

IMPACT OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING TEACHING ON STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE FLUENCY AND CONFIDENCE: A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS

Dr. Zubaida Khanam^{*1}, Junaid Ahmad Khan², Shafqat Ali³

^{*1}Assistant Professor of Education, Government Graduate Islamia College for Women Cantt. Lahore

²Assistant Professor of Education, Government Graduate College of Science Wahdat Road Lahore

³Professor, Department of Education, Minhaj University, Lahore

^{*1}Zubaida304@gmail.com, ²Junaid503@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: *

Received: October 08, 2024 Revised: November 03, 2024 Accepted: November 18, 2024 Published: November 25, 2024

ABSTRACT

Comparing teachers' and students' perspectives, this survey-based study examines how collaborative learning environments affect secondary-level students' confidence and fluency in English. This study looks at how 356 students and 143 teachers perceive overall fluency in the English language as well as fluency in the four abilities of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Two rating scale tools were used to gather data using a quantitative methodology. The findings show that students regularly rate their fluency higher than teachers, with statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in every category. The results emphasize the need for evaluation standards to be aligned and show that there is a perceived gap between the two groups. To close the gap and promote mutual knowledge of fluency benchmarks, it is advised to establish systematic self-assessment tools, feedback mechanisms, and collaborative workshops. This study advances common educational objectives and improves the precision of language learning fluency tests.

INTRODUCTION

Learning a language, particularly English, is essential to contemporary education since it facilitates academic progress and international communication. To successfully navigate academic challenges and professional opportunities, secondary-level students must gain fluency and confidence in English. However, rote memorization and individual performance are frequently given precedence over meaningful contact in traditional language instruction techniques, which hinders students' capacity for confident and natural communication.

One cutting-edge pedagogical strategy to overcome these constraints is collaborative learning. It is based on constructivist theories and stresses active student participation through group projects and peer interaction. When it comes to language acquisition, collaborative settings allow for genuine communication, giving students the

chance to practice fluency and gain confidence in a calm, encouraging environment. Through exercises like role-playing, peer review, and group discussions, students can utilize language in authentic contexts, which promotes skill development and self-assurance.

Because of their various roles in the learning process, teachers and students frequently have conflicting perspectives on the efficacy of collaborative learning, despite its promise. While students assess tactics based on their own participation and results, teachers concentrate on educational objectives and classroom dynamics. This discrepancy emphasizes how important it is to share perspectives in order to comprehend how collaborative learning affects students' confidence and fluency in English.

By examining the effects of collaborative learning settings on secondary-level students' fluency and

confidence in English, this study seeks to close this gap. It also contrasts the perspectives of teachers and pupils, pointing out points of agreement and disagreement. By illuminating these viewpoints, this study offers educators insightful information that can improve language instruction through teamwork.

Objectives

1. To assess how teachers and students perceive the effects of collaborative learning on English fluency and confidence.
2. To evaluate collaborative learning activities by comparing and contrasting the opinions of teachers and students.
3. To determine the difficulties that educators and learners have in cooperative learning settings.

Research Questions

1. How do teachers and students view the effect of collaborative learning on confidence and fluency in English?
2. How do students' and teachers' assessments of group projects compare?
3. What difficulties do educators and learners see when putting collaborative learning into practice?

Literature Review

Particularly at the secondary level, collaborative learning (CL) environments—which are defined by peer-driven, student-centered interactions—have become popular pedagogical approaches for enhancing students' confidence and English language skills. CL is supported by theoretical frameworks that emphasize social interactions in cognitive development and skill acquisition, such as Vygotsky's Social Constructivism. Collaborative assignments promote a culture of shared responsibility among students, which improves language proficiency and self-assurance. Collaborative learning fosters language fluency by establishing meaningful, dynamic communication contexts, as research continuously shows. According to Johnson and Johnson (2017), CL gives students the chance to practice real-world conversational skills, which enhances fluency and lowers language anxiety. Similar to this, Gokhale (1995) and Slavin (1990) emphasize the advantages of group projects that allow students to jointly analyze, synthesize, and assess material in

order to foster deeper cognitive engagement and language acquisition.

In collaborative learning, multiple students work together "and share the workload equitably as they progress toward intended learning outcomes." This is a form of active learning. Students are "engaged actively in their own learning in a supportive and challenging social context" as a result of this cooperation and fair work distribution. While collaborative learning can help foster community among students who may be feeling otherwise disconnected, it also provides students with an opportunity to engage in team building and develop positive group dynamics.

Peer-supported settings help students get over their fears of speaking a second language, which helps them gain confidence. Increased motivation and self-esteem are facilitated by peer feedback and shared accomplishments in group settings (Chen, 2018; Brown, 2008). By fostering a safe, encouraging learning environment, CL also addresses affective filters like anxiety.

Role of Teachers in CL Settings:

Effective collaborative learning experiences are created and facilitated in large part by teachers. According to empirical research, structured activities like group discussions and jigsaw puzzles improve language proficiency and student involvement. According to Barkley, Cross, & Major, (2012), educators need to consciously design assignments that promote students' equal involvement and responsibility. Teachers' opinions of CL frequently demonstrate how it can enhance professional competence and diversity instructional methods (Cadavieco, Llorente, & Sánchez, 2016).

According to Zang (2010), CL falls within the collaborative goal structure group, whereas competitive and individualistic goal structures are quite similar to the conventional teacher-fronted learning approach. Students' involvement in the teaching and learning process is the second way that the collaborative learning approach differs from the traditional one. The traditional method tends to emphasize learning that is teacher-centered rather than student-centered. Seldom do students participate in the teaching and learning process; instead, they merely listen to what the teacher is saying. Grammar-translation and audio-lingual techniques are key components of many conventional learning approaches. These

instructional strategies solely emphasize specific linguistic elements without giving students enough opportunity to practice and expand their comprehension of the subject matter.

The beneficial effects of CL on English language proficiency are confirmed by experimental and quantitative research. Studies carried out in secondary and higher education settings, for example, demonstrate notable gains in students' speaking abilities as well as group work skills like negotiation and problem-solving (Escofet & Marimon, 2012; Vega-Abarzúa, Fernández, & Salazar, 2022). Furthermore, group activities like role-playing and peer debates are said to improve vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation (Millis & Cottell, 1998).

But certain problems still exist. According to research by Brown (2008), role imbalance and unequal participation within groups may reduce the efficacy of cooperative tasks. It is advised to use tactics like role rotation and clear group standards to address these problems. Both students and teachers gain from collaborative learning environments, which have a good impact on English language proficiency and confidence. CL tackles the cognitive, social, and affective aspects of language acquisition by encouraging peer interactions and common learning objectives. However, careful planning is necessary for implementation, with an emphasis on equality of participation and inclusivity. These dynamics could be further investigated in future studies, especially in varied educational settings.

A learner can accomplish collaborative goals when their classmates accomplish theirs as well. The least capable student will nonetheless be able to accomplish the learning objective based on his or her capacity, even though the portion varies somewhat from one to the next. Not everyone can accomplish the learning objective because of the competitive goal. Instead, some students succeed while others fail. There is no connection between an individual's success and other people's participation, either through competition or cooperation, in an individualistic goal system. To put it another way, one's accomplishments are separate from those of others. This happens as a result of each learner learning independently. Peer mentoring and rivalry with others do not exist.

Peer contact is included into language acquisition through collaborative learning, enabling students

to use language in context-driven and relevant ways. In a relaxed environment, exercises like role-plays, group discussions, and peer evaluations provide chances to improve confidence and fluency.

The majority of interactions are restricted to teacher-student interactions. Seldom do students interact with one another. Nearly all of the time, students are taught to be passive. They only end up receiving the information that the teacher imparts to them. Not enough room is provided for them to talk about and improve their communication skills. On the other hand, CL and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which involves interactions between students and between teachers, have similar concepts (Zang, 2010). In fact, it helps kids develop communication competence when they are given the opportunity to communicate with both their teachers and their friends. The communication which occurs is actually stimulating their mental function to maximize thinking, reasoning, and problem solving.

Through these activities, students are inadvertently expanding their knowledge base. They are not merely passive recipients; rather, they are highly active ones who engage in critical thinking behaviors such as questioning, criticizing, and arguing in addition to taking in the information as input.

Methodology

This survey study used a quantitative methodology to look at the opinions of 356 students and 143 teachers. To guarantee representation across grade levels and school types, participants were chosen using a stratified random sample procedure. Two rating scale instruments—one for teachers and one for students—were used to collect data. Twenty items on the student instrument, while twenty items on the instructor instrument explored teaching engagement. Self-administered paper-based surveys were delivered at schools in order to gather data. Anonymized responses guaranteed confidentiality, and participation was entirely optional. Responses were compiled using t-test to compare the observation of teachers and students.

Table 1*Comparison of Students and Teachers' Perception Regarding Fluency in Listening English Language*

Respondents	Number of respondents	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	Sig. Level
Teachers	143	4.2129	.51253	-9.149	0.000
Students	356	4.5569	.34775		

Teachers' and students' views of fluency in listening to the English language differ statistically significantly, according to the t-test results in Table 1.

Perception of Teachers: Mean = 4.2129, Standard Deviation = 0.51253

Perceptions of Students: Mean = 4.5569, Standard Deviation = 0.34775

The significance level ($p = 0.000$) and the negative t-value (-9.149) show that the difference in mean

scores is very significant ($p < 0.05$). This implies that, in contrast to teachers' evaluations, students believe they are more fluent listeners. Compared to teachers, students' replies show less fluctuation, as indicated by their smaller standard deviation, suggesting that students' self-assessments of their listening fluency are more consistent. This draws attention to a potential perception gap that can result from different expectations or evaluation standards between the two groups.

Table 2*Comparison of Students and Teachers' Perception Regarding Fluency in Speaking English Language*

Respondents	Number of respondents	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	Sig. Level
Teachers	143	4.0852	.54706	-10.598	0.000
Students	356	4.4945	.34411		

Teachers' and students' judgments of English speaking fluency differ significantly, according to the t-test in Table 2.

Perception of Teachers: Mean = 4.0852; Standard Deviation = 0.54706

Perceptions of Students: Mean = 4.4945, Standard Deviation = 0.34411

This difference is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), according to the t-value (-10.598) and the significance level ($p = 0.000$). When it came to

speaking fluency, students gave it higher ratings than teachers did. The lower standard deviation for students implies a more consistent evaluation of their speaking fluency, whereas teachers exhibit greater heterogeneity in their assessments. There is a need for congruence in interpreting fluency benchmarks, as this disparity may be the result of different criteria used to evaluate fluency or a possible overestimation of speaking ability by students.

Table 3*Comparison of Students and Teachers' Perception Regarding Fluency in Reading English Language*

Respondents	Number of respondents	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	Sig. Level
Teachers	143	4.1821	.52898	-4.310	0.000
Students	356	4.3709	.44201		

A statistically significant difference between teachers' and students' views of fluency in reading English is found using the t-test in Table 3.

Perceptions of Teachers: Mean = 4.1821, Standard Deviation = 0.52898

Perceptions of the Students: Mean = 4.3709, Standard Deviation = 0.44201

The statistical significance of the difference in perceptions ($p < 0.05$) is confirmed by the t-value (-4.310) and the significance level ($p = 0.000$). Pupils believe they are more fluent readers than their teachers have assessed them to be. The standard deviation indicates that students' answers are more constant than teachers', pointing to a

common perception of students' reading ability. The significance of consistent fluency evaluation standards is highlighted by this disparity, which

could point to a difference in assessment criteria or overconfidence in students' self-evaluations.

Table 4

Comparison of Students and Teachers' Perception Regarding Fluency in Writing English Language

Respondents	Number of respondents	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	Sig. Level
Teachers	143	4.2359	.44752	-4.945	0.000
Students	356	4.4397	.43550		

A statistically significant discrepancy between teachers' and students' assessments of English writing fluency is seen in Table 4.

Perceptions of Teachers: Mean = 4.2359, Standard Deviation = 0.44752

Perceptions of the Students: Mean = 4.4397, Standard Deviation = 0.43550

The statistical significance of this difference ($p < 0.05$) is confirmed by the t-value (-4.945) and p-value (0.000). There may be a perception gap when students score higher on writing fluency tests than

teachers do. Comparable levels of response constancy are indicated by the standard deviations for the two groups, which are rather similar. The continuously higher mean score of pupils, however, can be the result of overconfidence or different standards for assessing writing ability. This emphasizes how important it is to match professors' assessments with students' self-perceptions, either by using more precise criteria or group feedback procedures.

Table 5

Comparison of Students and Teachers' Perception Regarding Overall Fluency in English Language

Respondents	Number of respondents	Mean	Std. Dev.	t-value	Sig. Level
Teachers	143	4.1763	.42634	-8.862	0.000
Students	356	4.4653	.31202		

The perceptions of overall English fluency by teachers and students are compared in Table 5, which reveals a statistically significant difference between the two groups.

Perceptions of Teachers: Mean = 4.1763, Standard Deviation = 0.42634

Perceptions of the Students: Mean = 4.4653, Standard Deviation = 0.31202

This difference is very significant ($p < 0.05$), as shown by the t-value (-8.862) and significance level ($p = 0.000$). There may be a perception gap because students gave their overall fluency a higher rating than teachers did. While teachers exhibit somewhat greater variability in their assessments, students' smaller standard deviation suggests a more constant belief about their fluency. This disparity may result from students' propensity for self-evaluation or from different assessment standards, underscoring the significance of precise,

consistent standards for fluency in learning environments.

Conclusions

- All four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and overall fluency in English are routinely rated lower by teachers than by students themselves. This statistically significant discrepancy ($p < 0.05$ in all cases) points to a misalignment in perception between the two groups.

- Higher mean scores and smaller standard deviations show that students regularly rate their fluency more highly and consistently. This pattern can be the result of different standards for judging fluency or overconfidence in one's own assessment.

- In most categories, the standard deviations of teachers' assessments are larger, suggesting a greater diversity of viewpoints. This variation may

result from different assessment criteria or a more sophisticated comprehension of the subtleties of fluency.

- The standard deviations of the assessments given to students and teachers for writing fluency are rather close, indicating that both groups evaluate this talent with a comparable level of consistency. Students still give themselves a higher rating than teachers, though.
- The disparities in perception across all domains underscore the necessity of a cohesive and open framework for evaluating fluency. There may be fewer differences and better communication on learning goals and progress if teachers and students have a common understanding of fluency benchmarks.

Discussion

As the published literature shows, teachers' and students' perceptions of the effectiveness of instructional strategies often differ. Teachers place less value on the educational framework than students do on participation and personal growth (Lin et al., 2022). This study also concluded that in most categories, the standard deviations of teachers' assessments are larger, suggesting a greater diversity of viewpoints. This variation may result from different assessment criteria or a more sophisticated comprehension of the subtleties of fluency.

Recommendations

✓ In order to reduce evaluation disparities and advance common objectives, cooperative workshops and training sessions could assist both groups in comprehending and implementing these benchmarks.

Provide students with organized self-assessment resources that meet the standards for teacher evaluation. Combine these resources with frequent feedback meetings when students and teachers go over their assessments. This method will promote regular evaluation procedures, assist students in adjusting their self-evaluations, promote reflective learning, and close the knowledge gap about fluency standards.

References

- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2012). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, H. D. (2008). *Principles of language learning and teaching (5th ed.)*. Pearson Education.
- Cadavieco, M., Llorente, M., & Sánchez, R. (2016). The Role of the Teacher in Collaborative Learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108*(4), 500–514.
- Chen, Y. (2018). The Effect of Collaborative Learning on Language Learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 7*(6), 79–84.
- Escofet, A., & Marimon, R. (2012). The Impact of Collaborative Learning on Language Skills Development. *Language Learning Journal, 40*(3), 354–373.
- Gokhale, A. A. (1995). Collaborative Learning: Effect on Student Performance. *Journal of Technology Education, 7*(1), 22–30.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2017). Cooperative Learning: Improving University Instruction by Building Learning Communities. *Journal of Higher Education, 88*(4), 365–388.
- Millis, B. J., & Cottell, P. G. (1998). *Cooperative learning for higher education faculty*. Oryx Press.
- Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Prentice-Hall.
- Vega-Abarzúa, C., Fernández, A., & Salazar, A. (2022). Collaborative Learning in Foreign Language Teaching: An Empirical Study on the Effectiveness of Peer Learning. *Journal of Applied Linguistics & Language Research, 9*(4), 131–145.
- Harbin, M.B. (2020). [Collaborative note-taking: A tool for creating a more inclusive college classroom](#). *College Teaching, 68*(4), 214–220.
- Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(1), 81–83.

- Jiang, Y.M. (2009). Applying Group Work to Improve College Students' Oral English. *International Education Studies*, 2(3), 136–139.
- Johnston, C. G., James, R. H., Lye, J. N., & McDonald, I. M. (2000). An evaluation of collaborative problem solving for learning economics. *Journal of Economic Education*, 31(1), 13–29.

