

ISSUES IN GROUP LEARNING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSES : A LITERATURE REVIEW**Alka Chaturvedi****Assistant Professor****Prestige Institute of Management , Airport Road . Gwalior****ABSTRACT**

This article reviews the analysis of research literature on symbiotic learning within the second language classrooms, in reference to the second language procurement, the maintenance of basic language, content learning, and the learners' perceptions. It also discusses some problems and issues of academic innovation in association with English as a second language. It also incorporates further analysis to look at the categories of native language learners, the combination of native and English communications made in cooperative groups and determining the students' development of educational discussion, to investigate whether or not, the native language used in cooperative teams affects the interracial and intercultural relationships between students. Thus, cooperative learning is probably useful for these learners. It can maximize second language procurement by providing more chances for each language input and output. It also facilitates students to draw on their native language whereas developing second language skills. It includes opportunities for the blending the language and content learning.

Key Words: symbiotic, procurement, perceptions, innovation, association, communication, investigate, cooperative, interracial, intercultural

INTRODUCTION

Collaborative learning is basically a room learning technique that needs the students to figure along in teams or pairs in learning tasks (Colbeck et al., 2000). Students from completely different levels work along for a standard goal as they are liable for their own learning and for others in their cluster. Johnson, Johnson, and Smith, (1991) indicate that collaborative learning needs components of positive reciprocity, individual responsibility, face-to-face encouraging interaction, acceptable use of cooperative skills and cluster process. Students are given opportunities to be told by inquiry underneath the steering of an instructor and at a similar time developing communicative skills, leadership skills and interpersonal skills (Bean, 2001). Learners can have a lot of opportunities to move with peers, gift and defend ideas, exchange numerous beliefs, question alternative abstract frameworks and be actively engaged in cooperative learning setting.

In second language acquisition, students realize difficulties in utilizing the language skills outside the school rooms as there are fewer opportunities thus giving a poor language environment. Thus, academicians have to compel to make sure that students use English in discussing and human action with one another within the room. Students realize it tough to utilize the language as a result of the category size, learning preferences and teachers' approaches to teaching. On the opposite hand, teachers are involved regarding the low proficiency level of the scholars and also the massive category size that they have to touch upon as a typical category may reach up to fifty five students

In recent years, symbiotic learning has emerged as a major technique and educational style in the sphere of second language learning. Abundant attention has been paid to the education and emotional justification of its use in second language categories (Long & Porter, 1985) and the hidden advantage is that it would be in bilingual programs and second or foreign language settings (Coelho, 1992, 1994; ; Holt, 1993; Kessler, 1992; mcgroarty, 1989,1992). The maximum conditions for second language learning and students for cooperative learning are compared to envision if the are in any manner similar (Fathman & Kessler, 1993). Tutorial styles and planning of second language education are also correlated with those of cooperative learning strategies to envision if there is some similarity (mc groarty, 1993). In addition to this

, studies are conducted at various levels to see the impact of group learning on the gaining of second language, maintenance of first language, the blending of language and content learning, and learners' perceptions. This article gives a critical review of the research literature on cooperative learning in four areas and discusses some issues and problems of educational innovation in an ESL context.

GROUP LEARNING AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

A remarkable belief in the field of second language education is that cooperative learning maximizes second language acquisition by providing more and more opportunities for each language input and output (Fathman & Kessler, 1993; Holt, Chips, & Wallace, 1992; Long & Porter, 1985; Mc Groarty, 1993). When compared with analysis on cooperative learning in thought education, research on cooperative learning in second language education is amazingly lesser in depth. Though theorists take cooperative learning to be useful to second language learners. Till date, very few studies have been based on cooperative learning and second language acquisitions. In spite of the restricted number of studies, the present study supports the idea that cooperative learning offers second language learners an additional opportunities for interaction in second language and this helps them to improve second language proficiency.

A study on group learning and interaction was carried out by Long, Adams, Mclean, and Castanos (1976) in intermediate-level, adult ESL categories. The researchers compared teacher-led discussions with peer discussions to look at the number and style of student speak in each contexts. Their results revealed that students in pairs created a considerably greater quantity and style of student speaking than within the teacher-led discussions. They not only talked but created a wider variety of language functions (e.g., rhetorical, education, and interpersonal).

In a study on second language learners, Pica and Manlike (1985a, 1985b) compared the teacher fronted discussions and small-group discussions during a classroom setting involving low-intermediate-level of students. They found that individual students had additional opportunities to observe and explore English and interact directly in teams than in teacher-fronted discussions by taking additional turns, by manufacturing additional samples of the target language, and receiving additional feedback

from different clusters. In an associated report, Doughty and Pica (1984) compared language use in teacher-fronted lessons, group work, and combined work. They noted that considerably, that to boost second language learning, occurred in teams (66% of total talk) and in pairs (68%) than within the whole class settings (45%). Pica (1987) reported in a research that involving low-intermediate level adult ESL students engaged in two styles of schoolroom activities in a very teacher-fronted setting and in little groups of 4. It was found that the teacher-directed participation pattern generated a comparatively bit of changed interaction in each activities.

The prevalence of such reciprocal moves checks and clarifies requests, that it is necessary. The involvement pattern, on the opposite hand, depicted a fancy image. The cluster participants produced considerably a lot of reciprocal moves to clarify or ensure message clarity, content quality of their utterances in the activities, but not within the different groups. Lastly, Pica emphasized on the importance not of cluster work but the character of schoolroom activities to be accomplished in little teams. In a situation wherever English was the L1 and Dutch was a remote language, Deen (1987) analyzed schoolroom interactions in a very cooperative learning situation and a teacher-centered scenario and found that a cooperative jigsaw activity created more fellow opportunities for individual learners. Students asked a way more queries of different sorts. By doing therefore, they created input for every different step and, at the same time, practiced natural use of the language. It absolutely was noted that the proportion of errors in cooperative student work was so much less than that in teacher-led instruction, As a result, students had more probabilities to use the language in cooperative work. In addition to the main focus on the impact of cooperative learning on the amount of interaction in L2, analysis has conjointly been meted out to look at the effect of cooperative learning on second language proficiency.

Sharan, Bejarano, Kussell, and Peleg's (1984). The study concerned junior high {school |secondary school|ly ceum|lycee| Gymnasium |middle school} Israeli students learning English as a second language. They studied cooperative learning ways with the whole-class technique and located that cooperative learning resulted in higher performance levels on associate degrees. The researchers suggest that students had opportunities to talk more often and to use totally different language structures within the small-group settings. Research has

conjointly been conducted to judge the result of cooperative learning on language proficiency in a very foreign learning scenario.

Bejarano (1987) reported on a study involving junior high {school|secondary school|lyceum|lycee|Gymnasium|middle school} school students learning English as a remote language in Israel. Students in categories were found to create vital enhancements and improvements in an overall English proficiency check and in a very listening comprehension subtest as against students in categories victimization whole-class ways.

ISSUES OF ACADEMIC LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The existing body of research in the second language classroom appears to indicate that cooperative learning methods maximize second language learning by providing opportunities for both language input and output. Nevertheless, little research has shown that the kinds of discourse produced in small groups and examined the quality of L2 acquisition.

In his discussion of language proficiency, Cummins (1984, 1992) distinguished between basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive/academic they have an effect on relations between students of United Nations agency returning from completely different ethnic groups and speak completely different mother tongues.

Cooperative Learning and Integration of Language and Content Learning. Good things about cooperative learning within the second language classroom is that it makes thought processing without delay to students .the content of the syllabus and also the language required to work it.

In their elaborated account of the principles of cooperative learning for language and content gains, Kagan and mcgroarty (1993) said that: By providing a spread of the way to reveal students cooperative learning serves each language and content curriculum goals are achieved. Through cooperative learning there's improved comprehension and production of language ,and each these outcomes aid to the attainment of material goals. (p. 47)

In her review of the useful effects of cooperative learning for second language instruction, mcgroarty (1989, 1992) made a variety of studies that were conducted . She reviewed by

stating that the good thing about cooperative learning is that it offers extra methods in which to include content areas into language instructions in each ESL and bilingual settings.

Some recent analysis has checked out cooperation between the professional (i.e., the teacher) and also the novices (i.e., the students). In his empirical study of a high school foreign language category, Freeman (1992) the teacher and her students worked through cooperative interactions to create a shared understanding of French as each content and activity. The findings show that "the material isn't the French language itself, but the interactions that generate it. Interaction produces content that is channeled or reworked into content" (p. 58)

In his observational study of a high school foreign language class, Freeman (1992) described how the teacher and her students worked together cooperatively to create a shared understanding of French as both content and activity. The findings show that "the subject matter is not the French language, but the interactions which generated it. Interaction produces talk which is channeled or transformed into communication" (p. 58)

Mohan and Smith's (1992) studied cooperation between the instructor and the students. The aim of their study was to analyze how and why a group of Chinese students were ready to achieve a graduate level class course though they had inadequate knowledge related to the topic matter and limited English proficiency (as measured by TOEFL tests). Their results showed that the group interaction of the trainer and also the Chinese students created a context that enabled the learners to develop the information and to steer ahead which was required to support work on the assignments. In different words, the instructor because the professional had structured the course interaction and also the series of assignments in an exceedingly approach that the novices might participate within the interaction and undertake assignments that will otherwise be beyond their apparent capabilities.

Webb's analysis issues the role of students' previous knowledge in their learning of recent content data in cooperative teams. Considering ESL students in content categories, the role of their previous data in L1 in their learning will cooperative learning facilitate ESL students draw on their previous data in L1 associate the degree expansion of their content data. Answers to these queries can facilitate a connection between cooperative learning and also the concurrent learning of language and content in an ESL context.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS

It is noteworthy that a lot of the discussion of the helpful effects of cooperative learning has been either from the researcher's or the teacher's purpose. What square measure the L2 students' perspectives? Do they understand cooperative tasks? Do they like their experiences once operating in groups? Perceptions from the investigator and also the teacher square measure necessary,

Students' beliefs and attitudes can influence the implementation and success of cooperative learning in second language lecture rooms. Their negative attitudes towards cooperative learning. During a study on ESL students' learning vogue preferences, Thomas Reid (1987) rumored that nearly none of her participants selected cluster learning as a significant learning preference.

Kinsella (1996) noted that despite the pairing and grouping his studies and varied high school and university teaching experiences with the lingually and culturally numerous students reveals that not all ESL students are fond of cooperative room learning with an equivalent zeal as do their instructors. In fact, some students are more confident to react with raised eyebrows and sighs at the prospect of a semester of in progress participation in peer working teams. In my very own categories and the people of same colleagues, I have found that well-intended efforts form additional and variety of contexts for second language use and growth and may be met with reluctance and disorientation on the a part of some students. (p.24)what is the positivity of these findings on cooperative learning What are the explanations and negative responses to cooperative learning? What are the measurable sources for the disapproval of students towards innovation that is supposed to beneficial for them?

ISSUES OF MENTAL OBJECT ASPECTS OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING

CLASSROOMS

How do these reports match with the positive findings of cooperative learning that is done among the studies that have been reviewed in the cases mentioned? What are the various explanations given for negative responses of ESL students' towards cooperative learning?

What are the measurable sources for their disapproval towards this guided innovations that are supposed to be for their benefits? The analysis must be done to know better understanding, learning and influence of their perceptions.

The mental object aspects of cooperative learning have not been given due attention in the analysis of second language education. Janda (1990) wrote: When collaboration enters the day to day life ... It does not enter an empty space where no social, linguistic or rhetorical activities occur. We tend to be persuasive and thus the collaboration is a wonderful practice, We also have a habit to restrict our mind that the old social and linguistic behaviors are well rooted in their minds, behaviors, and expectations of students and academics. (p. 292) The munition of ancient social behaviors concerns ore relevance for ESL students who come back from a standard background.

Xiaoping liang, bernard a. Mohan, and margaret early Swain and Miccoli's (1994) analysed documents of a Japanese adult learner and his stong feelings of anxiety while working very small group in a university graduate-level course at Canada. Her didactic background not completely fresh for her participation, besides, the thoughts and self belief had influenced her that learning could be a goal oriented activity. She struggled hard with a number of cultural changes to accomodate with the cooperative course formats.

Many ESL students in North yankee colleges comeback from instructional backgrounds wherever categories are mostly teacher-fronted, with the teacher transmitting data and students recording, memorizing, and recalling what is being transmitted. Having rarely seasoned different teaching approaches, they tend to require it without any consideration that this can be the sole (or a minimum of the best) thanks to learn. Once they are placed in cooperative learning settings, their past expertise might acquire conflict with their new expertise, and their previous beliefs with the beliefs powerfully command by several North yankee educators. This social group dimension of learning ESL in tiny teams needs to be addressed, discussed, and researched. Studies are required to explore however students' social group backgrounds and past instructional experiences contribute to the means they approach and adapt to cooperative learning in ESL lecture rooms.

CONCLUSION

Research within the second language schoolroom indicates that cooperative learning is probably useful for ESL students. It can maximize second language procurement by providing more chances for each language input and output. It may facilitate students draw on their 1st language whereas developing second language skills. It includes opportunities for the mixing of language and content learning. Though the beneficial effects of cooperative learning within the second language schoolroom are spectacular, a lot of analysis must be done to look at the kinds of native language and second language discourses made in cooperative teams to search the concerning student development of educational language. Analysis must be conducted to investigate natural language maintenance in ESL categories wherever quite one first language is spoken. It might be vital to analyze whether the employment of some students' 1st languages affects the inter-ethnic relationships between these students and students who speak totally different native languages. Additionally, analysis is required to see the role of students' prior data in their learning of recent content data in second language in cooperative teams. Moreover, analysis must take a social group approach to find out however students understand cooperative learning and the way cultural and academic backgrounds might influence their perceptions.

REFERENCES

- Cummins, J. (1984). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In J. Cummins (Ed.), *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy* (pp. 130-151). San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.
- Colbeck, C.L., Campbell, S.E., & Bjorklund, S.A. (2000). Grouping in the Dark: What College Students Learn from Group Projects. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 60-83
- Cummins, J. (1992). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement.
- Deen, J.Y. (1987). An analysis of classroom interaction in a cooperative learning and teacher-centered setting. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1984, March 1984). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? Paper presented at the 18th Annual TESOL Conference, Houston.
- Fathman, A.K., & Kessler, C. (1993). Cooperative language learning in school contexts. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 127-140.
- Freeman, D. (1992). Collaboration: Constructing shared understandings in a second language classroom.
- Holt, D.D. (Ed.). (1993). *Cooperative learning: A response to linguistic and cultural diversity*. Mchenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta System.
- Johnson, D.W., R.T. Johnson & K.A. Smith. (1991). *Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional*
- Productivity, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. George Washington University.
- Srinivas, H. (n.d.). What is collaborative learning? *National Institute of Science Education*. [Online] Available: <http://www.gdrc.org/kmgmt/c-learn/what-is-cl.htm> (January 28, 2009)
- Xiaoping liang, Bernard A. Mohan, and Margaret Early Holt, D.D., Chips, B., & Wallace, D. (1992). Cooperative learning in the secondary school: Maximizing language acquisition, academic achievement, and social development. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Janda, M.A. (1990). Collaboration in a traditional classroom environment. *Written Communication*, 7(3), 291-315.

- Kagan, S., & mcgroarty, M. (1993). Principles of cooperative learning for language and content gains. In D.o. Holt (Ed.), Cooperative learning: A response to linguistic and cultural diversity (pp. 47-66). Mchenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta systems.
- Kessler, C. (1992). Cooperative language learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Regents.
- Kinsella, K. (1996). Designing group work that supports and enhances diverse classroom work styles. TESOL Journal, 6, 24-30.
- Long, M.H., Adams, 1., mclean, M., & Castafios, F. (1976). Doing things with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations.
- . Long, M., & Porter, P.A. (1985). Group work, inter language talk and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 207-228.
- MCGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. National Association for Bilingual Education Journal, 13(2), 127-143.
- MCGroarty, M. (1992). Cooperative learning: The benefits for content area teaching. In P.A. Richard & M.A. Snow (Eds.), The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers (pp. 58-69).
- MCGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D.D. Holt (Ed.), Cooperative learning: A response to linguistic and Cultural diversity (pp. 19-46). Mchenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta systems.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. Applied Linguistics, 8, 3-21
- Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985a). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 115-132).
- Rowley, MA: Newbury House. Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985 b). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7(2), 233-248.
- Reid, J. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. TESOL Quarterly, 21,87-111.
- Sharan, S., Bejarano, Y., Kussell, P., & Peleg, R. (1984). Achievement in English language and in literature.in S. Sharan, P. Kussell, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, Y. Bejarano, S. Raviv, & Y. Sharan (Eds.), Cooperative learning in the classroom: Research in desegregated schools (pp. 46-72).
- Swain, M., & Miccoli, 1.S. (1994). Learning in a content-based, collaboratively structured course: The experience of an adult ESL learner. TESL Canada Journal, 12(1), 15-28.

- Webb, R. (1990). Working collaboratively on topic tasks. Cambridge Journal of education, 20, 37-52.