

**The Effect of Collaborative Strategy on Improving Students'
Potentials in learning Active Voice and Passive Voice in English**

أثر استراتيجية التعلم التعاوني في تحسين أداء الطلبة في المبني للمعلوم والمبني للمجهول

Khalaf Al-Makhzoomi*, & Ahmed Awad**

خلف المخزومي، وأحمد عوض

*Faculty of Education, Yarmouk University, Jordan. ** Faculty of
Education, An-Najah University. Palestine

E-Mail: ahmedawad_amin@yahoo.com

Received: (20/5/2009), Accepted: (16/11/2009)

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the effect of the collaborative learning on improving the students' potential when dealing with the active voice and the passive voice in English. To achieve this aim, the researchers conducted this study on the eighth graders in Qalqilia district in Palestine. The treatment was applied to 50 male and female students who were randomly selected from all the district schools. The researchers divided the sample into two groups of 25 students each (a control group and an experimental group). The groups were given the same material about the passive voice and the active voice. The students in the control group were taught the use of the passive voice and the active voice through the traditional method while the students in the experimental group were taught the use of the passive voice and the active voice through the collaborative learning method. The researchers illustrated the collaborative learning principles to the teacher of the experimental group. For details see Appendix III, P23-24. During the second semester 2006-2007 and before applying the collaborative method, the researchers gave the two groups the same test to make sure that they were equivalent. They administered the same test to the two groups after applying the collaborative method. The findings of the study showed that there was a

significant difference between the experimental and the control groups in favor of the experimental group, which means that the collaborative learning strategy was more effective in improving students' learning of the active and passive voice. Based on these findings, the researchers recommended that teachers be advised to adopt the collaborative learning strategy that focuses on the learner who is considered as the foundation stone of the whole teaching and learning process.

Key Words: Collaborative Learning, Active Voice, Passive Voice

ملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة الى اكتشاف اثر الاستراتيجية التعاونية في تحسين قدرات الطلبة في تعلم المبني للمعلوم والمبني للمجهول في اللغة الانجليزية. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف، أجرى الباحثان هذه الدراسة على طلبة الصف الثامن في مدارس محافظة قلقيلية في فلسطين. واختار الباحثان عشوائيا مدرستين من مدارس المحافظة واحدة للذكور وأخرى للإناث ثم اختارا عشوائيا خمسين طالبا وطالبة من المدرستين. قسم الباحثان العينة إلى مجموعتين (ضابطة وتجريبية) تحوي كل منهما (٢٥) طالبا وطالبة. درست المجموعة الضابطة موضوع المبني للمعلوم والمبني للمجهول بالطريقة التقليدية بينما درست المجموعة التجريبية الموضوع نفسه باستخدام الطريقة التعاونية. استخدم الباحثان امتحانا قبليا وبعديا للتأكد من اثر الطريقة التعاونية وكان ذلك خلال الفصل الدراسي الثاني ٢٠٠٦-٢٠٠٧. ودرب الباحثان المعلم الذي درس طلبة المجموعة التجريبية على كل جوانب التعلم التعاوني. لمزيد من التفصيل انظر إلى الملحق III صفحة 24. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن هناك فروقا ذات دلالة إحصائية بين أداء طلبة المجموعة الضابطة وأداء طلبة المجموعة التجريبية وذلك لصالح المجموعة التجريبية مما يظهر أهمية استخدام الطريقة التعاونية. وبناء على نتائج الدراسة أوصى الباحثان بضرورة التركيز على الطريقة التعاونية التي تركز على المتعلم الذي يعتبر بمثابة حجر الأساس في العملية التربوية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التعلم التعاوني، المبني للمعلوم، المبني للمجهول.

Introduction and Theoretical Background

Scholars started with a simple question “Is collaborative learning more efficient than individual learning?” The majority of studies have shown that collaborative learning is more efficient. (Piaget1928, 1932, Vygotsky1978, Blanche 2003, Becker 2004, Mukti et al 2005 and Gleeson et al 2006, among others). Collaborative learning (CL) is a

personal philosophy, not just a classroom technique. It suggests a way of dealing with people which respects and highlights group members' abilities and contributions. The underlying premise of collaborative learning is based upon consensus building through cooperation among group members, in contrast to competition in which individuals compete against other group members. (Mc Groarty 1993).

Various names have been given to this form of teaching, among these are cooperative learning, collaborative learning, collective learning, learning communities, peer teaching, peer learning, reciprocal learning, team learning, study circles, study groups, and work groups. But, all in all, there are three general types of group work: informal learning groups, formal learning groups, and study teams (Johnson, and Smith, 1991).

Piaget (1928 and 1932) pointed out that collaborative learning has a major role in constructive cognitive development. His theory is consistent with other popular learning theories (Vygotsky 1978) in emphasizing the importance of collaboration.

In conclusion, a collaborative learning system concentrates on refining and integrating the learning process and the subject knowledge of the students with the help of the collaborative partners. The promise of collaborative learning is to allow students to learn in relatively realistic, cognitively motivating and socially enriched learning contexts, compared to other tutoring paradigms like Socratic learning,

Dillenbourg et al. (1994) identify three different theories of learning that could be employed in collaborative learning systems: 1-socio-constructivist theory 2- socio-cultural theory, and 3-shared cognition theory. Each theory relates the student's learning to a typical learning environment. These three theories are classified as cognitive developmental approaches that focus on the interactions among peers around appropriate tasks in a given environment that would increase the mastery of critical concepts.

1. The socio-constructivist theory advocates that students master new approaches of learning through interacting with others (Doise1990). This theory is an extension of Piaget (1928 and 1932) theory that

focused on the reasons for cognitive developments in individuals. In the socio-constructivist theory, emphasis is given to interactions rather than actions themselves. A given level of individual development allows participation in certain social interactions which produce new individual states which, in turn, make possible more sophisticated social interactions, and so on (Dillenbourg et al. 1994). The socio-constructivist approach focuses on the individual's development with respect to the social interaction, without really differentiating or identifying the underlying factors that enhance collaborative learning. Here the social interaction is assumed as a black box that boosts collaborative learning.

2. The socio-cultural theory focuses on the causal relationship between social interaction and the individual's cognitive development. This approach is derived from Vygotsky's zone of proximal development [Vygotsky1978]. In this approach, each internal cognitive change is mapped onto a causal effect of a social interaction. In Vygotsky's own words: The Zone of Proximal Development is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (ibid: 1978 P.4).
3. The shared cognition theory is different from the other two theories in the sense that the environment in which learning takes place is given the focus rather than the environment-independent cognitive processes. The environment consists of both physical context and social context. The previous two approaches attributed the learning only to the physical context. But the shared cognition approach places the focus squarely on the social context that is claimed to make the collaborations happen and not just the presence of the collaborators. Shared cognition aims at letting the peers learn knowledge and skills in contexts where they are applicable (Lave and Wenger1991). According to this approach, collaboration is viewed as a process of building and maintaining a shared conception of a problem, thus ensuring a natural learning environment.

Statement of the problem

Through the researchers' long experience in teaching English they have noticed that there is a large number of students who have a real problem in using the passive voice correctly. This problem might be attributed to several reasons:

General weakness in English can be one of these reasons since pupils are not interested in learning English. Some students feel uncomfortable inside the classroom, so they don't like to take part in the classroom activities.

Students sometimes don't understand the meaning of the words in sentences, so they can't distinguish between active and passive sentences; some students find it difficult to identify words parts of speech, so they cannot decide were the subjects, objects and the verbs are in sentences.

Moreover, many students cannot use the correct form of the verbs or the correct form of the auxiliary especially with sentences in present and past simple.

Upon noticing this problem through tests and exercises, the researchers decided to conduct this study trying to find a solution for it or reduce it as much as possible. The researcher found out that the best way to overcome such a problem was involving the students in all classroom activities through the use of collaborative learning method.

Purpose of the study

This study aims to (a) investigate the effectiveness of individual learning versus collaborative learning and (b) improve students' ability to use the passive voice correctly through focusing on collaborative learning.

Questions of the study

This study tries to answer the following questions:

1. Are there any significant differences between the control group and the experimental group students' mean scores on the posttest due to the strategy of learning (individual versus collaboration)?
2. Are there any significant differences between the control group and the experimental group students' mean scores on the posttest due to gender (males versus females)?

Hypotheses of the Study

The researchers hypothesize that:

1. There are no significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the control group and the experimental group students' mean scores on the posttest due to the strategy of learning (individual versus collaborative).
2. There are no significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the control group and the experimental group students' mean scores on the posttest due to the students' gender (male versus female).

Significance of the study

The significance of this study stems from the fact that it supplies EFL teachers with guidelines for enhancing their students' competence and performance in the active and passive voice of the English verbs. It also investigates the relative effectiveness of the collaborative strategy in learning the English active and passive voice, thus providing a solution to the problem of EFL learners' weakness in using the active and passive voice in real life situations.

Definition of terms

Collaborative learning: a method of classroom instruction in which students are placed in small groups and work together to achieve a common goal. It is supposed that such a method increases the students' learning, since it is less threatening to students' participation in the classroom interaction. (McGroarty 1993 and Cooper 1990).

The Traditional way of Teaching Grammar Vs The collaborative one: It is assumed that the “old way” of teaching grammar is through the use of more traditional methods i.e. worksheets, diagramming sentences, parts of speech identification, etc. where the individual work is dominant and the teacher is more powerful and active than students. This type of instruction becomes questionable when the materials, examples, and method of instruction become antiquated. As with any subject matter, we must make efforts to adjust our instruction to the changing needs of our students. These students have needs which are not being met by most “traditional” instructional techniques. This is where more traditional methods of instruction fall short; they fail to recognize the student’s place in the writing process. They tend to make grammar something which is either “right” or “wrong.” By changing his methods, the teacher can become less the “holder of knowledge”, and more “the facilitator of improvement and learning.” By building on this relationship, we can serve our students better, both in their writing and in their lives. (Mc Groarty 1993 and Cooper 1990).

Student -centered Approach: A method of teaching which emphasizes the active role of the students in learning and try to give learners more control over what they learn and it encourages learners to take more responsibilities for their own learning. This may be contrasted to the traditional teacher- centered approaches. (Mukti et al 2005)

Integration-Kid: is a learning companion system (student-teacher-companion) in the domain of symbolic integration, covering a complete but short course at the level of first year undergraduate. Either the student or the system generated companions are responsible for solving a given problem. One decides the problem solving steps while the other executes them. In the case where both the student and the companion cannot solve the problem, the teacher will interfere to help (Chan 1991, Chan1993).

Limitations of the study

This study is limited to the students in the Eighth Grade in Qalqilia Basic boys’ and girls’ Schools during the second semester of the academic year 2006 /2007. This study is also limited to the students who

study English for Palestine syllabus. Additionally, the study deals with one grammatical issue which is "passive voice and active voice".

Review of related literature

There is a number of experimental studies that emphasize the effectiveness of collaboration. (Mukti et al 2005, Blanche 2003, Dillenbourg et al. 1994, Davis 1993, Lave and Wenger 1991, Vygotsky 1978, Piaget 1928, and 1932, among others).

Collaborative learning is a very effective instructional strategy that works well in literature-based instruction. Students learn to read, write, and think by having meaningful engagements with more experienced individuals. Many times these individuals may be their peers. (Cooper 1993).

Biehler (1997) is on line with Johnson and Smith (1994), Johnson and Johnson (1986), McGroarty (1993) and Swain (1985 because they all showed the importance of collaborative learning in enhancing learners' motivation which helps in completing classroom tasks more successfully and bring better achievements and better interpersonal relationships.

An experiment on constructive interaction by Miyake 1986 confirms that in the learning process the bulk of constructive criticisms occur while learning in collaboration. The experiment showed that about 80% of self-critiquing (reflection) took place during collaborative learning compared to 20% which took place when students were learning alone. Self-critiquing is one of the major contributors to the effectiveness of collaborative learning. This experiment showed that the learners might have missed the opportunity for better understanding if they had not collaborated. Misconceptions in peers could be put to effective use when an appropriate peer is found to handle the misconceptions.

Gleeson et al (2006) agree with Becker (2004) in the sense that they agree that the collaborative-learning method was generally well received by students, with a clear majority seeing social learning and skill development advantages.

Honey et al (2005) and Mahmoud (2006) agree with Whattananarong (2004) because they all stress the effect of using the internet as an effective tool of communication and information gathering. When used correctly and appropriately, it allows for collaborative learning, James (2003) overstressed the idea that collaboration among groups of students and teachers from different schools, and different countries can occur via the wise use of the internet.

Harris (2005) is on line with Earp (2003) and Williams. (2004) because they all agree that learners can use the internet to communicate and share information and things quickly, easily and cheaply with millions of people and with both young and old from different cultures which is said to be the essence of collaboration.

Durfee et al (1989) showed that the performance of a network of problem solving agents is better when there is some inconsistency among the knowledge of each agent. Thus a set of non-overlapping misconceptions among collaborating peers could be put to effective use in collaborative learning.

Anuradha (2003) stressed the idea that emphasizes the role of collaborative learning in helping to think creatively, solve problems, and make decisions. He added that it provides an environment to enliven and enrich the learning process.

Blaye et al (1991) showed that children who had previously worked as collaborative pairs on the task of planning and problem solving were twice as successful as children who had had the same amount of experience working alone. They emphasized the roles of executor, the one who solves the problem and reflector, the one who observes and comments on the problem solving.

Chan (1991 and 1993) implemented a collaborative learning environment called Integration-Kid for the domain of symbolic integration. In Integration-Kid the student collaborates with a simulated companion to learn integration. The system provides more dimensions of learning, higher motivation, and better attitude toward learning through collaboration.

In a collaborative learning environment, where the goal is split into subtasks to be carried out by individual peers, it is often found that the peers are assigned roles that are natural and directly applicable in the given domain. In general, a collaborative learning environment can have the following set of roles: decomposing, defining, critiquing, convincing, reviewing, and referencing. For a peer, the system should maintain a model of each of these roles (McCalla 1990).

Blandford (1994) presents a list of actions that are applicable for a conflict-resolution based collaborative learning system, where it is possible for the peer to execute different types of actions related to imparting disagreement (I disagree), eliciting justification (Why do you believe that), imparting justification (...because...), imparting alternative belief, eliciting agreement (don't you agree?) and eliciting confirmation (do you really believe that), etc. (Blandford 1994 : 8)

Collaborative Learning (CL) encourages active student participation in the learning process. It encompasses a set of approaches to education, sometimes also called cooperative learning or small group learning. CL creates an environment "that involves students in doing things and thinking about the things they are doing", and reaches students who otherwise might not be engaged. Finally, CL is one teaching strategy among many, each of which can play a role to make learning an active and effective process (Blanche 2003)

Few teachers or students have had any exposure to the CL teaching/learning technique. Teachers are not trained during their certification processes in collaborative methods and those that are, often receive incomplete training. If teachers are taught by the lecture method while at teachers' college, then it is hardly surprising that this will be the method of choice when their turn arrives to take over the classroom. And the fact that most students have been exposed only to the competitive, individualistic approach used in our school systems today at all levels constitutes a major problem. Students are not likely to change their attitudes from one class to another unless they are trained in CL techniques. (ibid 2003)

According to Johnson and Smith (1994) the purpose of collaborative learning is that effective groups produce higher quality project than individuals while at the same time making each member a stronger individual in his own right. He added that the effective collaborative learning involves group members to:

1. Share positive interdependence and work together as individuals.
2. Help each other work efficiently and exchanging feedback to improve each other's learning.
3. Provide feedback to improve future performance and promote group goals.
4. Have individual accountability and personal responsibility.
5. Use interpersonal and small group skills.
6. Communicate with each other accurately and unambiguously and accept and support each other.
7. Evaluate their process and maintain good working relationship among each other.

Swain (1985) mentioned that co-operative strategies provide English learners with natural settings in which they can derive and express meaning from academic content.

McGroaty (1993) agreed with Swain (1985) when he mentioned that students should have opportunities to comprehend what they hear and read to express themselves in meaningful tasks. Collaborative learning creates natural interactive contexts in which students have authentic reasons for listening to one another, asking questions, clarifying issues, stating points of view and carrying out interactive tasks which naturally stimulate and develop the students cognitive, linguistic, and social abilities.

Proponents of collaborative learning claim that the active exchange of ideas within small groups not only increases interest among the participants but also promotes critical thinking. According to Johnson

and Johnson (1986), there is persuasive evidence that cooperative teams achieve at higher levels of thought and retain information longer than students who work quietly as individuals. The shared learning gives students an opportunity to engage in discussion, take responsibility for their own learning, and thus become critical thinkers (Totten et al 1991).

Johnson and Johnson (1987) mentioned that team building activities help students get to know and trust one another. Other important social skills include accepting and supporting others and solving conflicts constructively. Teachers need to model positive interpersonal skills, encourage students to practice the skills. Focusing on social skill development will increase students' achievement and enhance students' employ-ability, interpersonal relationships and general psychological health.

According to Senge (1990) team learning is the process of aligning and developing the capacity of a team to create the result of its members as it is desired.

Johnson and Johnson, (1994) reported that students need access to activities in which they learn to depend on each other as they ask for and receive help from one another individuals, and competition teaching methods certainly have their place in the instructions and learning.

Holt (1993) is in congruence with Kagan (1993) in the sense that both of them mentioned that the collaborative-learning method holds great promise for accelerating students' attainment of high academic standards.

Miyake (1986) shows that the complex understandings of the working of a tailoring machine is better understood when the peers interacted collaboratively and attempted to understand the problem. Connery (1988) believes that the cooperative behavior supports higher cognitive learning, based on a simulated physical world domain.

In general, collaborative learning is found effective in domains where peers engage in skill acquisition, joint planning, categorization, and memory tasks. The idea is that peers learn the prerequisites of the

topic to be learned and reinforce/internalize the topic using the collaborative environment (Totten et al 1991).

The studies reviewed above all agree that collaborative learning helps students to acquire knowledge and skills better than individual learning. The researchers, therefore, conducted this study to investigate the effect of collaborative learning in Palestinian eighth graders' learning the English active and passive sentences.

Procedures of the Study

Population and Sample of the Study

The population of this study consisted of 400 male and female students who were enrolled in the eighth Grade during the scholastic year (2006/2007) in Qalqilia Basic boys' and Girls' Schools. The sample of the study consisted of 50 male and female students who were randomly selected and equally assigned to a control group and an experimental group of 25 students each. Table 1 shows the distribution of the sample of the study between the experimental group and the control group.

Table (1): Number of subjects in each group.

Gender Group	Male	Female	Total
Experimental	11	14	25
Control	14	11	25
Total	25	25	50

To ensure the equivalence of the control group and the experimental group, the researchers administered the independent t-test on the two groups. Table 2 shows the results of the t-test.

Table (2): T-test for the equivalence of the experimental group and the control group.

Group	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Computed T	DF	Sig.
Experimental	25	29.42	22.91	-0.09	398	0.92
Control	25	29.69	30.4			

Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group on the t-test, therefore, the two groups were equivalent before the application of the treatment.

Design of the Study

The researchers used the following statistical design for the study:



Where O1 stands for the pretest of the experimental group, T stands for the treatment, O2 stands for the posttest of the experimental group O3 stands for the pretest of the control group and O4 stands for the posttest of the control group

Instruments of the study

The researchers used two instruments:

1. Treatment { the collaborative approach }
2. Achievement Test.

Before the treatment, the students of the experimental group were told that they were going to learn the Passive Voice through the collaborative- learning method, and they were informed that they would be tested on the passive voice later. The researchers trained the teacher who taught the experimental group students all the issues related to collaborative learning including the techniques, exams and lesson plans. For details see the appendix III, p.23-24 the experimental group students

were divided into small groups including (5-6) members each. Each group included high achievers and low achievers.

The students were given instructions about the collaborative learning and how to deal with it. The material was presented to the students in the experimental group in work sheets to be done by them co-operatively. Students worked in groups to identify subjects, verbs, and objects in sentences, to distinguish passive sentences and active ones, to use some verbs in meaningful passive sentences and to change sentences from active into passive and vice versa. The teacher's role was that of an organizer, facilitator, assessor and prompter and the students worked collaboratively. Meanwhile the control group was taught the use of the passive voice in the traditional way. That is, the teacher explained the passive voice then gave students work sheets to do them individually and he checked their answers. Students were not allowed to ask each other or to work together. This experimental period lasted for two weeks.

An achievement test was used as an instrument to test the research hypothesis of this study. The test, which was constructed by the researchers, included 60 subjective and objective questions covering the three levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Lorin W 2001) (knowledge, comprehension, and application). In constructing the test, the researchers took into consideration the difficulties that the students face in using the passive voice. The test was given twice as a pretest and a posttest to the control group and the experimental group to find out the appropriateness and efficiency of the collaborative learning strategy in learning the active voice and the passive voice.

Validity of the test

To ensure the validity of the test, it was handed to a jury of five professors and teachers from different universities and schools in Palestine. The members of the jury were asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the questions of the test to the whole purpose of the study. Consequently, the specialists sent letters in which they ensured the validity of the test and recommended some modifications which were taken into consideration.

Reliability of the Test

To ensure the reliability of the test, the researchers used the test-retest method with a period of five days between the two administrations of the test. The reliability coefficient was computed and it was .85.

Results and discussion

This study examined the effectiveness of collaborative learning in enhancing the students’ ability to use the passive voice correctly. The findings of the study are shown below for each of the two research questions.

To answer the first question of the study, “Are there any significant differences between the control group and the experimental group students’ mean scores on the posttest due to the strategy of learning (individual versus collaborative)?”, The researchers used the paired samples t-test. Table 3 shows the results of the t-test

Table (3): Results of the paired Samples t-test.

Measurement	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Computed T	D f	Sig.
Pre-test	25	29,42	23,14	-31.11	199	0.000*
Post - test	25	67.82	24,.7			

Table 3 shows that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test among the students of the experimental group in favor of the post-test. Therefore, we reject the first null hypothesis of the study. From the results shown in Table 3, it can be concluded that the collaborative-learning strategy proved to be effective in students’ learning of the active and passive voice in English. This finding agrees with others' (Johnson and Smith 1994; Blanche 2003; Chan 1991-93 and Blaye et al 1991 , Ard W. Lazonder 2005 among others.)

To answer the second question of the study, “Are there any significant differences between the control group and the experimental group students’ mean scores on the posttest due to students’ gender?, the

researchers used two-way ANOVA. Tables 4 and 5 show the results of the two-way ANOVA.

Table (4): Means and Standard Deviations for each variable of the study.

Gender Group	Male		Female		Total	
	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd	\bar{X}	Sd
Experimental	50.87	29.15	47.17	37.39	49.2	32.27
Control	23.84	16.7	23.34	19.5	23.59	18.10

Table (5): Results of two-way ANOVA for the difference in the students' learning active voice and passive voice.

Source of variance	Sum of square	Df	Mean square	F	Sig *
Gender	1335903	1	1335903	2803	. . .9
Group	258216,423	1	258216423	541810	* *
Interaction (Gender* Group)	169202.673	1	365.841	15.428	0.002*
Error	19999.98	396	476581		
Total	448754997	339			

Tables 4 and 5 show that there is no significant difference in students' learning the active voice and passive voice due to gender; therefore, we reject the second hypothesis of the study. This proves that boys and girls have similar potentials in learning the active voice and the passive voice via the collaborative learning strategy. This finding disagrees with Golbeck,S and Singagra,K (2000) study which showed that The men outperformed the women. Although peer collaboration did not lead to greater understanding than working alone, peer interaction data showed that the men and women talked about the problem differently. In other words, the researchers did not find any role for collaboration in respect to gender; both boys and girls showed improvement in their learning of the active voice and the passive voice when referring to collaboration. This could be a strong proof for

conducting other studies that will deal with the effect of gender to find out whether girls are more collaborative than boys or not.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Due to the positive effect of using collaboration on the students' attitudes and results, the researchers present the following recommendations to develop the eighth grade students' ability to use passive voice correctly in learning English as a foreign language:

1. Teachers must motivate students by adopting new attractive and up to date techniques such as collaborative learning, competition, games, puzzles and role- play. Teachers are advised to vary their techniques in order to keep students alert, motivated and interested.
2. Teachers are advised to adopt techniques and methods that focus on the learner Because (S)he is the center of the learning process.
3. Implementing collaborative learning into a course involves careful planning and preparation of students, but it is very useful. Collaborative learning has also been used via the computer. The widespread use of computer for instructional purposes, both as a companion to and a replacement for the traditional classroom, has encouraged teachers and students alike to approach teaching and learning in ways that incorporate collaborative learning and the social construction of knowledge.
4. The researchers think it behooves teachers to educate themselves about the myriad techniques and philosophies which create interactive environments where students take more responsibility for their own learning and that of their peers. Then it will become possible to pick and choose those methods which best fit a particular educational goal or community of learners.
5. This research is an invitation to interested researchers to implement collaborative learning skills and activities into their teaching practices and to do more research in other skills such as comprehension, speaking , reading and listening as well

6. More research about collaboration among groups of students and teachers from different schools, and different countries via the wise use of the internet.

References

- Andi, Ward. (2004). "The Importance of Self-Critique". A Resource for Writers. Lazette Gifford. Editor. Vision@sff.net
- Anuradha. (2003). "Collaborative Learning and thinking". The Ninth Sloan-C International Conference on Asynchronous Learning Networks (ALN) - Orlando. Florida PP. 14-16.
- Ard, W. Lazonder. (2005). "Do two heads search better than one? Effects of student collaboration on web search behaviour and search outcomes". *British Journal of Educational Technology*. 36(3). 465-475
- Azmitia, M. (1988). "Peer interaction and problem solving: When are two heads better than one?". *Child Development* 59. 87-96.
- Baker, J. (1991). "The influence of dialogue processes on the generation of students' collaborative explanations for simple physical phenomena". In *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Learning Sciences*. Illinois. USA PP. 9-19.
- Becker, W. (2004). "Quantitative research on teaching methods in tertiary education". in Becker. W. E. and M. L. Andrews (eds) *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education. contributions of research universities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Beckman, M. (1990). "Collaborative Learning: Preparation for the Workplace and Democracy". *College Teaching*. 38(4). 128-133.
- Biehler, S. (1997). *Psychology Applied To Teaching*. USA. Houghton Mifflin.

- Bunyan, S. Greer, J. E. & McCalla, G. (1992). "Learning recursion through the use of a mental model-based programming environment". In Lecture Notes in Computer Science. 608. 2nd International Conference of Intelligent Tutoring Systems. Springer-Verlag. 50--57.
- Blanche, T. (2003). Conference on Asynchronous Learning Networks Conference announcement received via Conference Alerts: The Ninth Sloan-C International Conference on Asynchronous Learning Networks (ALN) November 14-16. Orlando. Florida
- Blandford, E. (1994). "Teaching through collaborative problem solving". Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education. 5 (1). 51-84.
- Blaye, A. Light, P. Joiner, R. & Sheldon, S. (1990). Collaboration as a facilitator of planning and problem solving on a computer-based task. CITE Report 90. Institute of Educational Technology. Open University. Milton Keynes. U. K.
- Blaye, A. Light, H. Joiner, R. & Sheldon, S. (1991). "Joint planning and problem solving on a computer-based task". British Journal of Developmental Psychology 9. 471-483.
- Chan, T. (1991). Integration-kid: A learning companion system. In J. Mylopoulos. and R. Reiter. eds. Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Volume 2. Sydney. Australia. 1094 - 1099. Morgan Kaufmann Inc.
- Chan, T. (1993). A tutorial on social learning systems. In T. Chan. and J. A. Self. eds. Emerging Computer Technologies in Education. AACE. 71-96.
- Connery, B. (1988). "Group Work and Collaborative Writing". *Teaching at Davis*. 1988. 14(1). 2-4. (Publication of the Teaching Resources Center. University of California at Davis)
- Cooper, J. (1993). "Cooperative Learning and College Teaching: Tips from the Trenches". Teaching Professor. 1990. 4(5).. 1-2.

- Davis, B. (1993). *Tools for Teaching Collaborative Learning: Group Work and Study Teams* Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco
- Dansereau, D. (1988). *Learning and Study Strategies: Issues in Assessment, Instruction, and Evaluation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Dillenbourg, P. Mendelsohn, P. & Schneider, D. (1994). "The distribution of pedagogical roles in a multi-agent learning environment". In R. Lewis. and P. Mendelsohn. eds. . *Lessons from Learning*. North-Holland. 199--216.
- Doise, W. (1990). "The development of individual competencies through social interaction". *Children helping Children*. J. Wiley and Sons. 43-64.
- Durfee, H. Lesser, V. & Corkill, D. (1989). "Cooperative Distributed Problem Solving. Addison-Wesley". 83-127.
- Earp, S. (2003). "More than Just the Internet Technology for Language Teaching". University of North Carolina- Charlotte
- Gleeson, A. McDonald, J. & Williams, J. (2006). "Extended case study: Collaborative learning tutorials for introductory microeconomics". Flinders University. Adelaide. Australia.
- Golbeck, S. & Singagra, K. (2000) "Effects of Gender and Collaboration on College Students' Performance on a Piagetian Spatial Task. Women and Language". *The Journal of Experimental Education* (2)1. 20-23
- Harris, P. (2005). Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) 1800 North Stonelake Drive. Suite 2 Bloomington. IN 47404 [http:// www. aect. org](http://www.aect.org)
- Holt, D. (1995). Co-operative learning for students from divers language background. Mc Henry.
- Honey, M. McMillan & Spielvogel, R. (2005). "Critical Issue: Using Technology to Improve Student Achievement. North Central

Regional Educational Laboratory". All rights reserved. info@ncrel.org.

- James, G. (2003). “Advantages and disadvantages of on line learning Source (white paper) white paper –Paresc infotech site
- Johnson, R.T. & Johnson, D.W. (1986). "Action research: Cooperative learning in the science classroom". Science and Children. 24. 31-32.
- Johnson, & Johnson, R. (1987). Learning together and alone Cooperative and Individualized learning. Eagle wood cliff New Jersey.
- Johnson. & Smith, A. (1991). Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity. ASHE-FRIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington. D. C. School of Education and Human Development. George Washington University.
- Kagan, Spencer. (1993). The Structural Approach to Co-operative Learning. Mc Henry.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. eds. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4. 108.
- Lorin W. Anderson. David R. Krathwohl. Peter W. Airasian. Kathleen A. Cruikshank. Richard E. Mayer. Paul R. Pintrich. James Raths & Merlin C. Wittrock (Eds.) *2001A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing — A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* Addison Wesley Longman. Inc.
- Mahmoud, A. (2006). The Teachers’ and Students’ Perspective towards Using the Internet in Learning English as A foreign Language. A paper delivered at Al-Isra. Conference. the role of the teacher in the Third Millennium.
- McCalla, G. (1990). The central importance of student modeling to intelligent tutoring. Technical report. ARIES Laboratory. Department

of Computational Science. University of Saskatchewan. Saskatoon. Saskatchewan S7N 0W0 Canada.

- McGroarty, M. (1993). "Co-operative Learning and Second Language Acquisition". Mc Henry.
- Miyake, N. (1986). "Constructive interaction and the iterative process of understanding". Cognitive Science (CS) 10. 151-177.
- Moyse, R. & Elsom-Cook, M. (1992). Knowledge Negotiation. Academic Press.
- Mukti, N. Razali, D. Ramli, M. Zaman, H. & Ahmad, A. (2005) Hybrid Learning and Online Collaborative Enhance Students' Performance Fifth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies pp. 481-483
- Piaget, J. (1928). *Judgment and Reasoning in the Child*. Harcourt Brace. New York.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. London.
- Reid, J. Forrestal, P. & USA Cook, J. (1989). Small group learning in the classroom. Portsmouth. NH: Heinemann.
- Senge. Peter M. (1994) "The Fifth Discipline; the Art and Practice of the Learning Organization". New York. Double Day.
- Smith, K. (1986). "Cooperative Learning Groups". In S. F. Schmoberg (ed.). *Strategies for Active Teaching and Learning in University Classrooms*. Minneapolis: Office of Educational Development Programs. University of Minnesota.
- Swain, M. (1985). "Communicative Competence; Some Role of Comprehensible Output in its' Development". Boston. Mass; Heinle and Heinle.
- Totten, S. Sills, T. Digby, A. & Russ, P. (1991). Cooperative learning: A guide to research. New York: Garland.

- VanLehn, K. & Ohlsson, S (1994). "Applications of simulated students: An exploration". Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education 5(2). 135-175.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. USA. Harvard University Press. 52 - 91.
- Whattananarong, K. (2004). "The Effects of Internet-Based Teaching and Learning Systems on Learners". SEAMEO Library Bangkok 10800. Thailand.
- Williams. C/ (2004)/ Institute for the Transfer of Technology to Education (ITTE) National School Boards Association. itte@nsba.org

Appendix I**The Test**

Name of Student: -----

Name of School: -----

-

This test contains six parts. Go through them carefully, and then answer each of them in the space provided.

I: Choose the correct answer:

- 1- The school had..... by engineers.
a)build b)built c)been built
- 2- The chickenat this moment.
a)is being cooked b)is cooked c)cooking
- 3-America.....in 1492.
a)discovered b)is discovered c) was discovered.
- 4- The guests.....the food. a) are eaten b)ate c)is eaten
- 5-My new book ----- next month .
a)was published b)will publish c)will be published
6. Don't sit on that seat, it
a) has just painted b) just has been painted c) has just been painted
7. Mount Everest to be the highest in the world .
a) has known b) is being known c) is known
8. Arabic by about eight hundred million people .
a) is spoken b) spoken c) has spoken
9. Do you think the thieves soon ?
a) caught b) will be caught c)had caught
d) have been caught
10. This room for a fortnight .
a) was not cleaned b) has not cleaned c) has not been cleaned

II: Write "P" for sentences in passive voice and "A" for sentences in active voice:

- 1- Cities will be built under the sea.
- 2- We drink milk in the morning.
- 3- The driver was stopped by the police.

- 4- After watching TV, students were asked to write the letter.
- 5- The teacher taught us how to write from left to right.

III: Rearrange these words to make meaningful sentences:

- 1- guard / were / the / closed / by / the gates.
- 2- the hospital / was / the patient / taken / to .
- 3- is / English / every day / spoken.
- 4- tomorrow / will / the / letter / sent / be .
- 5- the animals / by / this / be / water / drunk / will .

IV: Write the correct form of the verb:

- 1- The climber was..... (rescue) by the helicopter .
- 2- A shirt (be) bought yesterday.
- 3- The cake was (bake) by my mother.
- 4- these fish will be (catch) soon.
- 5-English (speak) in many countries.
- 6-A game (play) now.
- 7-Laws (must respect) by everyone.
- 8-Poor Laila (run) over by a bus yesterday.
- 9-Improvements (recently, carry) out .
- 10- A lot of progress (make) recently.

V: Use these verbs in meaningful passive sentences:

- 1- (eaten).....
- 2- (painted).....
- 3- (lost).....
- 4- (stolen).....
- 5- (cleaned).....

VI: Rewrite the following sentences beginning with given words:

- 1- The teacher writes the letter on the board every day.
The letter.....
- 2- The carpenter had fitted the windows.

- The windows.....
- 3- Abeer was reading a story.
A story.....
- 4- The girls have finished the composition.
The composition.....
- 5- Areen found a coin in the garden.
The coin.....

VII Put the following into the Passive Voice:

1. They gave my little sister a ticket, too.
2. People will show the visitors the new buildings.
3. Someone has already paid the money
4. They promise us higher wages.
5. Someone ordered the prisoners to stand up.

VIII Change from Passive into Active:

1. Evening dress will be worn.
2. Were the police informed?
3. Is service included?
4. The picture was painted by a famous artist.
5. Should all the questions be answered?

IX. Put the verbs in brackets into the Passive Voice using the tense suggested:

1. The house (clean) every day. (Present Simple)
2. The money (steal) during the night. (Past Simple)
3. The book (leave) on the table. (Future Simple)
4. The grass (cut) once a week. (Present Simple)
5. This suit (make) in England. (Past Simple)
6. The missing child (find). (Present Perfect)
7. The meal (cook) when I arrived. (Present continuous)
8. The house must (sell) before the end of the month. (Infinitive)
9. Four different languages (speak) in Switzerland. (Present Simple)
10. You can't go in, the house (plant) . (Present Continuous)

Appendix II Application of the collaborative Learning Strategy

This appendix presents the procedures of the collaborative-learning strategy.

There are five phases for designing instruction for collaborative learning: engagement, exploration, transformation, presentation, and reflection. In the "engagement" phase, the teacher sets the stage by providing the class with a collaborative activity. It is important that this task be designed in such a way that it, not only provides the basis for ensuing necessary group activities, but also brings home a sense of ownership to its learners. An example of an authentic collaborative activity for a reading classroom is one where students examine the type of persuasive language found in authentic sales literature such as brochures, advertisements, and labels. They can then analyze the kinds of strategies advertisers use to influence potential buyers.

In the "exploration" phase, students work on the initial exploration of ideas and information. Teachers have to decide how much input should be given for the learning task, and how much should be left to the resourcefulness of the students. To encourage group interdependence at this stage, teachers can ask students in teams to demonstrate their learning using different response modes. K-W-H-L-S is one of many strategies that can be used with students of all ages and levels to help insure that every student pursues goals that are individually beneficial and yet congruent with the group's common goal in the learning activity. The basic components of the K-W-H-L-S strategy are:

- K: What I know (e.g., information on what I already know about advertisements)
- W: What I want to learn (e.g., information on advertising strategies)
- H: How I will learn it and work with others to attain mutual goals (e.g., bring in information, share ideas and compare perspectives)
- L: What I learned (e.g., evaluating what I have found out and how I can use this information)
- S: How I shared, or will share what I have learned from others (e.g., writing up a joint report or opinion piece for publication in a magazine).

The third phase has to do with the "transformation" of knowledge. This is where students in their learning groups engage in activities to "reshape" the information by organizing, clarifying, elaborating, or synthesizing learning concepts. It is crucial for this stage of learning that tasks require discussion and contribution from all group members. It is too easy to let a situation turn into one where the most vocal or linguistically proficient member of the group takes over the tasks of clarifying and elaborating on learning concepts, and not have other group members benefit from the collaborative activity. The learning activity designed should therefore be complex enough that there can be many opportunities for knowledge transformation at different levels or in various sub-tasks, thereby involving as many group members as possible.

For instance, students take turns categorizing information, looking for examples to support their opinions, and discussing the implications of an advertising strategy on their own and their families' purchasing behaviors.

In the "presentation" phase, student groups have the opportunity to present their findings to an interested and critical audience. It is possible to structure the main activity in a way that would entail having different student groups contribute their findings to make up a bigger learning outcome (e.g., different sections of a proposal). A significant consideration at this stage is to ensure that the audience for the presentation is authentic and can provide responsive feedback to the information generated by the groups' efforts. This can be done with critical peer groups or with expert groups that have a genuine interest in the findings of the presentation. In the above example, the reading group that reviews sales literature and analyzes advertising strategies can now write an article for a consumer awareness magazine on what they have collaboratively learned about the influence of advertising on public buying.

The last phase of the group learning activity is "reflection." Here, students analyze what they have learned, identify strengths and weaknesses in the learning processes they went through, and offer constructive ideas on how their learning can be improved. Student reflection should be done both individually and collaboratively, and they need to analyze individual as well as group learning processes. For that purpose, teachers may construct individual and group guidelines. Some questions for reflection are:

- To prepare for this activity, I ...
- I think I contributed to the group's work quality by ...
- Something that would help us work better next time is ...
- One thing that was not useful to our group work was ...
- Some ways in which the thinking of the group could have been better are

Dewey (1938) said that one of the philosophies of education is not to learn merely to acquire information but rather to bring that learning to bear upon our everyday actions and behaviors. Consistent with this goal, we would argue that collaborative learning in the classroom should prepare learners for the kind of team work and critical interchange that they will need to be effective participants in their communities and workplaces in the future. Adopted from (Reid, J., Forrestal, P., & Cook, J. (1989)

Appendix III

Lesson plans for teaching the passive and active traditionally and collaboratively respectively

The Traditional Way

Unit/Lesson : -----

Class: -----

Date: -----

Topic:--Passive voice No of Students: -----

Period: -- -----

Behavioral objectives	Entry Behavior	Teaching/Learning Strategies		Teaching Aids	Tests & Activities	Assessment Techniques	Time allocated	Feed back
		Teachers Role	Students Role					
To read the passage then answer the questions	Question about the pictures	Teach the new words. Read the passage.	Listen, repeat and read.	P.B	Listening – Reading.	Repeating the new words.	20.m.	
To answer the Qs.	-----	Read the Qs	Read and answer	P.B.	Reading and answering.	Closed and open pairs.	10.m.	
To write the sentences into passive.	Examples on BB.	Write the rule on the B.b. Then sentences.	Read them then change to passive.	P.b-B.b.	Changing them to passive.	Do like the example.	10.m.	
To complete the sentences using passive.	Examples on B.B.	Read the sentences.	Complete them.	W.B./B.B.	Completing them.	T goes round and correct.	5.m.	

The Collaborative Way

Unit/Lesson : -----

Class: -----

Date: -----

Topic:--Passive voice

No of Students: -----

Period: -- -----

Behavioral objectives	Entry Behavior	Teaching/Learning Strategies		Teaching Aids	Tasks & activities	Assessment Techniques	Time allocated	Feedback
		Teachers Role	Students Role					
5m.	To find &complete	The previous lesson	Guide	Find &complete	P.B p.59	Working in pairs	Passive voice \examples	5m.
5m.	To look &read	Examples on b.b.	Guide	Look &read	p.b.p.59	Looking &reading	Reading the instruction	5m.
10m.	Tocomplete the description on P.B.p.58	The previous lesson	Assessor	Complete the sentences	P.B.p.58&59	Completing them	Reading the paragraph	10m.
10m.	To make sentences Use passive	Qs.about the pictures	Assessor	Make sentences	P.B.p.59	Making sentences	Reading them	10m.
10m.	To make sentences from the table	Examples on B.B.	Guide	In pairs make sentences	W.B.p.55	Making sentences	Writing them	10m.
5m.	To complete the sentences	Qs. About the pictures	Guide	Complete them	W.B.p.55	Complete at home	/	5m.