured to get results in a limited span of time could manage all this. It seems reasonable to assume that these idealised pictures of cooperative learning are presented as a goal to strive for to those who have committed themselves to this method. Moreover, these descriptions can appear as overwhelming demands for those who might wish to try out cooperative techniques but not to adopt them as the dominant form of learning. In the light of many of the handbooks on cooperative learning available, it is exactly this that might be seen as the disadvantage of cooperative learning.

Obviously, it has to be admitted that any handbooks are hardly produced without giving guidelines as to how to gain the best possible outcome. Nevertheless, considering the educational reality that many teachers are confronted with, it might be worthwhile to consider providing variations or

modifications for those teachers who do not wish to commit themselves to cooperative learning for the rest of their working lives but who simply would like to resort to it for the sake of variety.

4 IMPLICATIONS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH: REASONS FOR USING COOPERATIVE LEARNING

There must be a reason why cooperative learning appeals to teachers even if its use requires them to make such an effort. Sharan (1990) lists some of the positive effects that cooperative learning can have on learning. First, the improvement of students' academic achievement and promotion of high-level thinking are to be named. Second, positive interpersonal and inter-group relations among students in school can be promoted. She further remarks that these might account for at least some enthusiasm that teachers have for cooperative learning.

Quite a considerable amount of research has been conducted in the field of cooperative learning. More specifically, the influence of cooperative learning on learning has frequently been under scrutiny. Sahlberg and Leppilampi (1994:82) even suggest that the investigation of those effects has produced more information than there is about any other individual area of learning or teaching. However, only a few of the studies to examine cooperative learning have been conducted from the point of view of foreign language teaching.

Therefore, this chapter is a short summary of a number of studies carried out on the positive effects of cooperative learning. Clearly, the scope of this presentation is limited. However, an attempt is made to provide a concise outline of the most frequently found advantages that cooperative techniques have had on learning. Despite the numerous advantages observed, however, some points of criticism have also been put forward. Therefore, the present chapter will not only concentrate on describing the positive effects of cooperative learning but some of the possible handicaps will be discussed, too.

4.1 Learners' motivation

"Motivation is most commonly viewed as a combination of the perceived likelihood of success and the perceived incentive for success" (Johnson et al. 1991:29), and it is an important factor when discussing teaching and learning. Research has shown that the use of cooperative methods can, indeed, promote student motivation. Sharan and Shaulov (1990) suggest that there are two variables central in explaining the superior motivating effects of cooperative learning. Those are positive social facilitation and peer acceptance in small groups and enhanced involvement in decision making regarding learners' own work.

In their study carried out in sixth-grade classrooms in Haifa, Sharan and Shaulov (1990) report that cooperative learning affects student motivation to learn more than does whole-class instruction. Further, they remark that cooperative learning finds an active role for every learner and is therefore effective. They note that this involvement in learning is most often accompanied by a decline in students' disruptive behavior. Thus, cooperative learning can be seen as making school more engaging and less boring for students. Importantly, motivation to learn also strongly affects academic achievement. Similar findings have been attained in other studies, too. For example, cooperative learning has been found to encourage students participation (see e.g. Cole and Smith 1993, Craig and Bright 1994, Gunderson and Johnson 1980, and Prapphal 1991).

However, the differences in motivation between learners in cooperative and traditional classrooms have not always been found to be significant. Besides, Sharan and Shaulov (1990) remark that learner's motivation is not only affected through the instructional goal structure but also through other factors, such as social status and prior level of achievement.

4.2 Achievement

Sharan and Shaulov (1990) point out that cooperative learning is by far not the only factor to enhance achievement. Yet, quite a few researchers have been interested in the relationship of cooperative learning and academic achievement, and positive results have been gained. Qin et al. (1995) have examined 46 studies on cooperation and problem solving and found that members of cooperative teams outperformed individuals competing with each other. However, the superiority of cooperation was not at its best on linguistic problems.

Slavin (1990a) carried out three studies to investigate the impact of a program of cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC). Two of the studies investigated the impact of the full CIRC program and one study was designed to evaluate the components of that program. Overall, the effects of the CIRC program were found to be quite positive: in achievement tests, CIRC students achieved significantly more than control students.

Studies on academic achievement and cooperative learning has resulted in somewhat diverse findings. In other words, the influence of cooperative learning on learners' academic achievement has not always been significant. For instance, Cole and Smith (1993) report that no significant differences between cooperative and traditional classrooms were found. Similar findings have been gained for example by Seppänen and Suikki (1997).

4.3 Cognitive skills and learning strategies

Because cooperative learning has an impact on learners' achievement, one might assume that it automatically applies to the development of learners' cognitive skills. Several authors indeed indicate that cooperative learning not

only adds to achievement scores but also facilitates the learning process (e.g. Gunderson and Johnson 1980, Heikkala 1997, Prapphal 1991, Qin et al. 1995, and Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994). Johnson and Johnson (1974:219-221) postulate that a beneficial cognitive outcome can most likely be gained when students are given tasks including problem solving.

However, as Slavin (1977:641) points out, improvement in achievement does not necessarily imply improvement in cognitive skills. He explains this by suggesting that problem solving tasks, which the Johnsons (1974) find most useful for cooperative learning, do not actually occupy a significant amount of time in school curricula. In the case of foreign language teaching, this, in fact, seems more than probable. Slavin himself mentions mathematics, language (supposedly L1) and reading as subjects allowing little problem solving tasks. He does not deny the benefits of cooperation among peers, e.g. an improved social atmosphere, but he disputes cooperative techniques not developing skills such as reading and language. However, an improved social climate in the classroom might also facilitate the learning of these and other skills. For instance, the theory of experiential language learning emphasises the importance of learners' subjective experiences, attitudes and feelings about their own learning (Kohonen 1992a). In fact, Kohonen proposes that cooperative learning could offer a means of improving learners' self-image and self-directedness and promoting thus good learning results.

Sahlberg and Leppilampi (1994:68) claim cooperative techniques to help learners develop different kinds of learning strategies. Indeed, learners have been reported to gain good results in cooperative groups. However, corresponding results have not always been gained on subsequent cognitive performance (Slavin 1977). This might imply that suitable learning strategies have not been adopted after all.

4.4 Social skills and self-esteem

Improved social skills and self-esteem are probably the most significant and obvious benefits gained through the use of cooperative learning techniques. Based on her study, Prapphal (1991) reports cooperative learning to create a friendly and relaxing atmosphere and thus resulting in lower affective filters, which in her opinion might hinder learning. Similar results have been gained by several other authors, too. For example, Sharan and Shaulov (1990) and Cole and Smith (1993) observed progress in learners' peer support and willingness to work together. Subsequently, as pointed out above, a safe social environment has been found to foster learning, too (Kohonen 1992a). Moreover, Craig and Bright (1994) list a number of benefits of social learning: it gives students ideas as they can be clued by others. Thus learners can contribute to each others' learning. In addition, knowledge gets socially constructed.

In a safe learning environment created by cooperative group work, learners can more easily participate in the learning process: they do not have to fear being ridiculed or humiliated e.g. for giving a false answer (Koppinen and Pollari 1993:24-38). In a small, heterogeneous group it is also easier to express one's ideas. In the beginning of cooperative group work, however, learners might feel insufficient and insecure. Nevertheless, better self-esteem that is needed for learning to take place is usually what follows from successful use of cooperative learning (Koppinen and Pollari 1993, Kohonen 1990 and Kohonen 1992a). Furthermore, according to Koppinen and Pollari (1993:59), the growth of learner responsibility can be enhanced by the use of the cooperative method: it is rewarding for learners to be able to give information to one's peers than to the teacher who already knows the answers. However, the teacher, might not always know all the answers. Perhaps dialogue and negotiation could be adopted in the classroom, too.

5 PREVIOUS EXPERIENCES OF IMPLEMENTING COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM

There is a number of factors that affect teachers' classroom behaviour although only a few of them can be discussed here. The importance of teachers' underlying philosophies or views of learning will be viewed. In addition, an attempt will be made to enlighten the process of making cooperative learning (or, in fact, any other method) part of a teacher's curriculum and classroom practice. The factors involved in that process are plenty. Therefore, the most significant ones from the point of view of the present study will be considered in the following.

5.1 Teaching philosophies

In today's educational world a significant concept seems to be constructivism. The main idea behind this view of learning can actually be deduced from its name: learners are supposed to construct knowledge on their own while the teacher's role is to act as an observer of the learning process and a resource person for learners. Kohonen (1992a:30) discusses experiential learning as a form of constructivism and he defines the core of constructivism by contrasting it with another teaching paradigm, behaviorism. He notes that current pedagogical thinking is "shifting away from the traditional behavioristic model of teaching as transmission of knowledge towards an experiential model whereby teaching is seen as transformation of existing or partly understood knowledge, based on constructivist views of learning".

Constructivism is not only talked about but even preferred in the current curricula in Finland. For example, the framework curricula for the comprehensive school and upper secondary school present constructivist

ideas as the guiding principle (*Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet* 1994⁴). First, these framework curricula describe the prevailing notion of learning as one emphasising the learner's active role as an organiser of his/her own knowledge structures. Second, the role of the teacher is described as being the learners' guide and the designer of various learning environments. Further, the framework curricula describe learning as social interaction and mention the ability to cooperate constructively as a prerequisite for a civilised person. The importance of versatile teaching methods is emphasised. Accordingly, Kohonen (1992a:39) establishes that "it is important for teachers to clarify their basic educational philosophy and relate this to the nationally and locally defined educational goals and instructional aims".

Furthermore, Sahlberg and Leppilampi (1994) claim that cooperative methods should not be the only prevailing classroom practice. Rather, cooperative learning should be gradually implemented and simultaneously complemented with alternative methods and goal structures. They suggest that cooperative methods only constitute some 50 percent of all the methods used in the classroom. Sahlberg and Leppilampi mention that the Johnsonian approach expects cooperative learning to constitute some 70 to 80 per cent of all classroom activities. Johnson et al. (1991) admit that competitive and individualistic work forms should complement teaching when appropriate. They postulate that other goals are important in order to make students able to e.g. compete for fun or lead an individualistic learning trail of their own. However, Johnson et al. strongly suggest that cooperative learning should be used at least 60 per cent of time.

Whether the amount of methods other than cooperation is 20 or 40 percent, it seems too little. Even the framework curricula for comprehensive school

⁴ From this section onwards, *Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet* 1994 will be abbreviated and referred to as *Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994.

and upper secondary school (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994) encourage teachers to use a variety of methods. These curricula consider wide and versatile education and knowledge structures important for learners' all-round education. Furthermore, the ability to look at things from different aspects is viewed essential. It seems improbable that this can be achieved if the only method used is cooperative learning. Undeniably, it has its benefits but other aspects are certainly needed.

It is important for teachers to set clear goals for themselves as well as for learners. Achieving these goals is to a large extent defined by a teacher's own teaching philosophy and principles that he/she considers important. A supporter of the behavioristic view is not very likely to adopt a method like cooperative learning, which is largely based on learners' own construction of meanings and knowledge. However, a constructivist thinker might find cooperative learning worth trying out. If it does not work, there are plenty of other constructivist methods to use. Importantly, neither constructivism nor behaviorism works in all situations and learning environments. Therefore, it is essential that teachers do not blindly follow one particular model at all costs. Rather, it might be favourable to use one's own judgement and adapt to various situations by choosing the model appropriate for that particular learning situation in question.

5.2 Cooperative learning as part of the Finnish national curricula

The national framework curricula for the comprehensive and upper secondary schools in Finland are quite general and do not specifically and consistently prefer any teaching method over others (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994). However, the objectives of education are described in more detail.

First of all, the national curriculum for the comprehensive school expresses that an objective of basic education is to provide, among other things, opportunities for social growth and cooperative work. Furthermore, according to the framework curriculum, an ability to work in a group and express oneself explicitly and clearly are preconditions for successful learning. Also, the skills of self-evaluation and taking responsibility are considered important. (*Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:9-12, 68.) The framework curriculum for the upper secondary school also adds that students need to be able to work independently, though not completely alone. On the contrary, the curriculum promotes the use of cooperative learning as a form of independent learning. Thus, students learn to take responsibility for their learning without the teacher directly intervening in the process. (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994:24.)

The national framework curricula not only define the basic objectives of teaching but they also present implications for foreign language teaching. To begin with, in the comprehensive school, learning skills ought to be practiced and developed both alone and in a group. Also, learners ought to be able to use foreign languages for communication, creative activities, thinking and searching for information. (*Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:68.) It seems cooperative learning could be a way to establish this. In addition, the framework curriculum for the upper secondary school suggests that foreign language teaching should give students the facility to take part in international cooperation and work in international contexts (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994:60).

5.3 Teachers as practitioners of cooperative methods

There is a great number of studies concentrating on the impact of cooperative learning on learners. However, only a few researchers have

provided insight into how teachers experience the use of current techniques, particularly cooperative learning. The studies available show that even if teachers had clear visions about the principles according to which they would like to teach, the reality might not be that rosy. In the following, some of teachers' experiences of and feelings about cooperative learning will be discussed. These could be roughly divided in positive and negative accounts. In addition, an important precondition for the successful implementation of cooperative learning, i.e. collegial cooperation, will be scrutinised. Noteworthy, as pointed out above, the amount of studies concentrating on foreign language teaching is small. Therefore, in the following summary of research, the emphasis cannot be on foreign language teachers' views.

5.3.1 Experiences of using cooperative learning

To begin with, cooperative learning often arouses a variety of feelings in teachers. Some might love it while others find it completely rubbish. For example, in their pro gradu theses, Savolainen (1997) and Kivi (1998) examined teachers' views and experiences of cooperative learning. They both came to the conclusion that most of the teachers they had interviewed had adopted a fairly positive attitude towards cooperative learning. However, teachers also found this teaching method quite demanding and laborious at times, especially in the beginning. Kivi concluded that the knowledge of cooperative theory was essential for the method to work properly. Similar results have been gained in other studies, too. For example, Sahlberg and Leppilampi (1994:82-86) and Sharan (1990) point out that cooperative learning can only succeed and be productive if the particular way of thinking characteristic of cooperative learning has been adopted and the method is applied correctly. Furthermore, Savolainen (1997) formulates that teachers also have to be committed to individual growth and professional

development. She also sees teachers' self-evaluation as crucial for success in using cooperative learning techniques.

Seppänen and Suikki (1997) and Heikkala (1997) described cooperative learning as useful though it was not considered significantly better than other methods. Rather, Heikkala reported cooperative learning to be time-consuming and sometimes noisy. She also described it as somewhat difficult to control. However, it is, in fact, the learners who are supposed to "control" the cooperative learning process. Of course, learners might get carried away with the task, which could be one of the disadvantages of this method (Koppinen and Pollari 1993).

Further, Davis (1997:265) indicates that many teachers criticise the new paradigm of learning, i.e. group work, and deem it as a "fashionable time-waster". According to him, especially young and novice teachers have had difficulties in creating original tasks or carrying out learner-centered tasks. Davis explains this by young teachers' inexperience and the loss of teacher control over the class. Kohonen (1992a) agrees with Davis's observation in that he claims that much of cooperative work is still, in fact, teacher-centered. He further remarks that careful pedagogical thinking has to be given to the learner's role in the whole process of learning.

5.3.2 Wider sense of cooperation

The literature on cooperative learning lists quite a few preconditions for the successful implementation of cooperative learning. However, due to the limited scope of the present study, the aim here is to only look at one of these preconditions. Namely, the importance of collaboration among teachers will be discussed. Actually, the meaning of the term 'cooperative learning' has actually been extended to denote collaboration among teachers, too

(Sahlberg 1996:118). In fact, researchers of cooperative learning propose that in order for successful cooperative learning to take place, teachers ought to be able to cooperate among themselves as well as in the classroom (see e.g. Kohonen 1990, Kohonen and Leppilampi 1992, and Slavin 1990a).

In other words, cooperative learning cannot work optimally unless the idea of cooperation is adopted wider in the educational environment. For instance, Graves and Graves (1985:405) suggest that cooperative learning ought to be "an inextricable part of a total social context" which "arises spontaneously from interaction within the group". According to this view, cooperation ought to be part of curricular and school concerns, i.e. cooperation ought to be applied beyond the classroom, which is quite a challenge to teachers.

Indeed, collegial cooperation is a frequently occurring concept (e.g. Johnson et al. 1991 and Kohonen 1990b). Johnson et al. (1991:I:3) point out that collegial support groups are necessary for the successful implementation of cooperative learning. Moreover, they also find collegial cooperation an important factor that can improve the quality of life within most schools. In fact, Kohonen (1990b:97) remarks that collegial cooperation is vital for the developmental process within a school.

Furthermore, when the development of local curricula is concerned, cooperative work is promoted. The framework curriculum for the upper secondary school (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994:19) establishes that it is important for schools to cooperate with other intermediate grades (F. keskiasteen oppilaitokset) and be in contact with the society outside the school. Further, cooperation among colleagues is argued for in the development of curricula (*Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:10).

6 THE PRESENT STUDY: VIEWS ON COOPERATIVE LEARNING HELD BY ENGLISH AND GERMAN TEACHERS

In the following, the framework for the present study will be introduced in detail. In addition, justification, that is, the need for this particular study will be manifested. Furthermore, issues such as the research themes, pilot study and data collection, and the way of coding it will be scrutinised and discussed.

6.1 Research questions

Despite the advantages of cooperative learning and its successful use, for instance in the USA, a few questions arise. It seems reasonable to ask whether cooperative work might also have shortcomings. Undeniably, cooperative learning can have a positive effect, among other things, on learners' motivation, achievement and social skills. However, passionate supporters of cooperative learning hardly admit there being any severe shortcomings in the method. Nevertheless, cooperative learning is clearly more suitable for teaching some themes than others (Kuitunen 1993). Also, it is not simple to implement and it requires strong determination to be carried out successfully. Moreover, it is a long-term process, which in itself, sets demands for a teacher. (Johnson and Johnson 1990.) Further, teachers, as individuals, make subjective choices and may have different perceptions of cooperative learning (Savolainen 1997). Finally, cooperative learning might just not be suitable for every group of students.

A few potential shortcomings of cooperative learning have already been introduced above. However, empirical evidence lacks: only a relatively few studies have been carried out in order to investigate the usefulness of cooperative learning, especially in foreign language teaching. Moreover, as

there is plenty of evidence for successful use of cooperative learning abroad, an intriguing point of view could be Finnish. Because Finnish culture is different from that e.g. in the USA, one might assume that the attitudes towards and implementation of cooperative learning could also differ.

Therefore, the present study is set out to examine views on cooperative learning held by Finnish foreign language teachers. Issues like how teachers perceive the concept cooperative learning and whether they are familiar with its workings, will be of interest. Also, teachers' experiences of and attitudes towards cooperative learning are essential for it is the teacher who has the foremost influence on which teaching method is applied in the classroom. Teachers' opinions and views presumably affect their working practices and are therefore of significance.

Furthermore, teachers' collegial cooperation will be scrutinised for it has an significant role in successful implementation of cooperative learning. Also, the importance of in-service training for teachers' professional development will be examined, particularly from the point of view of adopting current teaching methods. In short, the research problems could be formulated as follows:

- 1) Perceptions of cooperative learning
- 2) Experiences of and attitudes towards cooperative learning
- 3) National and local curricula vs. teachers' practices
- 4) The importance of collegial cooperation and in-service training for professional growth

6.2 Subjects

For the present study, 11 foreign language teachers in a middle-sized town (ca. 15000 citizens) in western Finland were interviewed. More specifically,

these were teachers of either English or German or both and they worked in comprehensive and upper secondary schools⁵: 6 of the teachers taught English and 2 German in the comprehensive school. Besides, two of them taught both subjects and one additionally taught Swedish. In the upper secondary school, there were 3 English teachers and 2 German teachers. One of these also taught Swedish and one Latin. The teaching experience of the teachers varied significantly. Experience of one to 32 years was manifested, the mean length of teaching experience being 12.8 years. Noticeably, only two of the teachers were male, whereas the great majority, i.e. nine teachers, were female.

Teachers of English and German were chosen for the present study for two reasons. First, there was a wish to examine whether cooperative learning is used more for teaching a language which learners have studied for years (English) than for teaching a language of which learners usually have less experience (German). Second, these languages are of special interest for the present writer, her being a future English and German teacher herself.

6.3 Method

The method chosen to approach the research themes was the semi-structured interview. The interview was chosen for its in-depth character. By interviewing teachers it is believed that more insightful information about their thoughts can be obtained than for instance by conducting a nationwide quantitative study with closed or even open-ended questions. For the purposes of the present study, the semi-structured interview seemed optimal in that foreign language teachers' views underlying their classroom practices were examined.

⁵ The schools under examination will be referred to as school A (the comprehensive school, grades 7 to 9) and school B (the upper secondary school).

Thus, being semi-structured, the interviews were "flexibly organized guided by more general questions aimed at uncovering subjective meanings" (Holstein and Gubrium 1997:116). More specifically, during the interviews, only the interview schedule⁶, i.e., an outline of the themes to be covered, was at hand. Furthermore, although the flexible structure of the interview allowed the respondents to elaborate fairly freely, a list of particular themes ensured that it was the same themes that were handled in every discussion. In addition, the list is a helpful means when coding the data. A similar approach has been proposed in a number of studies. For example, Pagliarini Cox and de Assis-Peterson (1999) and Hirsjärvi and Hurme (1982) argue for the semi-structured interview.

Before conducting the actual interviews, any possible shortcomings had to be detected. More specifically, a pilot study was carried out in order to discover whether the the interview schedule actually gave the information needed. In fact, Eskola and Suoranta (1998) stress the need to carry out a preliminary interview with an outside respondent. In this case, the pilot interview was carried out with a Swedish teacher who worked in the upper secondary school in the very same town as the actual interviewees. A foreign language teacher working in the same educational environment with the respondents was chosen in order to gain detailed information as to how to improve the interview schedule. The presumption was that some issues not taken into consideration in advance could emerge in the pilot study. However, after conducting the preliminary interview, the schedule was regarded as thorough as the research themes of the present study required.

⁶ see Appendix 1

6.4 Data collection

The actual interviews were carried out successfully during one week in January 2000. They resulted in a pile of material to work on. Even the present researcher's own inexperience in interviewing did not seem to interfere the respondents. Nevertheless, despite the pilot study, at least one shortcoming was detected: teacher feedback was not investigated in the interviews although it is important when using cooperative learning. Furthermore, the data might have been more thorough had the means of observation been used, too. Monitoring the language lessons of the respondents could have given insight into their actual classroom procedures. Therefore, the reliability of the respondents' accounts could have been evaluated by viewing them in the light of the observations made in the classroom. However, in the scope of the present study, it was not possible to tackle such an amount of data that would most probably have been provided by the interviews and observation.

Furthermore, interviews, be they highly structured, semi-structured or free flowing conversations, are interactional. Thus, Holstein and Gubrium (1997:113) point out that the interview conversation is "framed as a potential source of bias, error, misunderstanding or misdirection". However, they note that the corrective is simple: if the interviewer asks questions properly, the desired information will be elicited by the respondent.

It seems that the present study is not very difficult to define in its orientation. Seliger and Shohamy (1989) discuss different scientific orientations and based on their reasoning, the orientation of the present study can be analysed. To begin with, it is clearly not quantitative nor experimental. Therefore, the only difficulty there might be is to classify the study as either qualitative or descriptive. In the study, a phenomenon, that is, teachers' subjective meanings, is described without any experimental manipulation.

Furthermore, there are no hypotheses to be tested, which might be deemed as a feature of qualitative research. However, due to its deductive character, the present study can be classified as predominantly descriptive.

6.5 Coding of the data

The interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed⁷. In the process of transcription, features such as pausing and stress were considered. From a discourse analytic point of view, some features of interaction and speech might have been coded in more detail. However, the present study was not discourse analytic and thus the emphasis in the transcriptions was on the content.

The interviews were conducted in Finnish, the participants' mother tongue. Therefore, for the purposes of the present study, any quotation from the interviews had to be translated into English. Thus, the very content of the accounts might have undergone a slight change in the process. Furthermore, some of the accounts comprised considerable repeating or searching for a particular word. When this was not regarded as meaningful or indispensable for the message itself, it was deleted in the translation in order to ensure the readability of the quotation.

⁷ The transcriptions of two interviews have been included as samples, see Appendix 2.

7 FINDINGS

In the following, the findings gained in the present study will be introduced and discussed. In order to ensure the readability of the chapter, the headings of the sections are predominantly derived from the research problems, which were: 1) perceptions of cooperative learning, 2) experiences of and attitudes towards cooperative learning, 3) national and local curricula vs. teachers' practices and 4) the importance of collegial cooperation and in-service training for professional growth.

7.1 Perceptions of cooperative learning

Previous research on the implementation of cooperative learning indicates that the successful use of cooperative methods requires quite a thorough theoretical knowledge on the part of the teacher (see e.g. Kivi 1998, Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994, Savolainen 1997, Sharan 1990). Similar remarks have been made by Kohonen (1990b), who emphasises that teachers ought to acknowledge the teaching principles underlying their work practices in order to be able to develop professionally. Besides, Davis (1997) points out that teachers need to engage in action research to be able to give up preexisting assumptions about designing activities and implementing these in their classrooms. Furthermore, the framework curricula for the Finnish comprehensive school (*Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:9) and upper secondary school (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994:11) stress the need for teachers to develop their own work continuously.

Thus, if teachers wish to implement a method, such as cooperative learning, successfully and productively in classrooms, they ought to have both knowledge about the theory and principles behind the method and more practical knowledge about the workings and procedures of the method in

question. Therefore, the teachers interviewed were asked, **firstly**, what they knew about cooperative learning and how they would define it in their own words (theoretical knowledge). **Second**, the basic principles of structuring cooperative work were investigated (practical knowledge). **Third**, the teachers' ideas about the purposes and effects of cooperative group work were under examination.

The interviews were succesful at least in that they provided quite a lot of material to work on. In the following, the findings of teachers' background knowledge will be reported and discussed.

7.1.1 Theoretical knowledge: definitions of cooperative learning

To begin with, most of the teachers interviewed had heard about cooperative learning, though on the other hand there were two persons who had practically no theoretical knowledge at all. Thus the interviewees could be roughly divided in three groups based on their level of theoretical knowledge of cooperative learning:

Group 1) teachers who **could define cooperative learning** on a general level using accurate terms,

Group 2) teachers who **had heard of cooperative learning** and remembered a few related concepts, and

Group 3) teachers who **had not heard of cooperative learning**, or did not recall the method until a few hints had been provided.

Actually, the majority of the interviewees (7/11) fell into group 1 and they had quite a good understanding of the theory underlying cooperative learning. A fifth of the interviewees (2/11) represented group 2 and similarly, another fifth (2/11) of the participants fitted the description of group 3.

Importantly, this categorisation is not supposed to label the interviewees as either professionals or rookies based on their level of knowledge about this particular method. Rather, this grouping only serves as a helpful means to structure the analysis of the findings.

Group 1

The representatives of group 1, i.e. teachers who could define cooperative learning in their own terms and were able to elicit the major principles of cooperative learning, were either teachers with a relatively long working experience, approximately 20-30 years, or younger teachers with approximately 2-9 years of teaching experience. This division shows that age does not seem to be significant as far as theoretical knowledge of cooperative learning.

The teachers' definitions of cooperative learning varied, however, to some extent. Nonetheless, most of these definitions were descriptions of the jigsaw technique (for a detailed description, see section 3.2.1) as if it represented the whole concept of cooperative learning. No other techniques were even mentioned, let alone described. The descriptions of jigsaw were, nevertheless, quite thorough. The basic structure of a jigsaw classroom, that is, the division of learners into home groups and expert groups, was described in detail. Moreover, the interviewees gave a detailed and practical description of how a subject to be learned could be organised for jigsawing. All of the teachers in group 1 had tried outcooperative group work, here, the jigsaw technique, in their classrooms at least once. Noticeably, however, the older teachers confessed only having tried it out a few times quite a long time ago.

However, none of the teachers could recall anything particular about the origins of cooperative learning, although they were familiar with the actual cooperative procedures. When asked where cooperative learning has come from or who might be the "gurus" of this method, very hesitating comments

were given. After hearing about the United States and the Johnsons, many of the teachers replied something like (translations from Finnish⁸):

Well, I was about to say America but I wasn't quite sure
(female with 32 years of teaching experience) or

Oh yes, I guess I've read about them. (male with 3 years of teaching experience)

Some of the interviewees had attended a course in Tampere and remembered the name of their instructor. The teachers were very careful with their answers, in other words, they did not give any guesses but only said what they were sure about. In the light of this observation, it seems that teachers have adopted the role of a "knower": they do not want to give false information and they only answer when they are quite certain. Perhaps, however, teachers could be learners as well; they do not have to be perfect.

Every one of the teachers in group 1 had gained their information about cooperative learning from various courses they had attended during their working life. Only one had learned about it from her younger colleagues at work. On the courses, lectures and theoretical information and background had been offered. In addition, some of the teachers had used cooperative techniques on the courses. Only two of the interviewees had got acquainted with cooperative learning as early as during their university studies. Most of them had additionally read about the method in *Tempus*, the journal for Finnish foreign language teachers.

Group 2

One of the teachers categorised as group 2 had one year and the other nine years of experience. Neither of them knew very much about cooperative learning and they could not actually define cooperative learning in any detailed way. However, they had at least heard of cooperative learning: they

⁸ All quotations from the interviews are translations from Finnish transcriptions.

recognised the method when a definition⁹ of it was provided. Definitions such as

I've heard it's that when pupils teach each other (female with 17 years of teaching experience) and

[...] they are divided in groups where they study it and then they change and one person moves to another group and teaches it to others (female with 1 year of teaching experience)

came up. These teachers did not remember anything specific about the origins of the cooperative method either. Only one of the two remembered that it might have been an American "invention".

One of the two teachers in group 2 had come across cooperative learning during her studies at the university. The other had heard about it from her colleagues familiar with the method and on a course. Regardless of the source of information, only some theory had been provided. The teachers had not actually practised the use of cooperative methods and perhaps due to that, both of them regarded themselves as too uncertain even to try out this method.

Group 3

Finally, group 3 was represented by two interviewees, one having one year of teaching experience and the other thirteen, and they did not have much previous knowledge about cooperative learning. They gave somewhat lengthy and indefinite comments when talking about the concept cooperative learning:

Well I was just thinking I don't actually have any theoretical information I haven't actually done anything cooperative or practiced it except for what I remember having read you see I only have sort of everyday knowledge so my idea is or what I think it might be is just that together you try to learn together

⁹ See Appendix 1.

and find solutions by working together (female, 1 year's experience)

When provided a concise definition of cooperative learning, only one of them recalled having heard about it during her studies. After seeing the definition, the interviewees probably tried to save their faces by giving rather vague comments, such as:

Well, I don't know you see I might be using that in one form or another all the time... (male with 13 years of teaching experience)

In summary, one could argue that the teachers' theoretical knowledge of cooperative learning was, at the very least, rather unbalanced. Most of the teachers were able to give a definition of cooperative learning, while nearly half of them could not define the method in their own words. Only very few of the teachers remembered that cooperative learning originally came from the United States being unable to recall any names related to this method. It is noteworthy that even the teachers possessing theoretical background knowledge, only acknowledged the jigsaw technique as representing the whole idea of cooperative learning. The majority of these teachers had come across cooperative learning during additional, in-service courses and only one or two during their university studies. Thus, it seems probable that the instructors carrying out the courses present jigsaw as being the only mode of cooperative learning or at least emphasise it over other techniques. Such techniques as e.g. snowball and rotating circles might be quite useful for foreign language teaching and should therefore be brought up more often (for more information on different cooperative techniques, see e.g. Kearney 1993).

7.1.2 Practical knowledge: impact and demands of cooperative learning

The perceptions the teachers had of cooperative learning were divided in two major sections: theoretical knowledge, on the one hand, and practical knowledge, on the other. Here, the purpose is to examine the interviewees' practical knowledge. In other words, the role of the teacher and learners in a cooperative classroom and the goals of cooperative learning will be surveyed. As the teachers' knowledge on how to organise a cooperative lesson (here, actually a jigsaw lesson) was discussed above, it will not be addressed here. Besides, teachers' actual experience on cooperative learning will not be tackled here because a whole section (see section 6.3) will be reserved for it later.

However, it is worthwhile to introduce these items here as they are an essential part of teachers' perception of cooperative learning. When teachers are familiar with the way in which cooperative learning can affect learners and what goals can be achieved by using the method, it might be assumed that an interest in cooperative techniques might arise. In addition, the teacher's role in a cooperative classroom is an important one. Moreover, it is relevant for teachers to know what the demands for a teacher are when applying cooperative learning in their own classroom. Thus, they perhaps would not unrealistically assume to gain good effects with little work. Moreover, if teachers were familiar with the prerequisites for successful cooperative work, they might not be too easily disappointed or shocked by the amount of work needed. Thus, in the following, an attempt will be made to throw some light on teachers' assumptions of the demands and goals of cooperative learning.

Based on their knowledge on the teacher's role in and goals of cooperative learning, the interviewees could not be categorised into three groups, which was the procedure above. Here, all the teachers except for two (of whom

one had just graduated and the other had nearly three decades of teaching experience) could name at least two ways in which learners could benefit from the use of cooperative techniques. The issues named varied although a few of them occurred several times. In the following, they will be enlisted by frequency of occurrence:

- social skills and group skills (6),
- learner responsibility (4),
- empathy and positive learning atmosphere (4),
- cognitive skills (3),
- oral skills (2),
- personal growth,
- self-esteem,
- increased motivation,
- total participation

Social skills and the ability to work in a group were the benefits that occurred most frequently. It seems probable that from the word ‘cooperative learning’, one can assume it to have something to do with working together. Thus, it is fairly easy to guess this benefit or feature of cooperative learning even if a teachers did not actually know much about cooperative learning. However, as most of the teachers knew what cooperative learning was, it could be presumed that they also knew how the method affected learners and learning. This observation gets support from the fact that teachers could name more features than just social skills.

More specifically, several teachers found it important that learners could take more **responsibility** for their and for others’ learning, too. In addition, while working in a cooperative group, learners could, according to the interviewees, learn to take the feelings and opinions of their group mates into consideration. This was found to increase learners’ skills of **empathy** and also the **learning atmosphere** in the classroom. Many interviewees thought

that learners' **cognitive skills** could improve as they were themselves responsible for completing a task. In addition, cooperative learning was also considered useful for practicing **oral skills**. Furthermore, the need for **participation**, increased **self-esteem** and **motivation** were seen as benefits of cooperative learning.

The list above shows that the interviewees knew, or at least assumed, that the use of cooperative learning could have quite a positive impact on learners. Quite importantly, exactly the teachers' assumptions were pursued in this part of the interview. Teachers' attitudes based on experience will be discussed in more detail in section 7.3.3.

The reasons for using cooperative learning (which were learners' motivation, achievement, cognitive skills and learning strategies, social skills and self-esteem) were discussed in chapter 4 above. In the interviews, all these factors but one, i.e. achievement, came up. Intriguingly, only one of the teachers identified cooperative learning as something that could improve learner achievement. Further, the list of motivating factors provided by the interviewees contained items that were not reported in chapter 4. This might also support the interpretation that the teachers find cooperative learning as potentially useful.

Further, in addition to listing potential benefits of cooperative learning, the interviewees were familiar with the needs that ought to be met when implementing cooperative learning. The teacher's role in a cooperative situation was described in a way that could be presented in a handbook. The great majority of the teachers commented on the role of the teacher (9/11) and according to them, the teacher in a cooperative class ought to take on the following responsibilities: preliminary work, careful planning and being an "undercover agent" who guides and helps learners, i. e. a tutor. One of the teachers said she tried to make herself useless in a cooperative classroom.

To sum up, the perceptions the teachers had of cooperative learning varied quite significantly. However, the teacher's age, working history or language were not found to affect their perception of cooperative learning in any significant way. The younger teachers' assumptions and perceptions did not differ from those of the more experienced teachers in any significant way. Further, some differences could have been expected to appear between teachers of English and German and yet, none of significance were found. Nevertheless, considerable variation in individual interviewees' accounts could be manifested.

In the light of these observations made of the interviewees' background knowledge of cooperative learning, it seems that they had rather a good sense of what "should happen" when learning cooperatively. To begin with, they were able to name the basic structure of a cooperative activity, the jigsaw technique. In addition, the teachers knew how the use of cooperative learning could possibly affect learners. Furthermore, the interviewees had such a perception of the teacher's role which could be presented in handbooks on cooperative learning. Nevertheless, these knowledge structures were pretty theoretical and might not be quite easily applicable in real classroom situations. Quite a few of the teachers had actually come across cooperative learning in an educational context, either during their teacher studies at the university or on an extra course while already working as a teacher. However, fairly seldom had any concrete examples been provided as to how to use cooperative learning. Rather, theoretical knowledge had been offered to them.

7.3 The teachers' experience on cooperative learning

In the following, an attempt is made to examine to what extent the teachers had applied cooperative learning in their classrooms and how they had

succeeded in doing so. Furthermore, the actual procedures of their cooperative lessons will be illustrated with a few examples. Then, the interviewees' personal opinions and attitudes of cooperative learning based on their experience will be investigated. Last, the relationship between national and local curricula and the classroom reality will be considered and commented on.

7.3.1 Procedures applied and criticism aroused

In the following, the interviewees' experiences on cooperative learning will be introduced and discussed in more detail. In addition, the procedures applied will be dealt with.

As pointed out above (see section 7.1.1), the teachers often considered the jigsaw technique the same as cooperative learning as a whole. It might be argued that if the teachers only considered jigsaw as a cooperative technique and did not use it, they might claim that they did not use cooperative learning at all in their teaching. However, they might still have used other cooperative techniques though possibly not consciously. Therefore, the evidence gained from the interviews might be to some extent inconclusive.

The interviewees who had used cooperative learning in their classrooms were actually exactly the same teachers who fell into **group 1** in section 7.1.1. They had the most knowledge on the theoretical framework of cooperative learning and perhaps due to this, had interest to see how the method would actually work. However, their experiences of applying cooperative learning were not uniform. On the contrary, quite diverse reactions were reported. **Group 2**, on the other hand, was represented by two teachers who would have liked to try out cooperative techniques, had they more theoretical and practical understanding of the method in question. These were the teachers

who knew the term 'cooperative learning' but could not actually define it in their own words. Finally, **group 3** consisted of the two teachers who knew practically nothing about cooperative learning. After seeing the definition of cooperative learning, they did not consider it suitable for their own teaching, although they admitted it might have some benefits.

Group 1

First of all, teachers of group 1 (7/11) had tried out cooperative learning **at least once**. Two of these had become interested in the method after attending an introductory course a few years earlier. In addition, one teacher had tried out cooperative group work on her own initiative. These three teachers had approximately 30 years of teaching experience. They deemed their experience on the method quite limited in that they had only tried cooperative group work for a short while and returned to their old procedures rather easily. Furthermore, they acknowledged that in order for cooperative learning to succeed, it ought to be carried out persistently for a longer period of time. Actually, these three teachers pointed out that the implementation of cooperative learning might be easier if the method had already been introduced to learners in the first grades of comprehensive school.

The other four teachers in group 1, that is, interviewees with two to ten years of teaching experience, were **occasional users of cooperative learning**. They saw cooperative group work as an alternative form of learning that could be used for the sake of variety. None of these teachers wanted to devote themselves completely to cooperative learning. On the contrary, the use of one single teaching method was considered inadequate to meet the needs of different learners. Moreover, the teachers thought they were using their own modifications of cooperative learning in the classroom. One of the teachers emphasised that she never adopted a method or a technique as such but she always modified it to suit her purposes:

I always take something from one method and something else from another and never that this is the thing for me [...] I always select the parts that I like (female with 2 years of teaching experience)

The lessons during which cooperative group work had been applied, comprised themes or areas such as grammar learning, studying new texts and oral exercises. None of the teachers used any extra material outside the textbook when applying cooperative group work. In fact, one of the teachers said she never brought anything extra for her English lessons.

These teachers listed several **difficulties** they had experienced when using cooperative learning. To begin with, lack of time was emphasised. The implementation of cooperative learning was found very time-consuming, at least in two ways: cooperative tasks have to be planned very carefully in advance and the actual cooperative work in the classroom takes a lot of time. What adds to the time consumed on preparations, is the interviewees' willingness to do their jobs well:

If I just carry it out in a slidshod manner, I would not be satisfied with it and neither would the students. (female with 32 years of teaching experience)

She further remarked that even if she learned new methods and implemented them successfully, she would not gain everyone's approval or enthusiasm. However, she thought it is part of a teacher's job to develop continuously. She thought she had developed, if not knowingly, her style of teaching in that she always had tried to use various approaches in her lessons.

Further, heterogeneous groups were also seen as a disadvantage as the so-called fast learners sometimes felt inhibited by their slower group members. One of the interviewees pointed out that there is no opportunity for diversification when doing cooperative work. In addition, two of these

teachers would have preferred working with a homogeneous group in which learners would have been more alike e.g. in terms of their language proficiency.

Despite these disadvantages of cooperative learning, the teachers were ready to try it out again now that it was brought up. Actually, they were even willing to try using cooperative learning for a longer period of time. However, they felt that some more practice was needed in order to succeed in that task.

Consequently, inexpertise was considered a factor to account for some of the problems the teachers had encountered. For instance, giving instructions was a problematic area for the teachers. Many of them blamed unclear instructions as a reason for their difficulties in the implementation of cooperative learning. Many of these teachers resorted to the learners' mother tongue, i. e. the Finnish language, to ensure that learners understand. Moreover, the teachers in the comprehensive school (grades 7 to 9) considered Finnish a medium to be better listened to and thus it was a way of speeding up the lesson.

Further, the teachers had observed idling when applying cooperative learning. In the interviewees' opinion, some learners saw an opportunity to idle when they were, in fact, supposed to work cooperatively, particularly when teaching and listening to each other. Nevertheless, a few of the teachers mentioned that these "idlers" were often the ones who never were enthusiastic about anything. Accordingly, the teachers emphasised that cooperative learning was not likely to work properly in every group of learners and they preferred working with learners they know best.

All the teachers in group 1 (7/11) had collected or at least made observations on learner feedback. The feedback had not been quite uniform. According to

one of the teachers, some hate it, whereas others love it. Koppinen and Pollari (1993:85) highlight the importance of learner feedback. However, they also point out that the teacher should give either oral or written feedback to learners in order to meet the need for reflection (for more, see section 3.4).

Learner involvement might be enhanced by using authentic extra material. However, several teachers, though by far not all, reported that they did not provide any material outside the textbook. Obviously, extra material meant extra work for the teacher, but that work might very well have been worth a while. Learners' textbooks are, in fact, important and presumably most often well-structured, too. Nevertheless, the textbook is not supposed to be the curriculum.

To sum up, the difficulties the teachers had experienced were quite similar to those reported in previous studies. For example, the teachers found the persistent use of cooperative learning quite troublesome. In fact, Koppinen and Pollari (1993:19) point out that teachers have to be familiar with group processes to be able to stick to cooperative learning and not to give up too easily. Further, lack of proper instructions was seen as a disturbing factor. Johnson and Johnson (1990:23) support this and claim that clear instructions are essential for successful cooperative work. Therefore the interviewees' difficulties in this area might be of significance. However, the teachers' notion of homogeneous groups as optimal for cooperative learning was in controversy with previous research. More specifically, it is generally heterogeneous groups that are preferred in cooperative tasks because that enables slow learners to be supported and helped by their faster group mates (see e.g. Johnson et al. 1991 and Sahlberg and Leppilampi 1994).

Group 2

The teachers in group 2 were those introduced in section 7.1.1. They **did not have any actual experience of using cooperative group work** as part of

their teaching. However, they seemed to be quite optimistic in that they thought they might, in fact, be using parts of cooperative learning (whatever those might be!) constantly in their teaching:

I might be using some cooperative idea every day (female with 2 years of teaching experience) or

I think something like this happens during any lesson (female with 9 years of teaching experience)

Group 3

The two teachers categorised as group 3 **had not tried out cooperative learning** either. In section 7.1.1 above, two of their comments on cooperative learning were quoted. These comments implied that they were not actually against the method, although they had not considered it suitable for their own teaching, at least not for the present. One of the teachers based his reaction on his assumption that the teacher, as a professional, ought to be the ultimate source of information. He did not consider learners at the age of 13 to 16 mature enough to take responsibility for their learning. When given a brief definition of cooperative learning, both teachers, however, admitted that it might be a good idea, although they were not especially enthusiastic about it. Further, similarly to group 2, one of them vaguely implied that he might be using parts of cooperative learning in one way or another in his lessons. However, neither of them had actually tried out cooperative techniques, at least not knowingly.

However much the teachers' experiences varied, there was at least one similarity between them: their views on how to structure a cooperative group. The teachers in group 3 had not tried out cooperative learning but they had used traditional group work as part of their teaching. All teachers except for one (10/11) agreed on letting learners form groups on their own without the teacher intervening in the process. The interviewees did not want to interfere with group formation because they thought learners would not

agree on working with pupils other than their friends. In addition, the group formation process was considered to happen more fluently if learners who normally worked in pairs could just team up with their neighbours, i.e. their friends:

They could choose their teammates on their own, often two pairs formed a group. (female with 30 years of teaching experience)

Another teacher reasoned her choice to give learners free hands by her observation: there is always somebody with whom others do not want to work. She considered it unfair and not productive to force learners to work together with persons they felt antipathies against. She further remarked that group work was not supposed to end up as a quarrel between the teacher and learners:

I don't want to make it a fight but it is a natural situation that you learn in this way (female with 2 years of teaching experience)

Although one of the principles of cooperative group work is the careful structuring of heterogeneous groups, the teachers did not consider it very important even though they were aware of the principle. However, one of the interviewees argued that it was impossible to let learners choose groups to work in. She said that the groups

can never be chosen by the pupils themselves I mean it would not work (female with 32 years of teaching experience).

In summary, the findings in the present study were rather similar to those of Sahlberg's (1996:198-200). He examined teachers' understanding of different teaching methods and analysed their perceptions of their capability to use those methods in the classroom. He came to the conclusion that teachers' level of theoretical knowledge on a teaching method was relatively

higher than their own perception of their capability to implement that method in their classrooms.

Similarly, many of the interviewees of the present study had relatively good background knowledge of cooperative learning and had at least tried out the method. However, only a few of the teachers under scrutiny used cooperative learning constantly as part of their teaching. Thus, similarly to Sahlberg's findings, the interviewees were fairly familiar with the theory of cooperative learning, but the level of using the method (constantly) was not that high.

On the whole, however, one could claim that the teachers seemed to be quite willing to implement various teaching methods, at least cooperative learning, in their classrooms. Nevertheless, sometimes applying a method, in this case, cooperative learning, seemed to be laborous or difficult. Or, a method might be rather unknown to the teachers. Still, the teachers did not seem to be willing to admit rejecting a teaching method altogether. Rather, some of them implied that they might be using cooperative methods on an unconscious level though not having a very solid theoretical background of it. Perhaps our society tends to demand teachers to be perfect. In addition to being aware of the latest trends in foreign language teaching, teachers might feel obliged to offer those to their students. Of course, teachers have to keep up with the continuously changing world and develop themselves, but perhaps they could admit not being able to do everything. In fact, one of the interviewees made a soothing comment: *I'm so satisfied with the way I'm teaching*. Every once in a while it might be healthy for teachers to be happy with the way they are, though not completely forgetting self-criticism.

7.3.2 Attitudes towards cooperative learning

What will follow, is a brief description and discussion of the attitudes towards and feelings about cooperative learning manifested in the interviews. In addition, these findings will be compared with some observations made in previous research.

The teachers had formed opinions about and attitudes towards cooperative learning. Only one of the interviewees did not have any opinion about the method as he had no actual knowledge about it. Although the interviewees' experiences of using cooperative learning varied, their attitudes towards it did not actually differ significantly. On the contrary, their views on cooperative learning as a teaching method were rather unanimous.

For one thing, all of the teachers who had used cooperative learning had used it for the sake of variety. They emphasised the importance of using a variety of methods and finding different approaches because there were so many different types of learners. According to the interviewees, no single method can be suitable for every learner. Rather, they pointed out that learners not only were different in the way they learn but they also needed to be familiar with different ways of learning. The interviewees considered using different methods practice for themselves and also for learners. In addition, the teachers noted that there were entities that were suitable for cooperative learning and entities in which a suitable approach was something else. For instance, one teacher postulated that

there isn't one single teaching method suitable for everything. Cooperative learning is a good method but there are other good methods as well. (male with 3 years of teaching experience)

Though not blindly following the principles of cooperative learning, but realising the shortcomings of the method, all the interviewees but one considered cooperative learning a method that could affect learning and learners in a positive way. None of them really wanted to use cooperative techniques all the time even if adequate theoretical knowledge had been provided. However, had they a more solid theoretical basis, most of them would actually be willing to try using cooperative learning for a longer period of time.

The possibility to use cooperative learning consistently, for instance, over a whole course, was considered most probable in optional English courses in which more teacher inventiveness was seen possible. A possible reason for this view might be that there are no books for optional courses in the schools under investigation. Therefore, the teacher responsible for the course could decide on the topics to be covered and the procedures to be applied during the course. In addition, optional courses would not normally end in a test to measure achievement and therefore there might be fewer obstacles for teachers to use their imagination.

However, as pointed out above, the textbook is not the curriculum. Even the framework curricula for comprehensive and upper secondary schools give teachers free hands to choose the methods and contents of their teaching (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994). Thus, there seem to be no official quarters to inhibit imaginative work in classrooms. Nevertheless, an undeniable fact is that there are certain contents to be covered both in comprehensive school and in upper secondary school, which are also outlined in the framework curricula. This sets demands for the teacher: in a limited time span, a whole lot of issues have to be studied. If teachers find the use of cooperative learning too time-consuming, it is no wonder that they do not use it constantly. Many of the interviewees pointed out, though, that if they used cooperative learning more, i. e. with more

determination, it might not take any more time than other methods they use as both the teacher and learners would be familiar with the procedure.

In sum, although the teachers reported having encountered some difficulties when implementing cooperative learning, their views on it were generally quite positive. These attitudes towards cooperative learning manifested in the interviews seemed to a large extent correspond with the findings reported in several Finnish pro gradu theses (Heikkala 1997, Kivi 1998, Savolainen 1997 and Seppänen and Suikki 1997). In the theses, the viewpoint was unfortunately other than that of foreign language teaching. Only research on cooperative learning conducted in Finland will be discussed here. This can be justified by the fact that the context for teaching is the same. As Leppilampi and Stähle (1993) point out, it is not wise to adopt a teaching methods directly from another culture.

The results reported by Kivi (1998) are, in fact, very similar to the observations made in the interviews carried out for the present study. In her study, Kivi examined the changing society and teachers' work from the point of view of cooperative learning. She found that teachers' experiences of cooperative group work were, for the most part, positive. In addition, cooperative work was considered laborious in the beginning, but it became easier and more rewarding after a while. Also, theoretical background knowledge on the method was seen as important for successful implementation. Moreover, when the principles were familiar to teachers, cooperative learning were more easily applicable on a larger scale, too. Finally, the teachers interviewed by Kivi considered cooperative learning a suitable method but not the only one. Seppänen and Suikki (1997) as well as Heikkala (1997) concluded that teachers regarded cooperative learning as a useful method. However, Heikkala also remarked that teachers found cooperative group work somewhat time-consuming and difficult to control.

Heikkala's results also correspond with the observations made in the present interviews.

Furthermore, Savolainen (1997) points out that teachers committed to professional development are the ones most likely to succeed in the implementation of cooperative learning. In fact, some of the teachers under examination in the present study pointed out that they wanted to keep up with what was happening in the world. Indeed, one of them indicated that it "comes with the job" that one had to be willing and able to develop continuously, both as a professional and as a person.

7.3.3 National and local curricula vs. teachers' work practices

In the following, an attempt will be made to examine the relationship between the national and local curricula available and the classroom practices of the teachers interviewed. First, an overview of the foreign language sections in the curricula will be provided. Then, these "official" suggestions will be compared with the teachers' practices (i.e. own curricula) discussed above in section 7.3.1.

The framework curricula for the Finnish comprehensive and for the upper secondary school only define the goals and objectives of teaching in broad outlines (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994). These national curricula offer local authorities, i.e. teachers and other educational personnel, a loosely defined context to work in. Nowadays, it is the duty of every school district to develop their own curricula. Also, teachers can construct their own curricula and are, in fact, even encouraged to do so (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994:11 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:9-12).

As the purpose of the national curricula is only to provide a framework, they do not name any particular teaching methods to be used. Noticeably, teachers have the freedom to use teaching methods they consider suitable and therefore these cannot be explicitly stated in any curriculum, national or local. However, a general suggestion is given: teachers ought to apply a variety of up-to-date learning and teaching methods (*Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:70).

The local curricula provided by each school in question, i.e. school A, the comprehensive school, grades 7 to 9, and school B, the upper secondary school, are somewhat more precise (school B: *Lukion kurssiselosteet* 1999-2000 and school A: *Yhteiskoulun opetussuunnitelma* 1999-2000). However, they only provide general objectives and describe the school system and procedures typical of the school concerned. Consequently, these do not directly suggest any particular teaching method to be used or to be preferred over others. Yet, as far as foreign language teaching is concerned, the curriculum for the upper secondary school establishes that the modes of working will vary from course to course and situation to situation. Several methods, which "will be applied in accordance with the contents and objectives of the course in question" are listed: pair work, elaboration, story grammar, scheme theory, cooperative learning, applied suggestopedia, frontal teaching, independent work, group and project work. While applying these, "new open learning environments and information technology will be used (school B: *Lukion kurssiselosteet* 1999-2000:10).

The curriculum for the upper grades (i.e. 7 to 9) of the comprehensive school gives a concise description of every foreign language course available. These include 8 obligatory courses for English as an A1 language (i.e. starts from grade 3): 2 courses on grade 7, 4 courses on grade 8 and 2 courses on grade 9. In addition to these, 3 optional courses are offered. German is taught as a

B2 language beginning from grade 8. Four courses are available, all of them optional.

Further, the curriculum for the upper secondary school includes descriptions of the following English (as an A1 language) courses: 6 obligatory courses and 2 advanced courses recommended for everyone attending the matriculation examination. In addition to these, 4 optional courses are available. The German language can be learned either as a B2 language, or a B3 language beginning at grade 1 in the upper secondary school. A total of 8 optional courses are offered for learners of German.

The curriculum for the upper secondary school lists several teaching methods to be used on foreign language courses, though taking the nature of a course in question into account. This sets quite demands for teachers. The teachers examined for the present study were most willing to try cooperative learning for a longer period of time when carrying out an optional course. The comprehensive school only offers 3 and the upper secondary school 4 optional courses in English. These 7 courses make 20 per cent (7/35) of all the available courses in English and German. Thus, the possibilities to implement different teaching methods seem actually rather small presupposing the implementation only takes place on optional courses.

Noticeably, because studying German as a foreign language is optional, all courses offered for learning German are actually optional, too. However, the nature of German and English optional courses is different. Namely, the contents of the German courses are defined in more detail than the optional courses for English. This might be due to the fact that the optional English courses deepen or widen the knowledge gained on the obligatory courses, whereas the optional courses for German are actually supposed to provide the basic knowledge of the language (see e.g. *Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994:61 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:70). In the comparison of

the number of obligatory and optional courses above, the courses for German were considered obligatory.

To sum up, both the local and the national curricula for comprehensive school and upper secondary schools are quite general in terms of defining the methods of teaching. This might be due to the professional freedom teachers ought to have in Finland. By defining the broad outline for their work, the curricula give teachers the opportunity to realise that freedom.

Indeed, the teachers investigated for the present study, were quite aware of this possibility, perhaps even a presumption, of teachers' professional freedom. In fact, every teacher interviewed responded in almost the very same words when asked whether any particular teaching methods were promoted in the curricula or in the working environment. They did not have any specific recollection of the contents of their curricula, but all of them remembered that the use of various teaching methods was considered desirable. Even if the teachers did not use cooperative learning consistently as part of their teaching, they cannot be claimed to have neglected the curricula. Only the use of cooperative learning was under investigation in the present study and therefore the interviewees' perceptions and experiences of other teaching methods were not even inquired. Therefore, the interviewees might be using several other teaching methods, or only one method for that matter. In the scope of the present study, however, the use of all possible teaching methods could not be evaluated.

7.4 Collegial cooperation

In the following, the present situation of collegial cooperation will be described in the light of the interviews carried out in the two different schools. In addition, the teachers' suggestions for improvement will be

presented together with implications for improvement put forward in literature.

7.4.1 The present situation

Above, the professional freedom of teachers was brought up. An obvious consequence of this freedom is the possibility that teachers have in choosing the teaching methods and contents they consider appropriate or worthwhile. Of course, the limitations set by the curricula have to be taken into account, but the freedom is still considerable. However, the professional freedom also has other consequences, though probably not as obvious. Namely, it might be partly due to this freedom that teachers are often considered "lonely labourers" (see e.g. Sahlberg 1996). They are often individual workers only responsible for themselves and for a group of learners.

If collaboration among teachers is called cooperation, it ought to refer to professional activity in which achieving common goals is central (cf. elements of cooperative learning, section 3.1). Accordingly, teachers ought be socially interdependent of each other. However, Little (1990:177-180) presents four degrees of cooperation among teachers:

- 1) chatting
- 2) dialogue
- 3) helping
- 4) cooperation

According to Little, the first three of these (that is, chatting, dialogue and helping) represent relatively weak forms of collegialism. He further remarks that the last one, cooperation, represents the strongest form of collegialism. Cooperation comprises activities such as collaborative planning, teaching together, observing each others' lessons and peer coaching. In the present study, the term collegial cooperation will be used in a more general sense to

refer to all the degrees of collegialism. However, Little's degrees will be used in order to evaluate the level of collegial cooperation in the schools under examination in the present study.

To begin with, the interviewees' accounts on collegial cooperation were, in short, somewhat vague. Most teachers, i.e. 9 of the total of 11, commented on how they cooperated with their colleagues. In both schools under investigation, that is, in the comprehensive school and the upper secondary school, at least some degree of cooperation among teachers did take place. No significant difference in the amount of cooperation between the two schools could be established. Furthermore, the interviewees could not be divided into the three groups used in the analysis above.

Generally speaking, the collegial cooperation in the schools could be considered rather low. According to the interviewees, only the lowest forms of collegialism, i.e. chatting, dialogue and helping, had taken place in their working environment. None of the interviewees reported having observed each others' classes or teaching together, which would represent the strongest degree of cooperation (Little 1990). Instead, the interviewees' accounts included issues like chatting about work related matters, changing materials, planning tests together, changing ideas and information about pupils:

Yes, to some extent. We talk about things, problems and such, with other language teachers. So in that sense we cooperate.
(female with 30 years of teaching experience)

We have changed materials, of course, if someone has found nice extra material for a course or something like that and of course we exchange opinions about courses and chapters and contents. (female with 1 year of teaching experience)

We cooperate all the time and as there are so many of us, we automatically form groups of four, five [...]. (female with 32 years of teaching experience)

The teachers in the comprehensive school saw their big number as one reason, or rather, a facilitator, for their cooperation. Also, they mentioned that foreign language teachers planned most course tests together as they wanted to ensure objectivity in their evaluation. One teacher, who worked both in the comprehensive and in the upper secondary school commented that there was more collegial cooperation in the comprehensive school.

Further, none of the teachers interviewed considered the level of collegial cooperation quite sufficient and, accordingly, most of them thought there could be more cooperation:

We [foreign] language teachers have very valuable cooperation, we work very well together but language teachers versus other teachers, there is less cooperation, and it's diminishing all the time. There could be more, it could cheer us up. (female with 10 years of teaching experience) and

In my opinion we have enough cooperation, it's working quite well on the one hand but actually we could do more together [...] there is definitely much room for improvement (female with 32 years of teaching experience)

Comments like these show that the teachers realise the need for cooperation, although they do not seem to connect collegial cooperation in any way with cooperative learning.

Further, three interviewees pointed out the possibility to expand the concept of collegial cooperation to integration between different subjects, mainly with subjects such as biology, history and Finnish. One English teacher in the upper secondary school had carried out a course in cooperation with a biology teacher. Another English teacher from the comprehensive school

remarked that it could be worthwhile to cooperate with the Finnish teacher when studying grammar in order to make the understanding of different grammatical concepts easier. Moreover, she criticised that there was a lot of talk about integration, but nobody had really done anything about it. Consequently, the interviewees did not quite agree on the usefulness of integration, at least in the comprehensive school:

A language is a language [...] I personally don't like the idea [of integration] and I don't think we need it at least not yet. Let's just teach biology in Finnish. We're talking about pupils who are 12 to 15 years' of age! (male with 13 years of teaching experience)

A significant observation was that some of the interviewees indeed seem to support the general view of teachers as individual workers. Three teachers of the 9 who commented on collegial cooperation, that is, 30 per cent, indicated that in their experience, teachers were inclined to work alone:

We work quite well together although there are so many people of various ages. I think everyone handles his pupils and lessons in his own way but we do talk about things, such as where others are going, how they have taught a particular point and we switch pupils if it doesn't work well. (male with 13 years of teaching experience)

[...] Mostly you go there alone, keep the lesson and come out. At least I hope we could do more. I'd like us to do, for example, some projects together, like a Valentine's Day project. [...] I wish we could show others, too, that we study English here and that it's good for pupils, you can do so many great things in English classes. That's missing. (female with 1 year of teaching experience)

In addition, one of the interviewees, an upper secondary teacher, had also worked in the night school. She considered the possibilities of cooperation

among colleagues better in the night school because the group of teachers was smaller:

There we had a small group of teachers and we had conversations with teachers of humanities and natural sciences about which courses could be integrated and which not. So there it worked quite well but it was a smaller group and people did not think that this is my material [...]. The night school is fairly young, only about 12 years, the tradition of silence is not there. (female with 10 years of teaching experience)

To sum up, it often seems that teachers are, as pointed out further above, individual workers who are not used to collaborative work, that is, sharing their visions, ideas and materials. For example, Nunan (1992:242) claims that teachers are often not very willing to help each other and those most experienced do not want to give anything away.

Indeed, there is much to improve when collegial cooperation is concerned. The teachers interviewed acknowledged the need for cooperation among colleagues, though the present level of their cooperation was relatively low. Furthermore, the interviewees did not point out the connection to cooperative learning in the classroom. However, for instance Johnson and Johnson (1992) argue that collegial support groups are necessary for the successful implementation of cooperative learning. Furthermore, Kohonen (1990b:97) considers collegial cooperation vital for the process of development within a school.

In this case, the Johnsonian implication that collegial cooperation goes hand in hand with successful implementation of cooperative learning is true. Namely, none of the interviewees had really implemented cooperative learning in their teaching. In other words, the teachers' experience on the use

of cooperative learning was experimental and had only taken place irregularly. Consequently, the degree of collegial cooperation among the interviewees was low, at least as measured by Little (1990).

7.4.2 Indications for improvement

In the light of the interviews, the level of collegial cooperation in the schools under examination was relatively low, at least as measured by Little (1990). Only the lowest degrees of cooperation could be observed: none of the interviewees mentioned any activities that could be categorised as representants of the highest degree. Interestingly, none of the interviewees even expressed their willingness to involve in such cooperative activities as planning whole courses in cooperation with colleagues, teaching together, observing each others' lessons and peer coaching.¹⁰ Yet, some teachers pointed out the need for more cooperation. Indeed, one of the upper secondary teachers thought there was a tradition of silence in the school, which seemed hard to overcome.

On the whole, nevertheless, it seemed that the teachers were accustomed to working alone and most of them even seemed to consider the present situation fairly satisfactory. An explanation to the teachers' unenthusiasm to work more together and let colleagues in their classrooms might be that the teachers, as everyone else, want to succeed in their work. Therefore, they want to avoid situations where their weaknesses might come out (Sahlberg 1998:161). That seems to work in both ways: teachers might be afraid of violating colleagues' independence or intimacy by proposing cooperative work.

¹⁰ The term peer coaching has been used e.g. by Kohonen (1993) to denote the type of collegial activity in which two teachers form a support group. They plan and prepare their lessons together, reflect on each others' observations and experiences, and observe each others' lessons and comment on them.

However, improved collegiality could also encourage teachers to try new ideas and teaching methods in their classrooms with less hesitations. Perhaps collegial support could help them to continue the use of cooperative learning persistently although it seemed laborous at times. Discussions with colleagues might also give new ideas as to how to proceed. Actually, one of the interviewees had originally tried out cooperative learning in her classroom at the same time with a few colleagues. They had attended a course together and become interested in the method:

I learned about it in Tampere some ten years ago and then, with enthusiasm, I tried it out mostly in the comprehensive school for a while. But I obviously should have done it for a longer time and there should have been more teachers doing it together. You see, there were three of us who tried it for some time. (female with 30 years of teaching experience)

In fact, research on collegial cooperation presents several favourable effects on collegial cooperation (Little 1990, Sahlberg 1996, and Sahlberg 1998). Undeniably, apart from developing teachers professionally, collegial work might improve the social climate. In addition, Sahlberg (1998:167-169) stresses e.g. the moral and psychological support provided by a cooperative working environment. Nevertheless, he also remarks that collegiality cannot be accepted as a trivial solution to problems in changing teaching practices, nor can it be the guiding principle in school development.

To sum up, in today's world, collaboration in working teams is stressed. Nonetheless, teachers still work in isolation from their colleagues although their collaboration could facilitate developmental process within the school (Kohonen and Leppilampi 1992:32). Obviously, the working environment in school is somewhat different from that in business life. Nevertheless, in order to enhance teachers' cooperation, the Finnish national curriculum for the

comprehensive school promotes collegial cooperation among teachers (*Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994:10). However, as Smyth (1991:83) points out, "it is well-known what should be done to improve a school (system) but it is often much more difficult to initiate action".

7.5 Further education - the key to professional development?

In the interviews, teachers were inquired about their experiences of in-service courses, i.e. further education. In fact, one of the teachers criticised the lack of practical guidance and information about different teaching methods and found practical examples as the solution for this problem.

I haven't tried it because I've never seen it put into practice so that I could really see how it works. I don't know enough about it to be able to try it myself. [...] If somebody arranged a possibility to observe it, you could see how it works. (female with 1 year of teaching experience)

She had only obtained fairly theoretical information on cooperative learning and considered it inadequate to give confidence to use a new technique in the classroom. In fact, another interviewee commented:

There was mostly theory and we only observed one biology lesson and about two English lessons. We were not let in other classes. (female with 30 years of teaching experience)

However, by far not all of the interviewees criticised the contents and form of the in-service courses they had attended. Namely, three of the interviewees had attended courses where they had learned by doing:

We practised these techniques, too, but basically we started from quite the beginning, I mean if you didn't know anything about it. (female with 4 years of teaching experience),

I don't know so much about the theory. It was only the one course that I attended where talked about it and did it

ourselves, too [...] (male with 3 years of working experience)
and

Last year I attended a course called called Oppilaat puhumaan and there they introduced this one, too [cooperative Learning] and we also had to act according to its principle ourselves, to learn from our own mistakes. (female with 10 years of teaching experience).

From the accounts, one could draw the conclusion that some of the interviewees had gained practical guidance during the courses and they considered the courses they had attended fairly useful. In fact, the biggest problem does not seem to be the quality of in-service courses available. On the contrary, the quality is criticised less than the quantity of the courses. In other words, the interviewees were quite dissatisfied with the present situation of additional education available. The teachers clearly established the need for more in-service training:

We used to have enough but nowadays we don't have any courses because of the lack of money. I'd really like to go and hear about new things and see colleagues. It's just that there isn't enough money. (female with 32 years of teaching experience) and

We have so little training in our school and especially language teachers don't get much. Everything [teaching methods] interests me but they always say there isn't money. (male with 13 years of teaching experience)

The younger teachers (with working experience of less than 10 years) did not actually criticise the amount of in-service training. Perhaps this might be due to their relatively recent university studies. They might still have many approaches, methods and ideas to try out and therefore might not require

additional stimulation for their work, at least not as much as teachers with a longer working history.

The interviewees acknowledged, however, that courses might be available at their own cost. Nevertheless, they considered it the local authorities' duty to deal with the expenses. Indeed, it seems that the amount of money spent on education differs greatly from place to place for local authorities can independently decide on the distribution of funds. Education should not be the place to spare costs for that is where our future hopes are growing up. Teachers' professionalism and well-being are a significant factor to improve pupils' learning environment.

On the whole, the interviewees considered in-service courses important, though not indispensable for their professional growth, e.g. for their adoption of new teaching trends. Rather, according to the interviewees, training mostly served as an source for inspiration and fresh ideas. Furthermore, the interviewed teachers considered training valuable for its social environment: during courses, teachers were able to meet colleagues:

There always something that you can use. Whatever the training is like, you can always adapt it to suit your own work and purposes. (female with 32 years of teaching experience)
and

It's good to hear about them [current teaching methods], you can't remember them if somebody doesn't remind you. I found it very refreshing when Kristiansen visited us here [...]. It was nice to see people, the most important thing in courses is that you get to meet with others. (female with 17 years of teaching experience)

Thus, it seems in-service courses not only provide teachers an opportunity to get acquainted with current trends but they also enable teachers to nurture their mental health by seeing and making contact with colleagues.

The evidence of the interviews is not quite similar to McLaughlin's (1997) ideas. According to her, in-service courses have often been "programmes" offered after school or during weekends and they have been composed primarily of "how-tos" and "shoulds" conveyed by experts. Consequently, difficulties have emerged in that teachers have not been able to embed their learning in everyday activities (McLaughlin 1997). In fact, according to Showers and Joyce (1996:12), less than 10 per cent of teachers attending "ordinary" courses were able to embed the teaching methods conveyed during the course in their own teaching. This might very well be the case. However, the interviewees of the present study did not even wish to adopt new teaching methods as such, although some of the teachers felt they would have needed more practical guidance on the courses.

McLaughlin (1997:82) introduces a simple answer for the problem of transferring teachers' knowledge in the classroom. Namely, she formulates that for learners, be they adults or children, context and cognition are inextricably linked. In other words, teachers, like students, "learn by doing, reading and reflecting, collaborating with other teachers, looking closely at students and their work and sharing what they see". Therefore, instead of offering theoretical information, further educational courses should enable teachers to try different methods themselves. In that way, implementation of new, interesting teaching methods might be somewhat easier.

7.6 Summary of the findings

The interviews for the present study were carried out among the comprehensive (grades 7 to 9) and upper secondary school foreign language teachers of a middle-sized town in western Finland. A great number of findings were gained and they were reported above. In the following, a summary of the most significant findings will be provided.

First, the interviewees' perceptions of cooperative learning were investigated. Those perceptions were divided into theoretical knowledge on cooperative learning and practical knowledge on the method. The interviewees were not familiar with the origins of cooperative learning, i.e. they did not know where it had come from and who had been initiating the method. Neither were all the interviewees able to define cooperative learning in their own words. However, those who provided a definition, described the procedure of only one individual technique, namely jigsaw. An interesting observation was that jigsaw was acknowledged as the only cooperative method. Further, the interviewees could, in general, give a fairly thorough description of the teacher's role in a cooperative classroom. They also enlisted a number of potential benefits that the use of cooperative learning might have.

Second, the teachers' experience on cooperative learning were examined. Quite significant differences could be manifested. Some of the teachers were not familiar with the method at all and had never even tried out the method, some knew about it but not enough to try it out and last, some of the interviewees had been occasional users of cooperative learning. Cooperative group work had most frequently been used for purposes such as teaching grammar or studying texts. The interviewees disputed the presumption that heterogeneous groups are optimal cooperative learning environments. On the contrary, they preferred cooperative work with homogeneous groups, in which it was, in their opinion, more likely to succeed. In addition, the interviewees were most willing to try cooperative group work with groups of pupils they knew best.

Third, interviewees' attitudes towards cooperative learning as a teaching method were scrutinised. The teachers' views on cooperative learning were predominantly positive. However, they pointed out some shortcomings of the method, for example, the following: the use of cooperative learning required

much preparatory work and was time-consuming in the classroom, too. Also, maintaining a cooperative classroom was difficult. In addition, the teachers remarked that cooperative learning allowed idling and demands responsibility of learners. Consequently, some of the interviewees thought that the cooperative method ought to be used consistently from lower grades in order for learners to get used to it. Despite the criticism, a number of teachers reported that learners' attitudes had been mostly positive. However, they pointed out that if cooperative learning was the only teaching method used, learners would be likely to get bored. Accordingly, teachers who occasionally used cooperative learning in their work used it for the sake of variety. They also thought that as learners are diverse, teaching methods should be diverse, too.

Fourth, the importance of national and local curricula was investigated especially from the point of view of the interviewees' classroom practices. Both the framework curricula for the comprehensive and upper secondary school (*Lukion OPS:n perusteet* 1994 and *Peruskoulun OPS:n perusteet* 1994) and the local curricula were fairly general in terms of defining the teaching methods to be used in the classroom. However, the use of various teaching methods was promoted in all the curricula in question. In fact, the local curriculum for the upper secondary school provided a list of teaching methods to be applied in the foreign language classroom. Nevertheless, all curricula promoted teachers' involvement in the development of local curricula. In addition, teachers were invited to commit to their own action research in order to develop their working practices. Consequently, teachers felt they had professional freedom and were able to make choices of their own. However, the interviewees were not very familiar with the contents of the curricula, either national or local. When asked whether any particular teaching methods were promoted in the curricula, they remembered that diverse and up-to-date teaching methods were preferred. Accordingly, many of them expressed their willingness to use a variety of methods to ensure

beneficial input for as many learners as possible. Thus, it seemed, the interviewees were conforming to the demands of the curricula.

Fifth, the quality of the interviewees' collegial cooperation was dealt with. In addition, the importance of in-service courses from the point of view of professional development was analysed and discussed. The degree of the teachers' collegiality was regarded as relatively low. Only weaker forms of collegial cooperation were manifested: e.g. chatting, helping and changing materials. Stronger forms of cooperation, e.g. collaborative planning, or teaching, peer coaching and observing each others' lessons, were not reported. However, quite a few of the interviewees' noted the need for more collegial cooperation. In spite of this, some teachers' accounts supported the generally held view of teachers as solitary workers. They remarked that the prevailing practice was to work alone and some of them seemed cautious in suggesting cooperation with others. Further, research has shown that cooperative learning is more likely to succeed if the level of collegiality is high, too. Consequently or not, the level of the interviewees' collegial cooperation was relatively low and no long-term use of cooperative learning had taken place.

Finally, in-service courses were seen as an important supplier of inspiration: they were considered to provide fresh ideas of current trends in foreign language teaching. Moreover, many of the interviewees had come across cooperative learning during courses and they had experimented with the method afterwards in their own work. The quality and contents of courses were not regarded as the foremost priority. Rather, teachers were interested in any kind of training and thought they could adapt at least some of the new information in their teaching. Another important aspect of in-service courses was that the teachers had been given a possibility to meet with colleagues and discuss their work with others working in the same field. Unfortunately,

according to the interviewees, the amount of in-service training had diminished significantly due to lack of money.

8 CONCLUSION

In the present study, an attempt was made to investigate foreign language teachers' views on cooperative learning. More specifically, 11 English and German teachers were interviewed in order to scrutinise their background knowledge on and experience of the method. Furthermore, factors possibly affecting the teachers' classroom practices were examined. These were the national and local curricula, collegial cooperation and in-service training.

Generally speaking, the respondents' background knowledge on cooperative learning was relatively weak. Nevertheless, their views on cooperative learning as a teaching method were fairly positive and the majority of them had tried implementing it in their own teaching. However, none of the interviewees had used cooperative group work consistently. Furthermore, over a third of the respondents had never tried out cooperative learning techniques. Due to lack of sufficient theoretical and practical knowledge, the implementation of cooperative learning was frequently considered difficult and laborious. In addition, lack of time was emphasised as a reason for not using cooperative work consistently. Quite importantly, the teachers did not even wish to start implementing cooperative learning as the only teaching method because diverse learners need diverse input. In other words, cooperative learning alone was not regarded as sufficient to meet the number of learners' needs.

Furthermore, the teachers were quite rational in their attitudes towards cooperative learning. They acknowledged the recommendation made in the national and local curricula to use a variety of teaching methods. They expressed healthy criticism towards various methods by not blindly following any particular approach. However, the teachers were obviously committed to professional development and willing to learn. In-service training was considered an important supplier of current trends and new ideas. Moreover,

training had given them an opportunity to meet with colleagues. However, at the present, the amount of training provided for teachers was deemed too low. Furthermore, the teachers were quite willing to cooperate with their colleagues. However, the degree of their collegial cooperation was relatively low. Consequently, several teachers pointed out the need to cooperate more.

Obviously, the results of the study only account for a very small number of foreign language teachers and such a small sample clearly does not suffice to make valid generalisations. Furthermore, the interviews were carried out in one town, which clearly is a limitation. In addition, as the interview is always an interactional situation, it is also a potential source of problems, such as bias, error and misunderstanding. Moreover, the reliability of the respondents is not assured, though assumed. This could have been avoided by observing the respondents' lessons. Despite the limitations, though, the results of the present study might provide a rough idea of the views on cooperative learning held by comprehensive and upper secondary school teachers. In addition, the observations of collegial cooperation and in-service training might be very true elsewhere in Finland, too.

To sum up, it seems teachers are quite willing to develop themselves professionally. For this, the national and local curricula offer a possibility: teachers are given fairly free hands to choose the teaching methods they prefer. However, teachers' professional freedom should not mean separation from colleagues. On the contrary, collegial cooperation offers a great chance for professional development. Professional cooperation with colleagues provides a fertile starting point for, for instance, trying out current teaching methods. Planning together, sharing visions and reflecting might make the implementation process easier, and perhaps more enjoyable. However, teachers' willingness to succeed in their work and not to show their errors might make collegial cooperation more difficult. In addition,

lack of practical knowledge and time seem to hinder the implementation of new teaching methods. Therefore, sufficient and practical guidance is needed. In other words, there is some challenge for authorities responsible for teacher training. For teachers' professional development and renewal, in-service training seems essential. Moreover, training is not only supposed to improve teachers' quality of life, but teachers' well-being will most probably also affect learners and learning positively. Thus, it is important that teachers' work satisfaction be maintained. In the near future there will be a severe shortage of competent teachers and happy in-service teachers would most certainly be good advertisement for the profession.

Furthermore, suggestions for future study rise. First, a closer look at the relationship of curricula and the classroom practices of foreign language teachers would be of interest. Whether teachers actually meet the demands set by the curricula is ambiguous. However, one might want to ask whether those demands are, in fact, proportionate to real life. Second, the need for specific and practical cooperative exercises for foreign language teaching has been established: user-friendly cooperative teaching material is lacking. The level of implementing new methods in one's teaching seems fairly high and therefore handbooks for starters and occasional users are needed. Finally, the way of introducing current teaching trends in in-service training as well as the contents of the courses would be worth examining. Some trends or approaches might be emphasised over others and others neglected. In short, everything that promotes teachers' professional competence and work satisfaction would be of interest. Action ought to be taken in order to make in-service teachers able to enjoy their profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aronson, E. and E. Goode 1980. Training teachers to implement jigsaw learning: a manual for teachers. In S. Sharan, P. Hare, C. Webb and R. Herz-Lazarowitz (eds.), *Cooperation in education*, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 47-81.
- Cole, B. and D. L. Smith 1993. Cooperative learning strategies for teaching adult business English, *Journal of Education for Business* 68, 170-173.
- Craig, M. T. and R. M. Bright 1994. Preservice teachers' reactions to an interactive constructive approach to English language arts coursework, *Journal of Teacher Education* 45, 96-103.
- Davis, R. L. 1997. Group work is not busy work: maximizing success of group work in the L2 classroom, *Foreign Language Annals* 30, 265-279.
- Deutsch, M. 1962. Cooperation and trust: some theoretical notes, in M. R. Jones (ed.) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Lincoln: Nebraska Press, 275-318.
- Eskola, J. and J. Suoranta 1999. *Johdatus laadulliseen tutkimukseen*. 3rd edition. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Graves, N. B. and T. D. Graves 1985. Creating a cooperative learning environment: an ecological approach, in Slavin et al. (eds.), 403-436.
- Gunderson, B. and D. Johnson 1980. Building positive attitudes by using cooperative learning groups, *Foreign Language Annals* 13, 39-43.
- Heikkala, E. 1997. *Tiedon jakajasta oppimiskonsultiksi. Opettajan ja opiskelijoiden kokemuksia kielipainotteisesta aineenopetuksesta Kuusamon ammatti-instituutissa vuosina 1994-1996*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Hirsjärvi, S. and H. Hurme 1982. *Teemahaastattelu*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Holstein, J. A. and J. F. Gubrium 1997. Active interviewing in D. Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice*, London: Sage, 113-129.
- Johnson, D. W. and R. T. Johnson 1990. Cooperative learning and achievement in Sharan (ed.), 23-38.

- Johnson, D. W. and R. T. Johnson 1974. Instructional goal structure: cooperative, competitive, or individualistic, *Review of Educational Research* 44, 213-240.
- Johnson D.W. and R.T. Johnson 1992. Yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen ja koulun kehittäminen, in K. Hämäläinen and A. Mikkola (eds.), *Koulun kehittämisen kansainvälisiä virtauksia*, Helsinki: VAPK-kustannus, 57-84.
- Johnson, D. W., R. T. Johnson and E. Johnson Holubec 1990. *Circles of learning: cooperation in the classroom*. 3rd edition. Minn.: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, D. W., R. T. Johnson and E. Johnson Holubec 1991. *Cooperation in the classroom*. Revised edition. Minn.: Interaction Book Company.
- Kagan, S. 1985. Dimensions of cooperative classroom structures, in Slavin et al. (eds.), 67-96.
- Kearney, P. 1993. *Cooperative learning techniques*. Hobart: Enterprise Design Associates.
- Kivi, S. 1998. *Tietotehtaasta yhteistoiminnallisen oppimisen työpajaksi. Tutkimus yhteiskunnallisten muutosten edellyttämistä uudistustarpeista opettajan työhön yhteistoiminnallisen oppimisen näkökulmasta*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Kohonen, V. 1990. Yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen pedagogisena eheyttämisenä, in R. Laukkanen, E. Piippo and A. Salonen (eds.), *Ehyesti elävä koulu*, Helsinki: VAPK-kustannus, 89-100.
- Kohonen, V. 1992a. Experiential language learning: second language learning as cooperative learner education, in Nunan (ed.), 14-39.
- Kohonen, V. 1992b. Kokonaisvaltainen oppiminen: sovellusnäkökohtia kielikasvatukseen, in V. Kohonen and J. Lehtovaara (eds.), *Näkökulmia kokonaisvaltaiseen oppimiseen*. 2nd edition. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto, 184-231.
- Kohonen, V. 1993. Kohti kokonaisvaltaista kasvua ja oppimista. Opettaja oman työnsä kehittäjänä ja tutkijana ja työyhteisönsä uudistajana, in S. Ojanen (ed.) *Tutkiva opettaja. Opetus 21. vuosisadan ammattina*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, Lahden tutkimus- ja koulutuskeskus, 66-89.
- Koppinen, M-L. and J. Pollari 1993. *Yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen. Tie tuloksiin*. Juva: WSOY.

- Korpela, E. 1992. *Cooperative learning and adults*. Espoo: Valtion teknillinen tutkimuskeskus (VTT).
- Kuitunen, H. 1993. *Yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen osa 1*. Helsinki: FinEduca.
- Leppilampi, A. and P. Stähle 1993. Yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen - askel uuteen koulutuskulttuuriin, *Opettaja* 10, 12-13.
- Little, J. W. 1990. Teachers as colleagues, in A. Lieberman (ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: creating the future now*, London: The Falmer Press, 165-193.
- Local curricula: School A: *Yhteiskoulun opetussuunnitelma 1999-2000*, School B: *Lukion kurssiselosteet 1999-2000*.
- Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet* 1994. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.
- McLaughlin, M. W. 1997. Rebuilding teacher professionalism in the United States, in A. Hargreaves and R. Evans (eds.), *Beyond educational reform. Bringing teachers back in*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 77-93.
- Nunan, D. (ed.) 1992. *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. 1992. Toward a collaborative approach to curriculum development: a case study, in Nunan (ed.), 230-254.
- Pagliarini Cox, M.I. and A.A. De Assis-Peterson 1999. Critical pedagogy in ELT: images of Brazilian teachers of English, *TESOL Quarterly* 33, 433-452.
- Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteet* 1994. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.
- Prapphal, K. 1991. Cooperative learning in a humanistic English class, *Cross Currents* 41, 37-40.
- Qin, Z., D. W. Johnson and R. T. Johnson 1995. Cooperative versus competitive efforts and problem solving, *Review of Educational Research* 65, 129-143.
- Sahlberg, P. 1996. *Kuka auttaisi opettajaa?* Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Sahlberg, P. 1998. *Opettajana koulun muutoksessa*. Juva: WSOY.

- Sahlberg, P. and A. Leppilampi 1994. *Yksinään vai yhteisvoimin?* 2nd edition. Vantaa: Vantaan täydennyskoulutuslaitos.
- Savolainen, L. 1997. *Yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen: teknisestä toistamisesta opettajana kehittymiseen.* Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Seliger, H.W. and E. Shohamy 1989. *Second language research methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seppänen, H. and S. Suikki 1997. *Ryhmätyön toteutus ja opettajien ja oppilaiden mielipiteitä kahdessa yhteistoiminnallisessa ja kahdessa tavallisessa luokassa.* Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Sharan, S. (ed.) 1990. *Cooperative learning: theory and research.* New York: Praeger.
- Sharan, S. 1990. Cooperative learning: a perspective on research and practice, in Sharan (ed.) 1990, 285-300.
- Sharan, S. and A. Shaulov 1990. Cooperative learning, motivation to learn and academic achievement, in Sharan (ed.) 1990, 173-202.
- Showers, B and B. Joyce 1996. The evolution of peer coaching, *Educational Leadership* 53, 12-16.
- Slavin, R. E. 1985. An introduction to cooperative learning research, in Slavin et al. (eds.), 1-15.
- Slavin, R. E. 1977. Classroom reward structure: an analytical and practical review, *Review of Educational Research* 47, 633-650.
- Slavin, R. E. 1990a. Comprehensive cooperative learning models: embedding cooperative learning in the curriculum and the school in Sharan (ed.), 261-284.
- Slavin, R.E. 1990b. *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice.* NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Slavin, R.E., S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz Lazarowitz, C. Webb and R. Schmuck (eds.) 1985. *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn,* New York: Plenum Press
- Smyth, J. 1991. *Teachers as collaborative learners.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Appendix 1

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I Mitä on yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen?

- mitä tietää, miten ymmärtää, miten määrittäisi
- syntyhistoria?
- miten on saanut tietää (koulutus, työtoverit, kirjallisuus...)
- opettajan rooli YTOssa?
- tavoitteet?
- mihin oppimisen osa-alueisiin vaikuttaa?
(esim. kognitiiviset taidot, oppimistulokset, itsetunnon, sosiaalisten ryhmätyö-taitojen ja oppimisstrategioiden kehittyminen)

II Kokemukset YTOsta vieraan kielen opetuksessa

- Onko kokeillut - miksi/miksi ei?
- kuinka paljon, missä kielissä - esimerkkejä!
 - laajempi yhteistoiminnallisuus? (opettajien kesken, oppilaitokset jne.)
- millaisia tekniikoita on käyttänyt - onko onnistunut, esimerkkejä!
 - mihin on käyttänyt - ongelmia, vaikeuksia?
 - materiaalia?
- oppilaiden suhtautuminen
- opitaanko tällä tavalla?
 - mitä?
 - verrattuna mihin?

III Miten suhtautuu YTOon?

- mitä mieltä on - perustelu! (perustuuko kokemukseen, uskomuksiin...?)
- onko vaikeaa, hyödyllistä, jne. - perustelu!
- opettajan oma kanta, oppilaiden suhtautuminen

A definition of cooperative learning

”The work in the teams is structured so that there is positive interdependence and individual accountability among the learners, with each participant contributing to the team product and the team being in charge of helping its teammates to learn.”

(Kohonen 1992)

Appendix 2

TRANSCRIPTIONS: 2 SAMPLES

- INTERVIEW 1: I = interviewer, TI = teacher I
- I okai no alotetaan vaikka siitä että koska no minä vuonna se valmistui
- TI mä oon valmistunut viime vuonna eli yhteiskäytöksenä
- I joo, ja sitte heti siitä lähtien ootko heti ollut toisessa
- TI no oon sen jälkeen joo ja sitä ennenki jo et mä tein siinä välissä toista ja tein sitte vasta gradun sen jälkeen
- I joo no mitä asteita se oot opettanu
- TI mä oon opettanu ala-astetta yläastetta lukiota ja aikuislukiota niinku laadasta laitaan
- I joo no aika hyvin, no sitte tota niin tähän aiheeseen että tiedätkö mitä on yhteiskolainlainen oppiminen
- TI tiedän joo
- I no voisitko miten se määrittelisit sen
- TI mä no se mitä muille on selitetty nii sillä tavalla että tota on ensi joku aihe ja pilkottean pienin palasin ja opilaat jätetään ryhmiin ja tuota ensi ne omassa ryhmässään tavallaan niinku käsittelee sitä asiaa ja sit ne niinku vaihtaa ja siirtyy yks henkilö seuraavaan ryhmään ja selittää siellä sen asian ja se niinku kiittää ja opettaa toisilleen sen asian
- I joo no, oo tiedätkö yhtään miten se on saanu alkunsa tai missä se...
- TI se oli muistaakseni joku amerikkalainen keksintö
- I joo no tiedätkö yhtään kuka sen suomeen on, esitelly tai
- TI en jakaa muistaa
- I (naurabduh) no mitenkä se oot ite siitä saanu tietää opiskelijan ohessa vai
- TI joo silloin opetusjärjestelun aikana siitä oli semmonen tavallaan yks kurssi missä siitä kerrottiin ja vähän käsiteltiin sitä, mut en mä oo ikinä nähny sitä käytännössä toimivan tai siis sillä tavalla että sitä ois tehty
- I joo elikkä esitettiinkö siitä mitenkä erityisen painokkaasti siellä
- TI aä, joo, tuota norsilla missä mä olin niin tuota, nii siellä oli yks englanninopettaja joka oli oikein innostunut siitä asiasta mutta mä en ikinä käyny sen tunteja sillä tavalla kuuntelemassa että ei muilla
- I joo
- TI ollu siihen mahdollisuutta
- I joo no mitä sitte siitä opettajan roolista voisit sanoa
- TI no se on lähinnä tämän ohjaajan rooli tietenkin sen täytyy, ne opilaattien täytyy opettaa siihen
- I hum
- TI että siihen ne noin vaan pysty sitä toisilleen opettamaan että niitten pitäs niinku tajuata et mikä siinä on se idea et ne tavallaan vähän neuvois et millä tavalla niitten pitäs käsitellä josaki tekstiä tai mikä siinä nyt onki mitä niitten pitäs käsitellä
- I joo joo no mitäs sitte tavoitteista, oo mihinkä oot alueisiin se sun mielestä vaikutta tää yhteiskolainlainen oppiminen
- TI aä no se tietenki kaikkiin noihin ryhmätöitätoihin et mitä nykyään tarvii työelämässä et tietenki se siihen sitte, opilaista kasvatkaa ja tavallaan sitä omaan vastuunottoon ne kai vastuussa siitä että ite oppii mutta myös siitä että toiset oppii
- I joo, no mitäs muuta no oot no ootko ite kokeillut
- TI en oolkaatann en niin suuressa määrin niinku et se selimerkiksi koko kundi et jostain ehkä semmosia pienempiä juttuja koska mä kuitenkin niillä lehdän jonkun verran ryhmätöitä en sillä tavalla et sitä niinku iten kanssa kiertäisä että en semmosta, et en sen vastustan vaan se on periaatteen mukaan en mut ehkä voisinkin kuvitella että joku idea sieltäkin on käytössä
- I joo no mikai et oo s
- TI no se johtuu iten siitä et mä en oo ikinä nähny sitä käytännössä niinku toteutettavan sillä tavalla et mä niinku iten toisinaan näkisin et miten se toimii et mä en siitä niin tarkk niin paljon tiedä et mä pystyisin sitä ite toteuttamaan
- I joo, noo do no missä kielissä nyt ku se sanoit että se kuitenkin ryhmätöitä teetät ja niissä on niittä vähäsen niittä yhteiskolainlaisia elementtejä niin niinkin missä kielissä
- TI hum
- I eiks sulla oo enkku ja saksa
- TI mullon saksa ja englantti joo
- I joo
- I no ootko mittei paljo iten iten satunnaisestiko vai säännöllisesti
- TI no tuota se vähän riippuu, saksaas ehkä on muilla on yläasteella pelkkii kaksiohjuntaa niin eiinä se oikeastaan iten hyväkin että siellä on vähän keventää sitä hommaa ettei mun tarvii koko ajan itte päästää kulta kuntia
- I joo
- TI ja ne kuitenkin tykkää tehdä niitä ryhmätöitä ja siinä ne, tavallaan ne koko ajan opettaa toisilleen vaikka onki siis keskustaan jostain tehtäväksi niin toinen sanoo
- I hum
- TI eiei ei se meikkaa noin
- I joo
- TI et sen pitäs olla sejahee
- I joo niin on

I	hmm no mitenkä ei sitte oot saanu ne oppilaat siihen, silloinlailla ei selitellyks sen asian niille että mitä pitää nyt tehdä ja millä kielellä ja miten ei oot antanu ne ohjeet	I	et kyllä niille saa sen ninku selittää useampaan kertaan koska osa ei kuuntele osa ei kiinnitä siihen niin paljo huomiota että vaikkapa kuulluksi sen asian	joo
Ti	no tota... sanotaanko näin et mulla on yläasteella peikkaa seiskaluokan sakkaa josta on siottanu viidenneillä luokalla, ja tuota se niitten kieliteito	I	et kyllä sen joutuu toistaan	joo
I	joo	Ti	joo no onko sulla sitte mitää erityistä materiaalia niihin, niitten ryhmätoihin vai ihan kirjanko pohjalta teette	joo
Ti	ei oo kovin hädänpöhen valittavasti että jos mä sen selittäisin josta kerta sakaksi nii mulla menee siihen puoli tuntii	I	no tota jos ois aikaa nii ois kiva tehdä ylimäärästä juttuja mut harvemmin on kuitenkään aikaa siihen että tietenkä saatta olla kiva ja sit jos mä tekee jonku lisämateriaalin niin mä saatan sen tehdä ite tai jos mä löydän jostain niin mä saatan ottaa sen lisäksi et semmoselle joka on nopee niin se voi tehdä sit vaha lisää siinhe tai *	joo
I	joo	Ti	joo joo, no tuota no, siitä oppilaiden suhtautumisesta että miten ne suhtautuu niihin ryhmätoihin ja semmisiin yhteistoiminnallisiin ylipäätää	joo
Ti	mutta et kyllä mä nyt ne aina jollain konstilla yritän vähän silleen ninku tavallansa ope opettavalla kielitellään mutta kun sitä on sitä halindä ja sun muuta niin	I	kyyllä ne siitä tykkää se on tavallaan siinä on tietenkä se vaara et ne kuvittelee et ku ne ite saa tehdä nii siinä voi vaha lusuilla sit et kukaan ei kukaan ajan koputa olelle et hai	joo
I	hmm	Ti	teeppeä nyt tätä ja tätä, mut et kyllä se osa sen ymmärtää et tää on ninku ihan omasta itsestä kyllä jos tääs tekee toita niin tääsähän oppii et epuahan saa aina kysyä	joo
Ti	se monesti säästää aikaa ja omia hermoja ku sen sanoo akkia suomeksi et mitä teette	I	nii	joo
I	joo	Ti	teeppä nyt tätä ja tätä, mut et kyllä se osa sen ymmärtää et tää on ninku ihan omasta itsestä kyllä jos tääs tekee toita niin tääsähän oppii et epuahan saa aina kysyä	joo
Ti	siis kyllä mä yritän aina, säännöllisesti kuitenkin siinä kondektieilla	I	mut kyllä siinä tiettyt vaarat on et vähän ryhmästä riippuen	joo
I	joo otto mä sit sitte antanu niitä ohjeita mitenkään erityisesti kalvoilla vai peikastan suullisesti	Ti	joo, no mitäs mialta tai minkämoisia kokemuksia sulla on että oppiiiko sillä tavalla että ne tekee yhdessä et oppiiiko sillä tavalla paremmin varattuna siinhe ku että ne tekee yksinään vai ...	joo
Ti	hmm yleensä suullisesti vähän riippuu tehtävästä kuitenkin	I	no tota enmä tii oppiiiko siinä nyt paremmin se on vaan semmonen vaihtelu et jos tekee aina vaan yksinkään tai aina vaan opettajan johdolla nii se tekee jo siitä vaha mukavaman ku saa tehdä vähän ninku jonku toisen kanssa elikkä se vaihtelunhalu tottakai neki haluaa vaihtelua ettei aina oo samanlaista	joo
I	joo	Ti	no tota enmä tii oppiiiko siinä nyt paremmin se on vaan semmonen vaihtelu et jos tekee aina vaan yksinkään tai aina vaan opettajan johdolla nii se tekee jo siitä vaha mukavaman ku saa tehdä vähän ninku jonku toisen kanssa elikkä se vaihtelunhalu tottakai neki haluaa vaihtelua ettei aina oo samanlaista	joo
Ti	ja sit tosiaan sanaston opiskelu et sanastotehtävä tai jos pitää tehdä jotain lauseita niin ne yhdessä niiltä miettiä ja	I	nii joo no enmä sitte tota lausuminen että onko sulla kun nyt tammusia pieniä yhteistoiminnallisia juttuja on siellä luokassa on niin onko se opettajan kesken ja luokkien kesken nii mitään yhteistoimintaa ei oikeestaan	joo
I	joo	Ti	onko onko tääs ollu koululle mitää semmosia koulutuksia tai, tai mitää etilaisuuksia tai sitte	joo
Ti	ja sen tyyppisiä ja tietenki sitte jos on opettanu jonku kielioppiajan nii sit ku ne aikaa sen ymmärtää nii ne voi keskenä tehdä niitä tehtäviäki jonku aikaa	I	ei oo	joo
I	joo no mitenkä sitte onko sulla jotain ollut erityisiä ongelmia niitten siinä mitenkä siinä tai siis näitten ohjeitten antamisen kanssa ongelmaa ku että niiltä ei voi oikeestaan sakaksi antaa että ymmärtäkö ne heti et mikä on homman nimi	Ti	ei oo	joo
Ti	hmm no eei aina ymmärä	I	joo eika koulujen keskenkää oo sitte ollu	joo

Tl
nii samaa ne nyt sitten tehään et me nyt jatketaan tällä viikolla
dactivia et me tehdään siitä sitte samanlainen juttu ja tehdään sit
muillon siihen semmonen peili siihen missä ne saa kans harjoitella
keskenään sitä

I
joo, se onki hyvä ku toiseen, ootkaa huomannu sitte että ku ne tekkee
yhdessä et ne miettiin kysyy siitä kaverilta ku kun suita vai
kysyykö ne siitä aina vaikka ne ois ryhmässä nii aina opettajalta

Tl
kyllä mä kyllä mä ainaki uskolain mitä mä nyt pystyn sivusta vähän
seurataa et onsi mietti keskenään ja niille tulee ritatillanne et
toinen on toista mietti ja kukaan ei osaa sanoa et kumpi on oikeassa et
nii sit ne tulee kysymä mistä tai sit mulla on joskus johonki peiliin
tai johonki pienenä tehdään nii mä annan yheille tai mä annan siihen
ryhmän lähele siihen semmonen ratkaupaperin mistä ne voi tarkistaa
sen

I
joo

Tl
jos ne ei vieläkkään ymmärrä mikä nii sit ne kay kysymä multa

I
joo se on hyvä ku kuitenkin keskenään et sillä tavalla

Tl
mä uskosin et ne kuitenkin keskenään mietti siitä, elikkä ku sittenhan
tulee pättitillanteita et toinen on toin toista mietä ja toinen
toista et sitte mä oon niinku ratkaaja

I
nii sit kuitenkin ne ku tulee se pättitillanne nii ne on jotenki aika
hauskoja usein ku yrittää perustella kuitenkin sitä kantaansa

I
hmm

Tl
ainaki mitä oon huomannu nii

Tl
nii siitä mä joskus teenki että ku joku sanoo et mä tiiän et son väärin
mut mä sitte kysyn et mikä tekia sa oot laittanu tämän tähän ja sit
ku ne kay perustelee niin ne on loppujen lopuksi ne on ite niin
soimussa että ne hoksee ettei tää voi olla oikein että

I
joo, no tuota onko sulla jotain yli yle yleistä sanottavaa vielä
tuosta yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta

Tl
hmm, emmä nyt oikein tiedä, et tosiaan ois kyllä kiiva näha et jos
joskus sitä toteuttaa nii vois sivusta seurata

I
hmm

Tl
et miten se loppujen lopuksi toimii koska yleensähan se nyt ihmiset
jotka, on tavallaan on innostunu siitä niin esittää sen aika
positiivisessa valossa vaikka ne muistaa mainita ne jotku
negatiivisecki asiat

I
hmm

Tl
mut ku non ite niin innostuneita nii ne ei ehkä kuitenkaan sitte et
se pitäis nähdä se koko tilanne miten se toimii et pystyis ite
niinku havainnoimaan et mikä niinku onnasta mielestä on vähä semmost

I
hmm

Tl
et oikei no onkahan tossa nyt jotain järkeä vai minikään tekia tehdän
noin

I
nii

I
joo nii ja se on aika vaikea pelkan kirjastiedun perusteella yhcäkkia
sovaltaa sitä niinku ainaki ite

Tl
hmm

I
aattelisin et vaikka sen tavallaan niinku ymmäittää sen periaatteen ja
sen miten se tapahtuu nii sit

Tl
nii

I
luokassa kuitenkin et miten ne nyt saadaan toimimaan yhdessä et ei sitä
ihan perinteista

Tl
joo

Tl
ja ku se on tosiaan nii ihmiskemioista kiinni et et tuleeko se ryhmä
keskenään toimeen et pystyykö ne ses sitä kasittaleen sitä asiaa
keskenään

I
onko sulla muuten tiliatko niistä ryhmätyksistä että miten minkälaiset
ryhmät siinä kuuluu olla tai kuuluu ja kuuluu mutta

Tl
ah sen itse asiassa mä en edes muista että mä oisin koskaan siitä
edes niin paljon kuulukaan

I
joo no siinä on kai just et pitää olla kahen viiva neljän hengen
ryhmiä ja semmosia heterogeenisia et siellä ois yka semmonen niinku
niinku huononmasta päästä ja yka parhaimmasta päästä

Tl
joo oon mä kuillu tosta joo nyt mulla alkaa muisti palaan

I
joo

Tl
palautuu mieleen joo

I
joo yka toinen opettaja sano et kauheen vaikea on ennalta miettiä se
luokka se luokka et ei sieltä meinaa löytä joka ryhmästä huonompaa
ja parempaa

Tl
nii ei tietenkää

I
sit joo ei ne vielä tuu keskustaan toimeen ollenkaa nii

Tl
varsinkin ku täällä viikasteella tehdän silloin et tai joissaki tai
melkein nyt joka luokka ollaan tavallaan jaettu silloin
piilotasoryhmät

I
aijaa

Tl
mikä siinä on se siitä tykkää koska okei silloin se on kiiva jos sa
saat sen hyvän ryhmän mut jos saat sen huonon nii se on hirvittävä
kivireki perässä koska ainaha se just muutama huono siellä luokassa
nii ne on helppo sieltä niinku poimia ja vähän tukea mut sitku siellä
on seittämättömiä seilasta jotka on ihan pihalla nii siinä on
semmonen et keta mä nyt pian kadesta ja opetan tämän asian ku ne on
sitte vähä laivoittomia samalla koska ne ei taho jakaa olla

Tl
nii semmosesta ei voi ollenkaa

I
nii on kyllä alvia tuota nuo tossa nyt tuli kyllä varmasti kaikki mitä
mulla on tassa itällä yhäällä et kiitoksia paljon

INTERVIEW 2: I = interviewer, T2 = teacher 2

- I no kysyttiin nyt vaikka että millon oot valmistunu ja miten kauan oot ollut toisessa
T2 mä oon valmistunu kuusikymmentäkahdeksan ja ollu toisess nyt sitten jo yli kolmekymmentä vuotta kaikkinaa
I joo millä asteilla sä oot ootko sä ollut täällä yläasteella koko ajan vai
T2 tuota mä oon ollu yläasteella ja se entinenhän oli niinku tää yhteiskoulunimitys -- (KUNNAN NIMI)lyseo vai mikä se oii
I joo
T2 ja sitten oon opettanut lukiosakin sakaa ja tuota psykologiaa ja lukion loppuvuosina ja joku tunti on ollut täällä koulussaakin silloin että vaikka virke oli niinku täällä ja ja et silloin niinku ollu niiltä kouluja kaikenlaisia mutta että tuota varsinainen tuota se vakituinen virke on ollu niinku täällä yläasteella ja ja kyllä se niinku hajauttaa et jos kauheen monessa koulussa on niin niin tuota on se niinku selkeämpää jotenki keskittyä yhteen
I nii kyllä varmasti
T2 kuitenkin et sen kokemuksen kannalta ja sitten vielä tuota yhteen aikaan kun mulla on niin psykologiankin cum laude nii sitte vielä ku ollaan kotitalousopettajiksiakin ja muuta että
I aha no silinä on tekemistä ollu
T2 ja niinku ne ensimmäiset vuodet silloin kunnallisessa keskikoulussa itäsuomessa kun ne tuli niinku täällä koulut vasta jotka nyt vastaa meidän peruskoulua
I joo niin
T2 mutta niiltä kutsuttiin vaan kunnalliseksi keskikouluksi
I joo no ootko sä sitten tässä työn aikana tai opiskeluitten aikana jo tai no ehkä ei opiskelujen aikana vielä mutta työn aikana kuului yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta
T2 on siitä on ollut niinku tässä koulutuksessa ja sitä tammareilla täällä normaalikoulussa tai harjoittelukoulussa ne nimet kun nyt on ehtineet muuttua siinä vaiheessa niin mun mielestä tää tarja foiland oli siihen parhaiten ja tuota minä oon ollut heinolassa tässä hanaan koulutuksessaan
I jaa
T2 joskus viikonloppusena nyt tässä työn aikana mutta että ei siihen aikaan kun mä nyt oon opiskellu ja asukultoinu niin puhuttu sen kummammin tästä
I joo no mitenkä voisit määritellä sen yhteistoiminnallisen oppimisen
T2 no tuota valitettavasti se ehkä kyllä tuntuu että aina käytännössä toimii joku toimii jota rytmessä vaikka sitä kuinka niiltä oppii ja niin etäältä ja oon kielitaidot on ollu ja sitten juuri että mä sitte silloin kun mä olin koulutuksessa niin sitte yritin sitte heti sen jälkeen innostuneena ku heti tietää oppilaat et millon
- I on ollu ku opettajat aina uusia keksti niin niin osa oppilaista sanoo et mitä varten meidän pitää tällasta
T2 hmm
T2 tehdä et ne jotenki niinku heti et ehkä sitä ei osannu markkinoida tai tuoda sillä tavalla mutta se on opettajalle aika niinku vaativaa ja ainakin niinku tää tarja foilandin itse sano et pitää niinku tehdä tiukasti vaan olla ja että pitää tehdä niin ja koko ajan olla niinku siinä valppaana ja ryhmästä toiseen että et se toimi
I joo joo
T2 ja se vaatii tietyn ajan niinku harjaantua myöskin niinku nyt mikä tahansa työmätty tai
I semmonen että
T2 niin
I no miten mikä siinä on aamun mielestä se pääperiaate että millä toimitaan
T2 no tuota minun käsittämäkseni vahan siitä että kaikki oppii kaikkea että se ois niinku semmonen tää mikäli se on nyt oikeassa että siinä ryhmässä tehtiin ja sitten aina niinku joku opetti ja sit ne siirty niinku toisiin ryhmiin ja ne opetti taas toisiaan että oonko mä niinku oikeassa
I joo
T2 joo että että siinä mielessä että et kyllä niinku se ei kaikilla niinku tapahtu mut jokuhan et oppilas joutuu niinku itse miettimään ja perehtymään ja ajattelemään kerran et mikä se asia oikein on ja mitä siinä on esillä niin sen omaksuu huomattavasti helpommin ja sen niinku tajuaa ja voi sitte tietysti kysyä siitä jos sitä joutuu vielä toiselle niinku esittämään niin siitä usein kohta toinenki huomaa tai sillä tavalla et siinä niinku huomaa et ahaa et mikä itselle on selvää niin joku asia toiselle ei ootkaan sillä tavalla selvä
I joo
T2 et sen takia niinku mä oon aina kannattanu tätä että hyvin paljon tai sanotaan että joskus kielillä itekin opiskellu myöhemmin jotaki uutta kielistä ihan alustuksen näköisesti et mitä se on kun ei mitään tiedä koska mullaan on ollut se ole niin yksinkertasta et se on näin ja näin niinku sitä luvattiin ja se on hyvä asia et tulee niinku vähän eri et valilla yrittää saada selville mitä toinen sanoo ja valilla opettaa sitä toista että kyllähän se niinku metodina tahokas on ja sit siin ei niinku kukaan voi oikein
I joo
T2 vetäytyä siinä niinku kokonaan pois eikä syrjäin vaan niinku kaikki joutuu tavallaan
I joo no mitenkä sulla sitten oo kun sä ite oot kokeillu ootko sä kokeillu silloin vaan kun oit ollu siellä koulutuksessa vai ootko myöhemminki vielä kokeillu tai no niinku ihan säännöllisesti vai
T2 ei säännöllisesti että se oli lähinnä silloin kun olin siellä koulutuksessa ja siinä ja sit se niinku helposti niinku tässä työssä nyt moni se niinku silloin entisiin uomiina että tottakai sitä omaksuu niinku jostain uudesta et se ei niinku ehkä aina huomaakaan ku sitä yrittää kokeilla et miten sais sen asian perille ja

I	miten sais mahdollisimman monta mukaan että kyllä mun mielestä tässä työssä on silti ihan spontaanisti muuttunu niinkun osa asioista vaihtet oot tietoisesti muuttanu	joo	T2	no kyllä ne nyt oppii sosiaalisia taitoja ja ja sitten sanomaan asiansa suhkoht selvästi ja ja tuota pikkusen niinku asettumaan toisankin osaan et kyllä mielestäni se kehittää ja sitten just cata et kun se on niin yhteistoiminnallinen jo se nimeni niinku viittaa siihen että toimitaan niinku yhdessä	joo
T2	mutta et ku kaikki muikin muuttuu niin ja kirjat muuttuu ja tehtävätyypit muuttuu ja muuta niin se on ihan terveellistä	joo ainaki vaihtelus	I	ja kantamaan tiettyä vastuuta sitte ja ottamaan itsekin vastuuta ihan toisella tavalla siita oppimisesta just ku ajattellee et ku ajattellee et se pitää niinkun jollleikki muullekin seuraavassa ryhmässä	joo
I	joo ainaki vaihtelus	niin vaihtelus joo	T2	taas niinkun opettaa että kyllä se niinkun siinä mielessä et jos sen sais toimimaan niin tuota niin kyllä se ihan hyvä on että ne pitää aloittaa aika varhaisesta vaiheesta sitte jo että yläasteelle ku tulee englanninki niin ne on tavallaan sitte jo ne joo vuotta ollu et että joitain muutamia et vaikka ihan niinku pienenä muodossa niinku joo jo ottaa sitte jo tuota mut se ei kovin mun mielestä yläasteella oo levinny tää ylä tää alku se johtuu näitten ryhmien heterogeenisuudesta	niin
T2	no opettaja nyt on lähinnä niinku semmonen et se ohjaa että se ei ainakin etäsovelleten pakkajien on mikä tuota mistä niinkun ei albiin se jostakin kun tulla lähinnä muuta et se on nyt lähinnä semmonen avustava tai jolta voidaan kysyä tai jonne puoleen kääntyä ja sitten niinku et se kiertellä ja kiertellä et mitenkä ei toiminta siellä ryhmässä tuota menee ja sitten että kaikki mahdollisuuden mukaan niinku pääsis siihen mukaan tai suorittaa sitä et se niinku lähinnä semmonen avustava	joo	I	että ainakin se opettaja pääasiassa toimii lukiössä ja vielä tallassaa harjoittelukoulussa jossa usein oppilasaikoin on erilaista niin niin tuota ne mallitki tulee sitte sieltä	niin
I	mä katsoisin että siinä	joo	T2	no mitenkä sitte ne ryhmät ku se mainitsit ne ryhmät on niin heterogeenisia niin mitenkä siin mitenkä se sitten valitset ne ryhmät missä ne toimii että saako ne ite mennä ryhmään vai oletko se	niin
T2	no se on että osa niinku varmaan ku mä niin lyhytkaikalohjauksella sitä kokellin ja lähinnä siinä omassa luokassa niin tai valvontaluokassani nii et mä tunsin oppilaatki parhaiten niin niin tokihan ne siinä niinku oppi mutta osa hyvistä oppilaista niinkun tuskastu niihin viitosen ja kutosien ryhmässä tai siis siinä olevien että kun ne oli niin hitaita ja siisä tavalla et siinä niinkun joutut turhaudui	joo	I	et ei se missään tapauksessa saa olla siisä tavalla että ne valitais niinkun itse ryhmät ei se toimi	ham
I	siisä tuli semmonen itselle semmonen tunne että kun ne halus edetä ja omaan tahtiin ja nopeasti ja tuota edellytyksinä vastavaasti et niinku eriytyneesti	ham	T2	siisä et kyllä ne tavryy olla et siinä tavryy olla joku semmonen et et se pitää olla niinkun ihan opettajan sanomat ne ryhmät	joo
T2	niinkun siinä nyt et tuota semmonen tunne jsi niinkun mieleen että osa sieltä varmaan niinku näitä nimenomaan hyviä oppilaita tuli se palaute että et mitä ne niinku tallasta tehdään et se on niinkun se on semmonen kasvun paikka ja oppia tekemään niinkun ryhmätyötä ja sitten että kestää aikansa et siihen pitää harjaantua	joo	I	no siinä nyt on Jonkin verran aikaa että mä muista mutta hyvin paljon tietysti sen kirjan mukaan ja mitä on niinku lämpöisiä kielioppilaita ja ja minkälaisia tehtäviä	joo
I	no tuntuuko että oppilaat siinä oppii muutakin muitakin taitoja kuin pelkästään vain sitä asiaa mitä ne opettelee		I		

T2	I	kirjassa sitten milloinkin saattuu olemaan ja tietysti siellä nyt jostakin tehdään myös tällaisia puheharjoituksia mut et hyvin pitkälti jotenkin kieliooppilasioitten niinku selittämistä	joo
I	I	taitaa aika usein olla	
T2	I	tämmönen mielikuva niinku jai joo	
I	I	joo, no mitenäs sitte annoit ne ohjeet ensin ku esittelit tämän uuden asian niin mitenkäs sä annoit ne ohjeet ja annoitko suomeksi vai sillä vierasella kielellä	
T2	I	suomeksi koska tuota	
I	I	joo	
T2	I	sekin on semmonen asia että että kun on pitkän uran tehnyt niin ku itse aikoinaan sukulitoin niin piti kaikki ohjeet ja kaikki sanat kieliooppiki vierasella kielellä ehdottomasti koko tunti sitä ja sitten taas	
I	I	joo	
T2	I	myöhemmin on sitten tämmönen trendi ollut että mikä kieliooppilas tai sellaisia joitten nimikkeet ja kasitteet siidinkieliä on oppilaille varainki yläasteella valkeita et mikä sitä valkeutta enään lisää	
I	I	hmm	
T2	I	että siinä niin ne ohjeet tulee yleensä sitten annetuksi ihan suomen kielellä	
I	I	joo, no tuntuuko siitä että ne oppilaat kyllä aika nopeasti ymmärsi mistä on kysymys että ne osas ruveta tekemään oikealla tavalla vai ...	
T2	I	no taas kerran sanotaan kun se kokeilu oli niin lyhytaikasta enkä sitä oo kovin harrastanu mutta kyllä yleensä oppilaat osaa aika monenlaisia työtapoja niinku käyttää että ne kyllä tämmösiä ku ne on eri aiheissaki tottuneet niin tuota oppii kyllä sitten sen kun selittää että ei se mielestäni se ei oo nykyisin ongelma et ne hyvin pian niinkun tajuaa sen että joo mitä tää pitää tehdä ja ainakin joku siitä	
I	I	hmm	
T2	I	ryhmästä joka voi sitten niiltä muitakin vähän neuvoa että	
I	I	joo	
I	I	toimiko se muuten sillä tavalla sitten kun ne oli ryhmässä oli joku joka opetti muita siinä niin	
T2	I	hmm	
I	I	kyäkö ne muut ryhmäläiset silta ryhmän opettajalta vai multa sitten neuvoja	
T2	I	no lähinnä se on taas sitä niinkun ryhmän o ryhmän silta opettajalta että ne ois niinku aika itsenäisesti toine mut tietysti tulee siellä tilanteita et ei sitä osaa oikein kukaan että ne niinkun kysyy myöskin sitte opettajalta	

I	I	joo	
T2	I	sitte ja hyvin mielellään jos siinä kerran liikkuu niin ne kysäsee sitten siitä tai varmista tai myöskin se	
I	I	joo	
T2	I	ryhmän opettaja että tämmönen	
I	I	joo, se on ihan hyvä että varmistusta, ooh no mitäs multa muuta vielä, no unko siinä ollu muita vaikeuksia muuta ku se että joku semmoiset tammoseet perämmet oppilaat niin turhautuu unko siinä muita ongelmia	
T2	I	no semmonen sanotaan et semmonen itselle tuli niinku semmonen et onkahan ne nyt oppineet varmasti sen ja tietysti sitä kun sitten kontrollioi ja näkeehtän sen että pitäisi niinkun nähdä mutta todella että tai siinä mielessä ei anna ihan että tyytä kuvaa koska sitä on niin vähän tuihy ja kokeilu että	
I	I	joo	
T2	I	et ne varmasti ne asiat tulee ihan sit toisella tavalla esille ja ongelmat et jos sitä pidetään aikaa niinkun taks tai suorittais ja kokeilisi	
I	I	tuntuuko nyt kuitenkin että tällä tavalla ois tarpeeksi että pystyisit josskun pidemmän vaikka yhen kurssin verran tällä tavalla	
T2	I	no jos palauttais niinkun esimerkiksi mutta kyl mun mielestä ne ois syytä varmaankin ne aikaan saadut materiaali ja ne työtävät ja muut niin mennä ihan huolellisesti vielä itse ensin läpi ja suunnitella aika tarkasti se että sitähan se niinkun vaatii	
I	I	joo	
T2	I	myöskin et se on myöskin vaativa ja ja tuota että luokkatilasta lähtien jo että missä ja missä mikään ja missä niiltä vastauksia on et kyllä se semmonen pohjatyön vaatii että ei se niinku et jos ma sanon toot nyt seuraavalla tunnilla että tehdänpäs näin niin ei siihen ois itsekään tyytyväinen	
I	I	joo	
T2	I	että kyllä se niinkun vaatii sen että mennä ihan niinkun uudestaan ne kaikki laput jos lähtii kokeilemaan ja mielellään semmosessa ryhmässä mikä ois hienon tämmönen homojen näköinen ja jättäisi siinä ja sitten kattoo että eiks sen pyörittäminen niinku tuntiin siinä sitte soveltaa sitä että harjoitteluhan se iteläkin on	
I	I	niin niin on	
I	I	tuntuuko tai oisiko sulla vielä kiinnostusta jostakin kokeilla tuota vai ootko hyljänny sen koko yhteistoiminnallisen oppimisen	
T2	I	(naurahdus) no miksei sitä kiinnostusta oo että ainahan sitä niinku joutuu uutta et se vaan on tavallaan ollu hetken aikaa unohtuksissa ja ehkä siitakin syystä et nää nykyiset ku nää on aika uusia kirjoja niin siillon aika monenlaisia jo tehtävityyppejä ja sitten sitä tulee niinku et ku -n sitä kirjoittelusta ja keskustelua ja perityötä ja kaikenmukasta tällaista niin niin että se aikakaan aine et se niinku siillon se ongelma että et tulee niinku mieltäneeksi et mistä aika siillon et jos oikein hitaasti kay jonkun asian ja sen sisänsäjo vie jo paljon aikaa niin niin sitte tulee semmonen tunne että tääsä	

I	I	kurssimuutoksessa välaasteellakin jo että kuinka paljon ja mitä mä karsin että	niin	kuulutus vähi minkälaisista tahansa että sitä voi niinkun soveltaa ja yrittää niinkun omassa työssä	ihän
T2	T2	et mä ehdin että mullon niinku aikaa niinku tälliseen perehdyttämiseen joka kestää kaemmin ku jossain lukioasteella		että kyllä siitä aina niinkun sai jotakin	
I	I	niin		joo kyllä	
T2	T2	opillaitoksessa			
I	I	no tota sitte vielä tämmöstä haluaisin kysyä että onko teillä opettajien keskuudessa paljon yhteistoimintaa ja siinä tavalla niinkun luokkahuoneen ulkopuolella onko yhteistoimintaa paljo		joo no mulla jai tossa alusaa vielä kysymättä että muistatko yhtään mistä tämä on kosoin tämä yhteistoiminnallinen oppiminen	
T2	T2	no nyt tässäkin nyt me jatkuvasti oikeastaan tehdään aikasemmin oii näitä yt-tunteja mutta että ei siinä tavalla oo ja että että siinä nyt ollaan sitä nimenomaan taas yritetään niinkun parantaa ja muuta yhteistyötä kyllä siinä on ollu ja jatkuvastihan me jonkinlaisia yhteistoimintaa tehdään ja kun meitä nyt on niin suuri ryhmä niin siitä muodotun autotien tässä ryhmä näijä viis jotta keskustelua siitä jatketaan ja niistä yhteistyöstä on ollu aika paljon		tarkotaksä mistä maasta	
I	I	mitä sitte muuta kyllä meillä mielestään on ollu yhteistyötä		ööh niin tai muistatko ketään kenenkään nimia	
T2	T2	riittävästi että et se toimii toiselta hyvin mut tietysti on ollu joitain projekteja on niin voittas niitä suunnitella sitte niinkun sitten yhdessä ja sen materiaalin ettei oo niin et kaikki tekse sitä omanaa ja kaikki tekse oman kalvon et kyl se pikkuksen semmosen et kyl siinä parantamisen väraa niinku ehdottomasti oia		mä en muista kenenkään nimikään siinä että kun mä silloin se siinä oii väraa niinku kirjakin mutta kun mielestäni tää kristianosen ei ainakaan tätä	
I	I	joo		ei ei ei	
T2	T2	ja saati sitte niin integroitin muihin alaisiin niin sitte siitä puhutaan aina silloin tällöin mutta se kyllä jaa aina siihen puhumiseen asteelle	joo	Yhteistoiminnallista oppimista oo niinkun tota en muista	
I	I	tuntuuko se kiinnostavalta		joo no se on amerikaasta ja nämä johnsonit	
T2	T2	no tietysti sekin tuntuu kiinnostavalta ja pakottihan sitä joutuu äidinkielen aikanuotoja ynnä muita lauseenjäseniä kertamaan tässä joka kerta niin itsekin mutta tuota et ei se aina oo sovellettavissa oikain hyvin kun toiset menee jossain muussa jaksossa sitä asiaa ja toinen menee toisessa		mä mainasin sanoo että amerikaasta et mullon semmonen käsitys et amerikaasta mut en uskaltanu sanoo että tuleeko että sieltähän ne kuitenkin tulee jonkin verran tutkimusta tämmöisissä alalla sitte näin	
I	I	joo		joo no voisitko lopuksi vielä sanoo semmosen yleisen kommentin yhteistoiminnallisesta oppimisesta ja mitä mielestä siitä oiet ja onko se sun mielestä kannattaako siihen sun mielestä uhrata aikaa	
T2	T2	että ku se ei satu sitte niinku yhtäalkaa että se siinä on tai sitte ku pääsee hyvään alkuun niin sit se	niin niin	no kyllä siihen väraan uhrata siinä mielessä aikaa että et kyllähän se niin tuota se opetella niinkun jollain tavalla itsestään itäse enemmän niinkun alisoita siivää ja heidän koulun siinä tavalla ymmärtämään sun asioita et se ei kyl se niinku koulun koulun koulun ja sitte valitellen niinku et se ei kyl se niinku toiselta mielestani on ollu niinku niinku niinku oikeasta sunnasta et mä oon niinku sitä mieltä että se niinku metodina aikansa huono niinku oia et sitä voia ainaki vaihtaa mut silloinki kyllästy sitten oppiaaet tuota ehkä helposti jos kaikki tapahtuu niinkun aina ja sen mukaan et kyl niitä pitäis vaihdella siit niitä työtäpoja vähän että onhan aika nyt niinku muutakin vaihtelun oia opettajajohtoinen mutakin kuin ihan tää yhteistoiminnallinen työskentely taitaa mennä ettei	
I	I	joo joo		joo no kiitoksia	
T2	T2	keskeytyy justilnsa pahasti että tämmöstä			
I	I	no mitenkä sitte tuntuuko että koulutusta on saanu tarpeeksi tämmöisistä uusista opetusmenetelmistä			
T2	T2	*no aikasemmin sai kyllä ihan riittävästi mutta nykyisin ei oo määrärahojen puutteessa että mielellään menis kuulemaan ja tapaamaan muita kollegoita ja mitä niillä on esillä ja mitä uusia on että nyt on taas vähän siihen suuntaan että pitäis löytyä jostaki se raha että pääsis kukin vuorollansa että tuota että se siinä on suuri ongelma oillukki että aikasemmin kyllä mielellään osa oia kyllä ihan mielellään kuunteli ja aina sieltä joku osa on semmosta että olipa			