University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Development of Speaking Skills through Cooperative Learning

Kateřina Urbánková

Bachelor Thesis

2023

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2021/2022

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE
(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Kateřina Urbánková**
Osobní číslo: **H20041**
Studijní program: **B0231A090018 Anglický jazyk**
Specializace: **Anglický jazyk pro vzdělávání**
Téma práce: **Rozvoj řečové dovednosti mluvení prostřednictvím kooperativního vyučování**
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Studentka se bude ve své práci zabývat rozvojem řečové dovednosti mluvení prostřednictvím kooperativního učení v hodinách anglického jazyka na 2. stupni ZŠ. V teoretické části nejprve zasadí rozvoj řečové dovednosti mluvení do širšího kontextu výuky anglického jazyka. Dále budou představeny výukové možnosti a podmínky podporující rozvoj této řečové dovednosti. Na závěr bude definováno kooperativní učení a jeho principy v souvislosti s rozvojem této dovednosti. V praktické části bude studentka pomocí vhodně zvolených výzkumných nástrojů zjišťovat, zda a jak jsou v hodinách anglického jazyka uplatňovány principy kooperativního učení při rozvoji řečové dovednosti mluvení.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Council of Europe. 2018. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages – Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Council of Europe.

Gavora, Peter. 2000. *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu*. Brno: Paido.

Johnson, David, Roger Johnson, and Edythe Holubec. 1998. *Cooperation in the classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kasíková, Hana. 2008. *Kooperativní učení a vyučování. Teoretické a praktické problémy*. Praha: Karolinum.

Kasíková, Hana. 2016. *Kooperativní učení, kooperativní škola*. Praha: Portál.

MŠMT. 2021. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání*. Praha: MŠMT.

Richards, Jack, and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.

Sitná, Dagmar. 2009. *Metody aktivního vyučování: Spolupráce žáků ve skupinách*. Praha: Portál.

Skalková, Jarmila. 2007. *Obecná didaktika*. Praha: Grada

Škoda, Jiří, and Pavel Doulík. 2011. *Psychodidaktika-Metody efektivního a smysluplného učení a vyučování*. Praha: Grada.

Vališová, Alena, and Hana Kasíková. 2007. *Pedagogika pro učitele*. Praha: Grada

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Helena Zitková, Ph.D.**
                               Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **2. dubna 2022**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **30. března 2023**

---

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D.   **Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.**
děkan   vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2022

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem Rozvoj řečové dovednosti mluvení prostřednictvím kooperativního vyučování jsem vypracoval/a samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil/a, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byl/a jsem seznámen s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 20. 3. 2023

Kateřina Urbánková v. r.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ANNOTATION

The bachelor thesis deals with cooperative learning and its use for the development of speaking during English classes. The work aims to investigate whether and how teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. First, communication competence and speaking as a language skill are introduced. Further, cooperative learning is discussed, emphasising cooperation between students, thereby creating the conditions for language learning. The paper is divided into two parts – theoretical and practical. The theoretical part forms the basis for the research described in the practical part.

KEYWORDS

ANOTACE

Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá kooperativním učením a jeho využitím pro rozvoj mluvení během hodin anglického jazyka. Cílem práce je zjistit, zda a jak učitelé využívají principy kooperativního učení k rozvoji mluvení během hodin anglického jazyka na druhém stupni základní školy. Nejprve je představena komunikační kompetence a řečová dovednost mluvení. Dále je rozebíráno kooperativní učení, které klade důraz na spolupráci mezi žáky, čímž vytváří podmínky, díky kterým dochází k osvojování si jazyka. Práce je rozdělena na dvě části – teoretickou a praktickou. Teoretická část tvoří základ, o který se opírá výzkum popsaný v praktické části.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CC – Communicative Competence

CEFR – Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CL – Cooperative Learning

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

ESL – English as a Second Language

FEP BE – Framework Educational Programme for Basic Education

FL – Foreign Language

ISCED – International Standard Classification of Education

L2 – Second Language

S1 – The First School

S2 – The Second School

SEP – School Educational Programme

TA – Teacher A

TB – Teacher B

TC – Teacher C

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The thesis deals with cooperative learning and its favourable influences on students' development and language acquisition. Concerning this fact, the paper aims to investigate whether and how teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school.

The thesis is divided into two parts – theoretical and practical part. The theoretical part explores communicative competence as the ability to communicate effectively. Subsequently, speaking is defined as the essential part of language skills requiring integrating language knowledge and skill. Then different theories of teaching speaking and commonly used activities to practise speaking are suggested. The following section discusses lower secondary school students and the importance of classmates at this age. The rest of the theoretical part studies cooperative learning and its positive influence on students, their speaking and skill development. Moreover, cooperative and traditional group learning are contrasted since they may be wrongly interchanged and cause misunderstandings. Furthermore, the thesis works with effective student cooperation based on cooperative learning principles, structures, techniques, and methods. Besides, various roles of student and teacher that appear in the classroom when the teacher disappears from the centre of interest are offered. The last topic of this part concerns the drawbacks of cooperative learning since its positive aspects are mentioned throughout the paper.

The research is introduced in the following practical part based on the findings from the theoretical part. This part tries to answer the research questions formulated on the basis of the overall aim of the thesis. The theoretical part consists of several phases. The first section introduces the research with its aim, plan, background, stated research questions, methods and instruments that must be considered before data collection, which is depicted in the following part. The third part deals with data analysis and follow-up interpretation. The last phase includes the answers to the stated research questions.

In closing, it is crucial to mention that a term teacher is, from time to time, replaced by the pronouns "he/she" or by possessive adjectives "his/her" or "their",

depending on the context. The same descriptors are used when talking about students, sometimes referred to as learners or pupils.

THEORETICAL PART

1 COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

1.1 Definition of Communicative Competence

Since English learners want to communicate with others, they must gain communicative competence (CC), which Hymes (in Goh and Burns, 2012, 51) understands as the ability to produce language effectively in real communication. Stenlev (2003, 39–40) refers to CC as another word for social competence, which is one of the main aims of cooperative learning (CL). Thus, in CL, students train in many components of CC.

CC was furtherly developed by Canale and Swain (1980, 28–30) to be used in language teaching. They claim that it at least has three main competencies – grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence. Grammatical competence is a mastery of knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, semantics, and phonology. Sociolinguistic competence includes sociocultural rules and rules of discourse. Finally, strategic competence is based on verbal and nonverbal strategies, helping the speaker to achieve the communication goal and overcome possible problems. The framework for CC by Canale and Swain served as a basis for further development.

Currently, the CC model from the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) is widely used when teaching English to speakers of other languages. Comparably to the previously mentioned framework, the CEFR (2020, 129) describes communicative language competence as linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competencies that are entangled and cannot be isolated from each other.

According to the model from the CEFR (2020, 130–137), linguistic competence reflects the need for language complexity and connected aspects such as general linguistic range, vocabulary range and control, phonological and orthographical control, or grammatical accuracy. Sociolinguistic competence focuses on the knowledge and skills needed to handle the social aspect of language use (e.g., level of politeness and difference in register, accents,

or dialects). Pragmatic competence deals with the actual usage of the language as a system hence is interested in flexibility, turntaking, thematic development, coherence and cohesion, propositional precision, and fluency. In sum, all these aspects help every speaker apply language adequately in specific social situations.

As it is based on both models mentioned above, there are only minor confusions in terminology, but the concept is the same. After analysing CC, it is necessary to connect it with second-language speaking, which the work will deal with in the next chapter.

1.2 Communicative Competence of the Second Language

Richards and Schmidt (2002, 472) describe a second language (L2) as any language speaker learns after the native language. Stern (1993, 16) follows up and defines L2 with the help of foreign language (FL). Subsequently, the L2 is a non-native language learnt and used in a country. At the same time, FL is a non-native language used outside the country, usually for travelling purposes. Harmer (2007, 19) notes that for decades, teachers pointed out differences between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL). However, it is hard to keep this distinction since English is a language of international communication, especially on the Internet, where students become part of a *global targeted-language community*. Similarly, Stern (1993, 15) further supplies that ESL has been applied to all non-native language learning. Consequently, the borders of this distinction blur. For this work, the term L2 will be used.

Goh and Burns (2012, 51, 53) further deal with the connection between CC and L2. Hence, they created a second language speaking competence model, increasing the speaker's ability to use linguistic knowledge to produce fluent, accurate and socially relevant speech and discourse. The three related parts of this framework will be analysed in more detail.

Knowledge of language and discourse, the first part of Goh and Burns's model (2012, 54, 57), includes grammatical knowledge, phonological knowledge, lexical knowledge, and discourse knowledge. This part is vital since, without it, learners would not be able to formulate and express any idea they have. Thus, it must be taken into the teacher's consideration when planning lessons.

The first part creates a needed base for the second section of the model by Goh and Burns (2012, 58–59), portraying *core speaking skills* helping to put the speaker's knowledge about the language into action. It compromises *pronunciation* with its connected articulation of vowels, word stress, and usage of different intonation patterns. The next skill is *speech function* containing the correct performance of communication functions, such as requesting, expressing, explaining, giving, offering, or describing. Then there is an *integration management skill* speakers use to regulate conversations. To do so, speakers must know how to initiate, maintain, or end conversations. Besides, they must be able to clarify the meaning of words, change topics or recognise verbal or nonverbal signals. *Discourse organisation* is the last skill concerning discourse usage linked with coherence and cohesion.

In the last model section selected by Goh and Burns (2012, 63–67), *communication strategies* are employed by speakers to narrow the scope of communication and effectively convey their message. These strategies are further divided. *Cognitive strategies* allow speakers to explain or paraphrase words they cannot remember, which corresponds with Bygate's (2006, 42) *achievement strategies*. Moreover, Goh and Burns (2012, 63–67) work with *metacognitive strategies* allowing thinking and production of language and *interactional strategies,* which include repeating, comprehension checks, giving examples or using non-verbal communication.

Non-native speakers must achieve CC to speak and communicate with others. Even though there were introduced three slightly different frameworks of CC, they match in the opinion that every speaker must acquire knowledge about the language, discourse, and strategies which help them to adapt the language to social context and deal with unforeseen speaking problems.

2 SPEAKING

2.1 Definition of Speaking

Every language can be described by its four language skills: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Thus, teachers should pay equal attention to these four skills when helping

students to acquire targeted language. Goh and Burns (2012, 2) admit that although students talk a lot in English lessons, speaking is not taught as a skill. Supported by Ur (1996, 120), who considers speaking to be the essential part of the four skills, most English learners are mainly interested in improving. Moreover, speaking is helpful in social or business spheres. Accordingly, this skill should not be underestimated.

Speaking requires integrating many subsystems, making it difficult for learners. In accordance, Goh and Burns (2012, 52) say that speaking requires a high multitasking level, making it a combinatorial skill. Bygate (2006, 3–6) first distinguishes between *knowledge* and *skill*. He emphasises that *skill* is using the language and specific knowledge of grammar and vocabulary to speak. Further, he states that every good speaker should have motor-perceptive skills that contain perceiving, recalling, and articulating sounds precisely and interaction skills covering making decisions about communication as knowing what to say, how to say it to satisfy particular demands. In conclusion, speaking means bringing together knowledge and various speaking skills.

In contrast, the CEFR (2020, 60, 70) does not define speaking but works with two terms – oral production and oral interaction. Oral production abilities are not acquired naturally; the speaker must learn, with the support of production strategies (planning, compensation or monitoring and repair), how to give a more extended, formal presentation. On the other hand, oral interaction activities involve at least two people co-constructing discourse, which is vital in learning since its strategies (turntaking, co-operating, or asking for clarification) are engaged in everyday conversations.

The definitions of speaking differ, and giving a specific explanation is not straightforward. Nevertheless, it is possible to conclude that speaking is a combination of language knowledge and skill in producing and adapting language situationally when making decisions rapidly or reacting in dialogues as unforeseen issues appear. Moreover, when creating language, the speaker must balance various processes with cognitive, emotional, and social demands.

2.2 Characteristics of spoken language

Speaking, together with writing, is considered a productive skill since speakers must actively create language. In accordance, they share some similarities, which give rise to the need to clarify spoken language.

Harmer (2007, 45–46) states that words and tenses in spoken language are used differently than in written language. It is caused by the fact that speech is spontaneous and occurs in real-time; consequently, it can only be well-formed and pre-organised as writing if it is a prepared monologue. Furthermore, the speech always has specific features like intonation, tone of voice or body movement. Bygate (2006, 7, 11–13) follows from that with two demands influencing spoken language: *processing* and *reciprocity conditions*. Processing conditions involve time, which affects verbal and stylistic speech choices. In contrast, reciprocity conditions provide feedback and show agreement, understanding or misunderstanding, which helps the speaker adjust his speech according to the audience's reaction. Eggins (2004, 92–93) gives a comprehensive explanation by approaching the situations in which spoken language appears. She said spoken situations are interactive, context-dependent and based on turn-taking, which means that the output is unrehearsed and full of hesitation, false starts, repetition, overlaps or interruptions. Generally, there is a big difference between prepared and composed-on-spot communication.

Spoken language also has its functions. Brown and Yule (1983, 23) assert two principal functions. The first is *transactional*, used to share a message, and the second is *interactional*, helping to create and preserve social relationships. Halliday (in Goh and Burns, 2012, 78) further expands these essential functions by asking for something, getting others' responses, expressing identity, discovering the world and how things work, and expressing thoughts and imagination.

2.3 Theories of teaching speaking

It's critical to present teaching theories when speaking is defined. Barns (in Bygate, 2006, 93–94) discusses two approaches to teaching speaking. He distinguishes between *exploratory* and *final draft learning*. The final draft approach is based on producing perfect language

without errors, meaning that students are expected to understand every aspect of the given task quickly at the beginning. On the other hand, the exploratory approach expects the learner's experiment with the language and personal interpretation for better understanding. Nevertheless, this approach assumes the final draft form when the learner knows and can use all the aspects of a discipline.

In contrast, Thornbury (2005, 37) lists three divergent theories: *behaviourist, cognitivist, and sociocultural*. The first theory, behaviourism, comprises three steps: presentation, practice, and production (PPP). In this process, language learning is the formation of habits through repetitive reinforcement concerning the development of speaking. Activities like listening to a recording, imitating it, and performing its features in the classroom are involved in this approach. As recorded by Thornbury (2005, 38) in cognitivism, speaking is viewed as a transition from controlled to automated processing. Accordingly, the PPP model is replaced by a procedure starting with awareness raising, then proceduralization, and ending with the autonomy of speakers. The cognitivist approach considers the mental processes involved in speaking and how much attention students give to language, contrasting the behaviourist view, which is only focused on imitating speech. The last theory mentioned by Thornbury (2005, 38–39) is sociocultural, which concerns language learning in a social context, believing that every language is mediated through social interactions. To achieve autonomy in speaking, the learner must experience other-regulation from a teacher or classmate who provides him with a supporting framework. This process helps the learner gain new competence, accept it as his own and further apply it; hence the learner reaches the state of self-regulation.

Even though each theory works with different terminology and integrations of new knowledge into the learner's existing system vary, they all aim to apply the new knowledge in a way that the learner becomes independent in speaking.

2.4 Speaking Activities

After the teacher selects a theory for teaching speaking, it is time to select activities to develop students' speaking skills. Harmer (2007, 348) lists commonly used speaking activities.

Harmer's first speaking activity (2007, 348) is acting from the script; during these activities, students act out dialogues from their coursebooks, or they can create playscript themselves. Since students must cooperate to create playscript, these activities are much more beneficial than just practising general language use, appropriate intonation, stress, and speed of speech. According to Almond (2005, 10–11), students practising these activities gain confidence, develop empathy, or participate in problem-solving. Moreover, learners must use body language, mimics or eye contact when acting. In general, these activities engage the students as a whole personality.

As the second category Harmer (2007, 349) lists communication games aiming to get students talking on the spot and fluently. Accordingly, Harmer (2007, 349) mentions information-gap games during which students work in pairs to solve a puzzle, describe and draw pictures, put the objects into given order or describe images to find similarities/differences. The purpose of these activities is to fill in some of the gaps participants have in the background knowledge of the task since they share different information. In addition, Goh and Burns (2012, 203–204) mention context-gap tasks, in which pairs are given the same set of data (set of pictures) to construct a new coherent speech (tell a story).

The next category mentioned by Harmer (2007, 350) is the discussion containing a wide range of activities, from informal small-group interactions to formal, whole-group staged events. Goh and Burns (2012, 207) claim that discussions can be made through simulation. Even though speakers are given roles, they must rely on their own real-life experience and knowledge of language to discuss the problem.

Other activities, such as prepared talks, questionnaires, or role-plays, are listed by Harmer (2007, 351–352). Goh and Bruns (2012, 202) furthermore draw attention to *monologic* tasks that need transactional interactions to inform the audience (giving presentations), necessitating the production of discourse by each speaker alone. In contrast, the authors say that communication-gap and discussion tasks call for *transactional* and *interpersonal interaction*. While sustaining interpersonal engagement, the learner concentrates on gathering relevant knowledge and viewpoints. On top of that, cooperation among students allows the practice of different core speaking skills, the application of knowledge of language and discourse, and the use of strategies to enhance speaking as a skill in general.

3 LOWER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENT

3.1 Characteristics of Lower Secondary School Student

Since every country has a different education system, a lower secondary school student can be understood in many ways. To avoid discrepancies, the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) (2012, 33–34) defines a lower secondary school as a part of programmes at ISCED level 2, which aim to complete basic nine-year-long education and, at the same time, lay the foundation for lifelong development and education of the students. These educational programs consist of subjects taught in one class by subject-specialised teachers. Moreover, completion of ISCED level 2 often means the end of the students' compulsory schooling at the age of fifteen.

Vágnerová (2000, 209, 251) states that students attending a lower secondary school are in the early stage of adolescence, which begins at approximately 11 years of age. As part of this development, overall physical and psychological changes occur. Correspondingly, the student rejects the subordinate role in relationships meaning that the teacher's authority is automatically accepted as a norm only if the teacher can attract the student's attention. According to Harmer (2007, 83–84), students gain a remarkable ability for abstract thinking in this stage of life. The author further highlights teenage students' vulnerability to negative judgements and the need for peer approval while searching for their identity and self-esteem. Implying that CL is suitable for this age group since classmates play an essential role in it.

In addition, teachers should prepare relevant material that combinate curriculum and students' experience or interests since learning English at lower secondary school must aim to fulfil the expected outcomes of the Framework Education Programme for Basic Education (FEP BE) (2021, 27). By this framework, after the ninth grade, the student should be able to speak enough English to ask for basic information and, at the same time, respond adequately in everyday situations.

4 COOPERATIVE LEARNING

4.1 Definition of Cooperative Learning

Man is a social being who cannot survive in isolation and needs to engage with others regularly. To apply himself to society and be beneficial, he needs many skills. The school should be where students develop their competencies and gradually acquire crucial skills for their future. CL helps teachers create an effective learning environment where students can acquire the skills. Moreover, Stenlev (2003, 40, 37) cherishes CL for improving students' speaking since all aspects of oral side CC are included. Concerning this fact, it gives the students opportunities to speak rather than merely having them do tasks that will help them communicate in the future. Following his statement, this part of the thesis deals with CL.

According to Johnson and Johnson (1999, 73), CL is the instructional use of small groups in which students work together to improve the learning of each member and the whole group while creating positive and supportive relationships within the group. Kasíková (2010, 27) describes CL as a form of teaching that consciously uses social relations for higher learning efficiency. She similarly claims that the cooperation principle is used to achieve stated goals. Thus, an individual's success depends on the work of the entire group, and the group's success depends on individuals. Richards and Schmidt (2002, 124) follow up with a detailed definition of CL in their dictionary. They characterise this term as an approach to teaching and learning during which students cooperate in small groups to maximise the learning of each student because it increases students' participation, reduces competition among them, and lessens the dominance of the teacher. Further, the students are the centre of the learning process.

The viewpoints mentioned above have in common that CL can positively affect the entire education of students, especially their relationships. All opinions mention work based on cooperation in small groups, where the success of one depends on the success of the whole group and vice versa. Therefore, this active learning relies on sharing and cooperation, leading to successful learning and full-fledged personal development. They work together in the group actively to achieve their aims, which allows even timid, shy students to participate and talk freely in the given task because the dominance of the teacher in education is left behind.

The teacher thus acquires the role of a guide who creates an effective learning environment where students succeed without competition.

4.1.1 Definition of Cooperation

For this paper, it is necessary to define cooperation since, as the terminology implies, CL is based on this term. Furthermore, it takes part in the FEP BE (2021, 126) through cross-curricular themes that strive to use the student's individual experience to achieve cooperation and thereby develop students, their attitudes, and values. In consequence, cooperation should assist the students in aiming for their education.

Mazáčová (2014, 78) defines cooperation as working together to achieve a common goal. Far more concerned with this term is Kasíková (2010, 29–30), who says that it cannot be clearly defined in pedagogical contexts, as it can be understood in several ways. She states that cooperation can be recognised as the aim of the learning structure, which a student can only achieve if the others in the group do. Moreover, she understands this expression as a personality trait of the learner or as the learner's behaviour in school situations influenced by external and internal conditions that can disrupt the learning harmony.

It may be possible to say that cooperation is a social interaction that arises based on common goals, which benefits everyone involved. Besides, it brings greater effectiveness and improves relations in learning groups.

4.1.2 Conditions of Effective Cooperative Learning

If the teacher plans to incorporate cooperation into the English lessons, he must establish conditions that ensure the productivity of CL. Kasíková (2004, 79) includes *positive interdependence* among these conditions, which strengthens personal responsibility in achieving goals. The result of positive interdependence should be another condition called *promotive interaction*, i.e., mutual support of group members. As the last condition, she considers *interpersonal and group skills* usage to ensure productive group work. On the other hand, the teacher cannot assume that CL will always be one hundred per cent effective, even if these conditions are considered. As Kasíková and Valenta (1994, 51) maintain,

in certain situations, a cooperatively working student may behave individualistically during exam preparation or competitively when he meets classmates who may threaten his success.

However, if cooperation succeeds under these conditions, it helps to prevent unwanted effects. Kasíková (2004, 78) lists some of them. She mentioned the *free rider effect*, which occurs when the task is performed only by more capable individuals. The next is *the sucker effect* which happens when more capable individuals exert less effort not to complete the work by themselves. The last unpleasant effect she mentions is the *rich-get-richer effect*, where more capable students take on leading roles in a group to benefit from it.

These are the three conditions for effectively applying CL theory in the lessons. Moreover, they are tightly connected to the principles of CL, which will be described later.

4.1.3   The Difference between Cooperative and Traditional Group Learning

Due to the frequent reference to group learning in this thesis, it is necessary to distinguish between CL and traditional group learning. From the outside, they are the same form of teaching, and hence they are often wrongly interchanged.

Skalková (2007, 227–228) emphasises that although there are some similarities in group and CL characteristics, they cannot be considered identical. She admits that group learning contributes to the cooperation of pupils and their reciprocal help, therefore also to the implementation of learning of a cooperative nature, since CL principles can be used in all teaching forms. That is followed by Kasíková (2017, 114), who states that the main difference is in cooperation. She claims that group learning assumes cooperation when achieving a goal, whereas cooperative learning principles set the proper conditions for students' cooperation. Other differences are listed by Johnson et al. (1984, 9–10), who mark that CL groups differ from traditional learning groups primarily in that they are based on *positive interdependence*, *individual accountability*, *heterogeneity* in ability and personal characteristics. Moreover, the members share responsibility for performing leadership in group actions and each other's learning. The co-authors also say that in cooperative groups, the focus is on each member's learning maximum, development of *social skills* and good working relationships. Johnson adds

that in such a structure, the observance and intervention of the teacher are necessary, mainly when groups process their effectiveness.

CL is similar to traditional group learning in that it always involves the group cooperation of pupils, but what distinguishes CL from group learning are the principles that support students in groups to work cooperatively, i.e., together, and not just next to each other. However, this still needs to change the fact that both forms are considered highly practical.

4.2 Cooperative Learning Principles

As already mentioned, for the proper function of cooperative learning, it is not enough to divide students into groups, even though this arrangement is one of the significant features of this learning. The teacher must consider many factors that distinguish CL from traditional group learning. CL is entrenched in an interconnected system based on the following principles registered by Johnson and Johnson (1999, 70–71): *positive interdependence*, *individual accountability*, *face-to-face promotive interaction*, *social skills*, and *group processing*. Since Johnson and Johnson state that applying all these principles provides an effective learning environment, this part of the paper will focus on explaining them in detail.

According to Johnson and Johnson (1999, 70–71), *positive interdependence* is rooted in a goal and joint rewards. It depends on the division of roles in the group, resources, and tasks, which leads to better relationships among group members. Stenlev (2003, 36) gives a more complex definition. She says that if a group of students are to do the given task, they depend on one another's contributions which participate in the overall project. That implies that everyone is interested in imparting their knowledge to others and learning from them until they have a mutual understanding.

Johnson and Johnson (1999, 71) describe *individual accountability* as the performance of each group member being evaluated. The results of the evaluation are used for the whole group to ensure that all members benefit from them and can perform higher as individuals. Furthermore, Stenlev (2003, 36) considers this second principle as one of the most important in motivation, as everyone likes to feel that they know anything helpful colleagues can use. On the repost of this, *individual accountability* has a positive influence on emotional factors.

Another principle that Johnson and Johnson (1999, 71) mention is *face-to-face promoted interaction* encouraging the students to help, assist, support, and praise each other with completing a task, which leads to an exchange of required resources, argumentation, and provision of help or feedback. Besides, the authors stress that meaningful interaction in a group of 2-4 members must be face-to-face for immediate verbal as well as nonverbal feedback among classmates.

Effective cooperation among students will be ensured by another of the principles of Johnson and Johnson (1999, 71), which requires *social skills*. They list essential social skills, such as leadership, decision-making, trust-building, communication, and conflict-management skills. As Kasíková (2010, 38) adds, these social skills must be taught purposefully and gradually, from the simplest to the most complex. Implying that socially unskilled students will not be able to cooperate.

Group processing is the last principle stated by Johnson and Johnson (1999, 71). The experts assert the importance of the group's reflection on the work done, during which the students must analyse the effectiveness/inefficacy of their work and their overall progress or plan the next steps and changes to achieve the stated aim. Furthermore, Kasíková (2010, 38) claims that this reflection sets proper conditions for thinking on the metacognitive level. To conclude, *group processing* strengthens students' intellectual levels.

These five essential elements form a system based on effective cooperation between students. To talk about effective CL, all these principles must be involved. Accordingly, teachers must consider them when planning, implementing, or evaluating CL lessons.

4.3 Students' Cooperative Skills

To let the students work with activities based on CL principles, they need many skills to cooperate and learn productively in social interaction. These skills are necessary for them to know to work with information or actively participate in tasks. As noted by Kasíková (2010, 65–66), no one is born with these skills, and therefore students must learn them during special situations designed to acquire these skills or directly during cooperative tasks. Johnson et al.

(1984, 49) highlight the importance of a teacher who ensures the meaningfulness of the skills in set-up situations throughout the students' acquisition of them. Moreover, the co-authors emphasise that the students should practise these skills until they use them naturally without thinking. Stenlev (2003, 41) agrees and follows up with the opinion that the skills should be learned regularly in the classroom. CL skills should prepare the learners for practical life.

Kasíková (2010, 66–67) includes task and social skills in learners' cooperative skills. Task skills include *group agenda* (ability to plan, work with time or recap progress) and *giving and receiving ideas* so that an open atmosphere arises in the classroom. According to her, social skills include *encouraging and valuing or managing group processes* aiming that everyone is involved. On the contrary, cooperative skills are sorted into four levels – *forming, functioning*, *formulating*, and *fermenting* by Johnson et al. (1984, 45–48). This division will be explained.

Johnson et al. (1984, 45–46) say that *forming skills* are the simplest skills connected to group organisation and cover creating learning groups, staying in the group during group time, using quiet voices, encouraging everyone to participate in sharing ideas and knowledge, and applying social skills like using names, looking at the speaker, or not interrupting other members' speech. Teachers use forming skills to ensure that the students are oriented toward working together.

Further, Johnson et al. (1984, 46) state that *functioning skills* manage the efforts to complete tasks with effective work procedures and a friendly working atmosphere. The authors include in this section giving direction to the group, expressing support and acceptance, asking for or offering advice and clarification, paraphrasing others' contributions, energising the group, or describing the feelings of others. Functioning skills help students operate altogether with the support of positive relationships.

Another level selected by Johnson et al. (1984, 47) is *formulating skills* stimulating higher-quality reasoning strategies to ensure retention of the assigned material. These skills include summarising aloud from memory, seeking accuracy by correcting others' summarisation, and the ability to elaborate by asking others to relate newly learned material to known things. Besides, the skills demand remembering ideas by using mental pictures or other memory aids, expressing thoughts to open discussion or correction, and asking other members to plan out

loud how to explain the material to others. To guarantee high-quality learning, teachers apply formulating skills in lessons.

The last set of skills from Johnson et al. (1984, 47–48) is connected to *fermenting*. *Fermenting skills* encourage reframing the studied content, cognitive conflict, and explaining the thinking processes leading to some conclusions. In this part, the writers incorporate criticising ideas (not people), identifying a disagreement in the group, combining different ideas into a single position, asking for an explanation of participants' responses, extending others' conclusions by providing new details or information, investigating by posing inquiries that advance comprehension, generating plausible answers by going beyond the first one, and checking if the group works with instructions and given time. To conclude, these most complex skills confirm intellectual challenges and disagreements within the group.

The skills mentioned above stimulate students' thinking and curiosity to reassure their motivation and effectiveness in learning. Cooperative skills play a crucial role in real life. Without these skills, humans would not be able to establish relationships with people, get a job or be a part of the community.

4.4   Methods and Techniques of Cooperative Learning

As stated above, Richards and Schmidt (2002, 124) characterise CL as an approach to teaching and learning. Hasanova et al. (2021, 371) follow on from that methods and techniques are parts of every approach to learning or teaching. In accordance, the need for these terms' definitions arises.

The definition of a method from the Merriam-Webster Dictionary says that it is "a systematic plan followed in presenting material for instruction" (accessed December 19, 2022). It is employed to achieve stated aims. On the other hand, the online Oxford Learner's Dictionary defines the technique as "a particular way of doing something, especially one in which you have to learn special skills" (accessed December 19, 2022). Thus, a technique is a formula by which a task is accomplished. Method and technique are teaching procedures following a defined plan.

In the following subsections, the work will further deal with methods and techniques of cooperative learning.

4.4.1 Methods of Cooperative Learning

Methods form the basis of group activity, formulated on social group relations. In the report of Slavin (1985, 6), cooperative learning methods are structured to be used in any subject at any grade level since they meet the practical requirements to solve problems using cooperation. Sitná (2013, 52) also deals with methods, emphasising that their strength lies in the systematic development of professional knowledge and skills and the development of vital competencies such as the development of cooperation, personal development, communication, awareness of responsibility for the course and results of learning. The teaching, therefore, should ensure that the pupils get to know the thematic unit in the broader context.

Slavin (1985, 6–8) includes among the most frequently used cooperative methods a set called *Student Team Learning* consisting of *Students Teams-Achievement Divisions, Teams-Game-Tournament,* and *Jigsaw II*. Other methods are mentioned as *Jigsaw, Learning Together*, or *Group-Investigation*. Cowie and Rudduck (in Kasíková, 2010, 51–52) list five basic methods, which will be depicted more. They first introduce the *discussion*, during which students share experiences, opinions and ideas for better understanding or group consensus. Another method is *problem solving*, where each group works on different task aspects, which are brought together at the end. *Work on the product* aims to create a specific product influenced by each participant's work. The *simulation* forces students to take the task as if it were from real life. If the students accept a specific role in simulation, they freely move to *role play*, the last method, when learners are assigned a character through which they will look at the problem. Sitná (2013, 51) expands these basic methods by others, such as brainstorming, snowballing, buzz groups, or mind mapping.

All the above methods have in common that cooperation is not a specifically given form of learning, but there are different requirements for it regarding its course. They are always learner-oriented and focus on their active participation.

4.4.2 Techniques of Cooperative Learning

CL techniques enhance interaction between students. Kasíková (2010, 53) expresses that techniques embody the main characteristic of CL – they bind the group together to share in inducing spoken interaction. She furtherly discloses that techniques can specify cognitive goals, creative goals, or developing individual and group awareness.

Hunterová (1999, 70–73) writes about four techniques to support guided group repetition. These include monitoring group responses and providing feedback using group, signalled, or composite responses. Another technique is to sample individual responses to show how the entire group understands the material. Checking written answers is the last method mentioned by Huterová. During the observance, the teacher examines the solutions of whom might need guidance. The most common mistakes are analysed in the classroom. Among the basic techniques, Kasíková (2010, 53–54) includes controlled discussion, step-by-step discussion, buzzing groups, snowballing, or crossed groups. According to her, these techniques positively encourage students to be creative.

These techniques are closely related to the methods already mentioned. An example is the so-called snowballing or buzz groups, which Kasíková includes in techniques, while Sitná calls them methods.

4.5 Cooperative Learning Structures

CL structures are tightly connected to methods, techniques, and principles of CL. Kagan and High (2002) define these structures as easy-to-use instructional strategies ideal for promoting language learning since the students learn more easily and quickly. Kasíková (2011) points out that some cooperative structures are uncomplicated, and some are more demanding in terms of time and skills of students and teachers. She highlights the significance of these instructional strategies because they can all be implemented in all teaching forms. Stenlev (2003, 36) adds the substant importance of choosing suitable structures concerning the aim and content as they affect students' success to a large extent. Consequently, the structures control students' behaviour since they constantly clarify each student's role in the team's interactions. By Kagan and High (2002), there are many advantages

of cooperative structures for English learners since they produce comprehensible input and language use caused by the natural context of language, peer support, negotiation of meaning, and lowered affective filter. After all, these strategies motivate the student to speak freely.

Stenlev (2003, 37) mentions three CL structures suitable for language teaching. The first structure is called a *3-Step Interview*, where students in pairs must express themselves in the target language and interpret their partners. An activity proceeds in a way that one student interviews the partner, then they switch roles, and in the end, they use *Round Robin*, which means that they in the team explain what they have learned from their partners. Kasíková (2011) mentions the possibility of working in threes or fours when students gradually change roles so that everyone asks questions, answers them, listens carefully, and chooses the crucial parts of the answers. She highlights that this structure can be incorporated into any lesson, although its content can be anything.

Another variation of the structure stated by Stenlev (2003, 37–38) is *Traveling Heads Together*. During this structure, the team is given a task they must discuss and come to an answer they all agree about and can defend. Then a student from each team is sent to the next group, where they explain the team's response. Kagan and High (2002) mention a similar structure called *Numbered Heads Together*, during which the teacher asks a question, students respond to them, discuss their answers in their groups, and when they are ready, the teacher calls a number. Students with that number answer.

The last structure given by Stenlev (2003, 38) is *Inside-Outside Circle*. Throughout, the teams work on the given material. All form two circles – one inner and one outer. The outer circle looks in, while the inner one is turned outward. There is a companion in the outer ring for each member of the inner one. The students exchange information with a partner. When they are done, one of the circles moves four people to the right (or left). Facing a new partner, they exchange the materials again. Kasíková (2011) adds a variation where the students stand in two circles - inner and outer, face to face with the difference that the teacher asks the questions, and the pairs discuss the answers.

Another structure mentioned by Kagan and High (2002) is *Timed Pair Share*, in which one student talks for a specified time and the others listen and then switch roles. During *Team*

Interviews, each member is interviewed by the teammates. The following strategy is called *Boss/Secretary*, where one student dictates to the partner who records the answer then students switch roles. The last one is *Mix-N-Match*; the students walk around the classroom with cards, quizzing each other and then finding their match.

All structures organise interaction between students to teach students how to share and receive new information. Since the students work and speak together, they feel more relaxed, get to know each other better, and train their performance skills. In addition, everyone is respected, which raises learners' motivation.

4.6 Teacher's Role

The teacher's role is a fundamental part of students' learning. During the CL process, the teacher disappears from the centre of interest. Being replaced by a student, the lector receives other roles.

Kagan (1985, 80) describes the teacher as the source of learning objectives and materials. The tutor must prepare for this even before the session during lesson planning, as stated by Johnson and Johnson (2008, 28). The co-authors say that every teacher must formulate objectives, methods, roles of students, size of groups, arrange the room and prepare materials needed during lesson planning. Sitná (2013, 52) as well, considers lesson planning to be a crucial part of a teacher's job description and adds that during preparation, the teacher must estimate the pupils' abilities, opinions, attitudes, and level of knowledge with the aim that they can fulfil the lesson objective. Only proper lesson planning can lead to the general student's development.

Johnson and Johnson (2008, 28–29) mark out the content of the teacher's work during the lesson more specifically. According to them, the teacher explains task instructions and *cooperative structure* together with criteria for success; then, he must structure *positive interdependence* and *individual accountability,* describe *social skills* the students are expected to use and emphasise cooperation among members of groups at the beginning of the lesson. The writers emphasise that the teacher monitors the students' success and usage of targeted social skills in completing the task. Nevertheless, at the end of the lesson, the teacher evaluates

students' achievement, ensures that students discuss their work effectiveness connected to the accountability of individuals and plans improvements. Although the teacher is not at the centre of the action, he uses a lot of experience and skills to lead the lesson properly.

Valenta and Kasíková (1994, 52) give specific names to the roles of the teacher in cooperative learning. They say that the teacher becomes a learning facilitator, a manager, a consultant, and an animator whose lesson leading is influenced by the features of cooperative learning. Sitná (2013, 52) lists other roles. She claims that when using cooperative learning methods, the teacher becomes a partner of the students, a guide, and an advisor. All these roles make the content of teachers' work more diverse.

The teacher takes on several roles during the lesson, from activity organiser to teaching guide. These roles erase the differences between the pupils and the teacher. Consequently, they become equal partners in learning. The teacher must consider the principles of CL when planning or evaluating the lessons and ensure effective cooperative methods, which will develop needed cooperative skills.

4.7 Student's Role

The main goal of CL is students' education, in the case of this work, students at the lower secondary school. Following the FEP BE (2021, 8), this form of teaching tries to prepare students to express themselves as free and responsible individuals but also helps them to develop a sense of cooperation and respect for the work of others. This development occurs, as Sitná (2013, 51) points out, mainly because the pupils are at the centre of all class activities. In consequence, their work determines the pace of the entire learning process. This idea is further evolved by Kagan (1985, 80), who says that learners receive relatively equal status with their teacher in CL. Showing the role of the student in CL is quite different from the student in standard education.

Assigning roles to students should ensure cooperative interdependence to make the groups function fully. As stated by Kagan (1985, 88), in CL, students become *consultants, presenters, investigators*, and *tutors* of their classmates. Johnson et al. (1984, 30–31) describe roles within the group. According to them, the roles to be given are *summarizer-checker*, who ensures

that everyone understands the lesson's content and a *research-runner* who gets needed material and communicates with other groups and the teacher. The next role the co-authors state is a *recorder* who takes notes of the group's decisions and is an *encourager* to support members' contributions and ideas. The last role mentioned is an *observer* who keeps track of group cooperation. This division ensures that students learn cooperative skills effectively.

In a standard learning environment, the student is expected to have only one role of a passive recipient of information. On the contrary, in cooperative learning, students acquire a lot of different roles, preparing them to assume other roles outside the classroom. Cooperation is more attractive for pupils, as it gives them freedom and equality with the teacher, so they are more motivated and learn better to fulfil their educational goal – general education connected to practical life.

4.8 Drawbacks of Cooperative Learning

The positive influence of CL on learners' social, psychological, and academic levels has been mentioned throughout this paper. In accordance, it is crucial to say its drawbacks.

Kagan (1999) mentions problems allocated with CL, which should be avoided, or they become the cons of learning. Some of the pitfalls the specialist listed were selected for this work purposes. The first chosen is a *lack of social skills*, which causes the students' inability to work together since they put each other down and do not cooperate. As Kasíková (2010, 87) states, this leads to conflicts that unskilled pupils cannot solve. Thus, any opposing opinion causes aggression, and a fight between group members arises from the discussion. Pupils must learn to respect and understand others with the help of appropriate social skills.

Another problem, according to Kagan (1999), can be group grades. This problem arises when one student completes the task, and the rest of the group receives the same grade without being involved in achieving it. According to Kasíková (2010, 83), this is caused by a dominant student who takes over the task that the other group members do not have the opportunity to participate in. Therefore, it is necessary to develop an understanding among students of how to work together effectively and successfully. The issue of grades is also dealt with by Palmer (2018, 142), who emphasises that placing learners in mixed-ability groups is

far better, which calls for more gifted students to tutor less gifted ones. And even the conditions that other group members will affect their grades disputably as CL is based on group work. Because if students are in groups according to their skill level, the lower-ability group may become discouraged and lose interest in completing the task.

Kagan (1999) further deals with teachers' lack of management strategies. That can cause a teacher to fail to put a quiet signal in place and becomes exhausted, attempting to control the students' attention. This problem is also discussed by Palmer (2018, 141), who says that teachers are afraid of losing control of the lesson or their confidence in teaching since they would have no control over the content that is being covered and provide students with the freedom to learn on their own.

Among other problems, Kagan (1999) indicates off-task behaviour and dependency on teammates leading to not being possible to work alone or between team competition.

Understandably, many teachers want to prevent these issues by using the common form of teaching, which requires students to sit in rows to avoid conversation and social interaction and quietly listen to the given information. Consequently, the lack of social skills among pupils will be concealed. For them, there will probably be no chance to learn vital skills for everyday interactions and communication.

5 CONCLUSION OF THEORETICAL PART

The thesis explores CC as the ability to communicate effectively, which is interconnected with the L2 and then applied in commonly used speaking activities such as discussion, communicative games or acting from the script. These activities aim to develop students' speaking and confidence during speech production, mainly with the help of cooperation, which serves as the principal substance of CL.

CL has many positive influences on students since it relies on sharing and cooperation, as mentioned. It leads to personal development and the acquisition of many skills vital for everyday life. This active learning helps students to develop their speaking; hence all aspects of CC are involved and trained in the classrooms. Furthermore, the dominance of the teacher is

suppressed, meaning that the students are at the centre of interest. While working in groups, they can speak freely about the given task, which allows shy students to be more involved.

The efficiency of this learning is ensured by CL principles that must be considered when planning lessons since all of them must be incorporated into the lectures to be able to talk about CL. These principles create the core, which positively affects students' relationships, emotional factors, development of social skills and cognition. CL structures, techniques and methods also support students' language learning effectiveness, mainly because of the organisation of interaction among students and their active participation, implying that the students are encouraged to communicate and express themselves in the targeted language. Accordingly, CL gives the students opportunities to use the language in practice.

The theoretical part serves as the basis for the research introduced in the following practical part.

PRACTICAL PART

6 RESEARCH

The practical part of the bachelor thesis is based on the findings from the theoretical part, where CC, speaking activities developing speaking and CL, together with its principles, were discussed. Correspondingly, CL is appropriate for making the whole learning process more effective. Moreover, it creates a variety of situations for students' speaking development. This motive has already been introduced in the previous part of the thesis, further giving rise to the paper's main aim.

This bachelor thesis aims to investigate whether and how teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. This topic is still relevant and up to date because of the constant need to create a learning environment where students learn more due to their active involvement.

This research problem will be solved systematically in several phases – the pre-research phase, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation and the research conclusion. These stages will be dealt with in the following sections and explained in detail.

6.1 Pre-research Phase

Pre-research phase plays a vital role in the follow-up research; hence it has been essential to define the background of the research that affects the results of the whole study. Nevertheless, the author must continually formulate research questions or hypotheses reflecting the findings from the theoretical part. The appropriate research method is also chosen for data collection at this stage. The researcher must contemplate the pilot study, forms for data analysis and other factors that must be decided before starting the survey.

6.1.1 Research Background

The research took place in English lessons of three teachers at two primary schools in the Pardubice Region. Both chosen schools were primary schools where the students start learning the English language from the third grade. As implied before, the schools have been visited to observe English lessons in lower secondary classes.

The schools have many things in common as well as differ in many ways. The first school (S1) is located in a small town. The main specification of the S1 is the division of the lower secondary school. It is divided into three categories according to the focus on football, athletics, and standard class without any specialised guide. After the fifth grade, the students from two classes are moved into classes where the given focus influences the teaching according to their preference. Moreover, the S1 accepts students from other schools, forming an entirely new group of students in the sixth grade. The content of the S1's curriculum is planned according to the School Educational Programme (SEP) named *Education through Sport and Play* (translated by the author – "Sportem a hrou ke vzdělání"). Each classroom has classic school desks and ICT technology such as a computer, interactive whiteboard, and projector. More than 20 students in every class are divided into smaller groups for English lessons in line with the language level. At the S1, the teachers share offices according to their subject specialisation.

The second school (S2) is a small village school where everyone knows each other supporting the teachers' orientation and knowledge of every student's sociocultural background. The students enter first grade and study together for nine years in a group not subject to any significant change. There is only one class in each grade. The S2 uses SEP named *Creative School* (translated by the author – "Tvořivá škola"). The classrooms have similar equipment as the S1, with the difference that there are carpets in the back of the classrooms for lessons with a form tutor or other whole-class activities. Each class has a maximum of 15 students who are not divided into groups for any subject. The teachers sit together in the same room, which helps them to cooperate more and interconnect the subjects. There is a teaching assistant in most classes.

At S1, the lessons of two teachers were attended; for other purposes, the labels teacher A (TA) and teacher B (TB) will be used. TA teaches English in the sixth grade, keen on athletics,

while TB tutors the ninth-grade footballers and students of the eighth and ninth grades interested in athletics. It is vital to mention that TB was in an unusual position, as several learning groups were combined due to the skiing course. Thus, there were always at least 20 students in the English class.

At S2, there is only one English teacher at a lower secondary school, furtherly specified as teacher C (TC). In accordance, observations at S2 took place in the classes of the seventh, eighth and ninth grades taught by TC.

To conclude, the chosen schools differ mainly in the location, the number of pupils and the relationships among teachers. Another factor is the division of lower secondary classes at S1 which may significantly influence students and their learning.

6.1.2 Research Questions

Regarding the theoretical part, where the specialists' opinions imply that CL is appropriate for the development of speaking; hence it gives space for conditions that ensure the use of English in practice. Concerning this fact, the paper's overall aim is to investigate whether and how teachers use the principles of CL to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. According to Švaříček and Šeďová (2007, 69), the aim of the work serves to formulate research questions that are the core of the research. Moreover, they must be constructed clearly so that the researcher is able to answer them at the end of the work. Only research questions framed this way can show the researcher how to conduct the study.

Based on the aim, two research questions were formulated:

Do the teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school?

How do the teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school?

6.1.3 Research Methods

Before defining the chosen research method, this term must be specified. Gavora (2000, 70) defines a research method as a chosen procedure used during the research. Furthermore, he allows that every research method can have concrete research instruments created only for its purposes. Following this, Hendl (2012, 161) highlights the importance of selecting the appropriate research method derived from the paper's aim and the research problem. Only with a correctly chosen method can the researcher obtain the desired type of information.

The research methods chosen for this thesis are observation and interview. According to Švaříček and Šeďová (2007, 143), the observation aims to capture and describe the events of a given situation precisely and in detail. For this purpose, this work used *direct observation*. This type of observation Gavora describes (2000, 78) as the one where the observer visits all classes in such a way as not to disturb their usual course. On that account, the observer sits in the corner of the classroom so that she can see what is going on in the class and has the opportunity to see most of the students' faces, which is essential when observing speaking activities. At the same time, it is possible to talk about *structured observation*. Švaříček and Šeďová (2007, 145) approach this as observation when the researcher tries to find an answer to pre-defined phenomena in a prepared observation sheet. To sum up, observation is used to record the interactions and actions of monitored subjects as they occur.

As mentioned, the second research method used was interview based on Švaříček and Šeďová's opinion (2007, 158–159) that it is more relevant to enrich observations with interviews for more comprehensive results of the entire research. Correspondingly, they define this method as questioning, as a rule, of one person by one interviewer using open-ended questions. The appropriate type of interview for this paper is mentioned by Hendl (2012, 173). He describes a *structured interview* during which different respondents are asked the same open-ended questions prepared in advance. Concerning this fact, Pelikán (2007, 120) emphasises the invariable formulation of questions for all respondents in these interviews, as even a small change in word order can be misleading. Gavora furtherly points out (2000, 111) the need for a calm and quiet interviewing environment where the respondent is not disturbed. At the same time, these conditions help create an open atmosphere among the participants ensuring truthful and sufficient answers.

6.1.3.1 Research instruments

For observations, two observation sheets were constructed. Observation Sheet I (Appendix 1) records the frequency of CL principles used in speaking activities. The schema (Figure 1) based on CL principles described by Johnson and Johnson (1999, 70–71) in the theoretical part was made to create Observation Sheet I.

CL Principles	Specification
Positive interdependence	Activities are based on goals and joint rewards. Relationships are ensured by dividing roles in the group, resources, and tasks.
Individual accountability	After the activity, each group member is evaluated, and the evaluation results are used for the whole group to benefit everybody.
Face-to-face promoted interaction	The students work in groups (2–4) to provide verbal/nonverbal feedback during the activity.
Social skills	Every student must know which social skills are needed in the given activity since these skills should be taught from the simplest to the most complex.
Group processing	After the activity, the students reflect efficiency/inefficiency of their group.

Figure 1: Cooperative Learning Principles

The Figure 1 contains CL principles, further described by which the given principle manifests itself and is represented by. This layout will be as well helpful later for data analysis and the creation of an observation sheet.

Observation Sheet I (Appendix 1) was designed based on commonly used speaking activities listed by Harmer (2007, 348) and Goh and Burns (2012, 203–204) and Figure 1 representing knowledge about CL principles from which the individual elements were derived and later search for in Observation Sheet II. This observation sheet comprises five principles specified by their elements in vertical columns. All its elements must occur in the lesson for a principle to be used. The first principle, positive interdependence, is divided into goal setting, joint reward, and division of roles, resources, and tasks. Individual accountability includes evaluating each group member, which results are used for the whole group. Face-to-face promoted interaction is represented by division into groups (2–4) and verbal and nonverbal feedback. Social skills are specified by knowledge of skills that must be taught from the simplest to the most complex. The last principle, group processing, includes the group's reflection. Horizontally, there are placed activities developing speaking skills, such as acting from the script, communication games divided into information-gap and context-gap games, and the last is discussion. Moreover, there is also a column marked as "Others" for different speaking activities used in the lesson. Everything is organised so that the principle or its individual elements used in the given speaking activity are recorded in the sheet. This sheet also includes space for the researcher's commentary.

Observation sheet II (Appendix 2) was made to track used speaking activities in detail. This table is divided into sections in which the speaking activities are described together with the teacher's and students' activity in the given speaking tasks. The detailed descriptions of the activities should show elements of CL principles used in the individual activities developing speaking to be furtherly recorded in Observation Sheet I.

These observation sheets were used to observe all English lessons at the chosen schools. To avoid misunderstandings, each observation sheet was marked with the teacher's label, lesson topic, class grade, number of students, and date of the observed lecture.

For the interviews, four open-ended questions were prepared in advance. These questions aim to find out the teachers' knowledge about CL, their attitude towards it and the view of their

teaching. The questions were asked in this order from more general to detailed, as recommended by Gavora (2000, 112).

The questions:

1. Do you know cooperative learning?
2. What do you imagine behind the term cooperative learning?
3. What is your attitude towards cooperative learning?
4. Do you think you use cooperative learning principles in your lessons?

6.1.3.2 Pilot research

With reference to Gavora's statement (2000, 71, 73), validity and reliability are two fundamental qualities of any research instrument that must be taken into account while conducting a study. Furthermore, the specialist explains reliability as a research tool's ability to be reliable and accurate. Švaříček and Šeďová (2007, 31) follow up with the definition of validity. The co-authors understand it to be an ability of the used research instrument to find the data that should be found, thereby ensuring the truthfulness and effectiveness of the entire research process.

For this work, it was possible to verify the validity of the research instrument, Observation Sheets I and II, in two ways. Firstly, the paper's author received feedback on both observation sheets from the supervisor, a didactic specialist. Then on 6th February 2023, both sheets were piloted in one English lesson at the S1. The pilot study of the research instruments found that only a few activities developing speaking are used in English lessons. This fact made the whole process of data collection more difficult. However, after all, the pilot observation contributed to adjusting the research instrument for the following observations.

A significant change in the research tool made after the pilot study was connected to the second sheet. After understanding the definition of field notes from Švaříček and Šeďová (2007, 155–158), the second sheet was renamed from field notes to Observation Sheet II since it describes the activities without the individual's reaction to the behaviour of others or the researcher's reflections on what it observed. Accordingly, the primary role of Observation Sheet II is to describe the activity. This description creates bases on which CL principles used are recorded

in Observation Sheet I. Another stylistic change was made in Observation Sheet II after the realisation that English lessons cannot or do not usually contain five speaking activities. The number of columns for recording the activity type and teacher's and students' actions was reduced to three (Appendix 2), increasing the space for a more detailed description of the activities used. Of course, the table could be further adjusted according to needs.

In addition, some adjustments were made in Observation Sheet I. A place where the researcher can comment on the lesson observed was added (Appendix 1). However, the table extension by the next column, called "Others", is the most crucial. Afterwards, the consideration and realisation that teachers do not have to use only activities depicted by Harmer (2007, 348) and Goh and Burns (2012, 203–204), this column was added.

6.2 Data Collection

As mentioned, data for this research were collected at two standard schools. English lessons of two teachers (TA, TB) were attended at S1. To be more specific, the lessons in the sixth grade of the TA and TB's lectures in the eighth and ninth grades. At S2, the observations occurred in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades taught by TC. After the first observation serving as a pilot study, each teacher was observed three times in their lessons, which means that the paper used data from 9 observed lessons. This number, after the consultation with the supervisor, was considered to be relevant for discovering whether and how teachers use the principles of CL to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. Before describing the data collection process, it is essential to note that none of the observed subjects was familiar with the aim of the survey.

The observed lessons were written down in the prepared observation sheets, which were adjusted based on the findings from the pilot study. Data were recorded from 6th February to 13th February 2023 at both schools simultaneously based on prior agreement with the teachers. The process of data collection was the same at both schools.

During the observed English lesson, the columns of Observation Sheet II were filled in (Appendix 2) to record the speaking activities and teacher and students' activities in one lecture (45 minutes). Immediately after each lesson, CL principles used in the recorder speaking

activities were identified with the help of Figure 1 and marked in Observation Sheet I (Appendix I). The researcher's comments on each lesson were written down throughout the observation.

After observing the teacher for three lessons, a short interview was arranged with her, which means that the researchers analysed data from three interviews, one with each teacher. At the beginning of the interview, the teacher was always asked for permission to record the interview, understanding that anonymity would be maintained and that her name would not be published anywhere. She was also informed that the recording would only be heard by the researcher, who would ensure that the recording was transcribed and then deleted. This was followed by an assurance that the questionnaire does not look for the correct answer but for teachers' knowledge about the topic and the view of their teaching. This means the abovementioned questions are general and not based on the observed classes.

The interviews were conducted in the teacher's office in Czech, ensuring that the subject was not pressured and could answer truthfully. Moreover, Czech was used to assure mutual understanding, either of the questions asked or the answers obtained. Detailed notes were taken during the interview, which accelerated the transcription process. When literal transcription was done, the audio recordings were deleted, and the transcriptions were translated into English by the researcher. Later, the interview findings will be connected with the results from observations.

6.3 Data Analysis and Interpretation

After collecting data at both schools, all the observation sheets were analysed. Analysing each teacher's lessons individually was vital to identify who uses CL principles during speaking activities. As already mentioned, one part of the analysis took place after the end of each English lesson. There is an example of the process shown in Appendices 1 and 2, where one lesson of TC is analysed.

The researcher always started by colour-marking the elements of individual CL principles in Observation Sheet I (Appendix 1), after which each element was searched for in the data recorded during the lecture in Observation Sheet II (Appendix 2). When a given element was

found, it was highlighted with the same colour as the element in Observation Sheet I. Moreover, a mark was registered in Observation Sheet I for the activity in which the element occurred. The other sheets were analysed in the same way. According to Gavora (2000, 77, 80), Observation Sheet I is for recording the frequency of CL principles in individual speaking activities based on recording marks when the observed problem happens. The data processed this way were organised into three tables (Appendix 3) showing the CL principles, especially their elements, used by the individual teacher during three English lessons taught by her. The tables used are, therefore, rather modified versions of Observation Sheet I, which is extended by the column recording the total number of individual elements used. The total numbers were then analysed in percentages and written in their column.

Data from these tables (Appendix 3) helped to decide whether and how each teacher uses the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. It is essential to mention that to be said that the teacher had applied the CL principle; every pre-defined element of the given principle must appear in the activity.

As seen in Appendix 3, in the three lessons of TA, two speaking activities occurred – an information-gap communication game and a discussion. In both activities, some elements of CL principles occurred. Positive interdependence was presented in both tasks by setting the goal while by the division of resources only in the information-gap game. Individual accountability did not appear. Face-to-face promoted interaction made an appearance twice in all its elements (groups 2–4, verbal and nonverbal feedback). Accordingly, it can be said that the CL principle of face-to-face promoted interaction was used in both activities. Social skills occurred in skill knowledge since the students used the skills, and none of them was taught purposefully and gradually, from the simplest to the most complex, as Kasíková (2010, 38) stated. In accordance, they already had been trained in the previous lessons; hence the students can cooperate. In the lesson, some skills listed by Johnson et al. (1984, 46–48) appeared, such as forming skills to create pairs, functioning skills for effective work, and formulating skills to express an opinion and contribute to the discussion. Nevertheless, the last principle emerged twice since its element, group reflection, was fulfilled in both assignments. All occurrences were transferred in percentage.

There is a table for TB in Appendix 3 as well. Similarly, in these English lessons, two speaking activities appeared. This time it was a discussion and Chinese Whisper, where the positive

interdependence element, setting the goal, emerged twice. Individual accountability was not spotted in any activity. Face-to-face promoted interaction was presented only by one element, nonverbal feedback, in Chinese Whisper. Comparable to TA, social skills were not taught since the students already used knowledge of some of them in the discussion. Mainly, functioning skills help the students complete the task in a friendly atmosphere, ask for or give clarification or paraphrase others' contributions, as Johnson et al. (1984, 46) said. TB applied the defined elements of CL principles the least times. None of the principles was used since all parts were not involved. However, these occurrences are again presented in percentages.

Appendix 3 contains a table for TC as well. In three lessons of TC, a discussion appeared three times, and an information communication game occurred once. In each task, the positive interdependence was represented by setting the goal. Once the division of sources in the information gap game supported this principle. Each group member's evaluation presenting individual accountability appeared in one of the discussions. All elements of the face-to-face promoted interaction principle (groups 2–4, verbal and nonverbal feedback) were visible in the information-gap game and one of the discussions. Apparently, this principle was used twice. As in the previous cases, social skills were pictured only by the skill knowledge in all tasks. This time the students took advantage of Johnson et al. (1984, 46–48) forming, functioning, and formulating skills for the same reasons mentioned above. On the other hand, in discussions, fermenting skills were used when the students were asking for an explanation of responses or extending others' conclusions by providing new information. In one discussion, the element group's reflection was included, by which another principle, group processing, was applied. In the lessons of TC were the highest occurrence of individual elements and the principles incorporated. The results are available in percentage interpretation.

Figure 2 was created to summarise the findings. The total number of occurrences of CL principles elements from nine lessons was recorded and transferred in percentage.

ACTIVITIES DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS			Acting from script	Communication games		Discussion	Others	Occurrence	%
				Info-gap	Context-gap				
CL PRINCIPLES	Positive interdependence	Setting the goal	–	2	–	5	1	8	23,5
		Joint reward	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of roles	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of resources	–	2	–	–	–	2	5,9
		The division of task	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Individual accountability	Each group member's evaluation	–	–	–	1	–	1	2,9
		Results used for the whole group	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Face-to-face promoted interaction	Groups (2–4)	–	2	–	2	–	4	11,8
		Verbal feedback	–	2	–	2	–	4	11,8
		Nonverbal feedback	–	2	–	2	1	5	14,7
	Social skills	Skill knowledge	–	2	–	5	1	8	23,5
		From the simplest to the most complex	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Group processing	Group's reflection	–	1	–	1	–	2	5,9

Figure 2: Total Number of Elements Occurrences in Individual Speaking Activities

As illustrated in Figure 2, each CL principle at least partially occurred by one of its elements. Positive interdependence is represented eight times in total by the goal setting (twice in the information-gap game, five times in the discussion and once in a different activity than listed by Harmer (2007, 348)) and twice in total by the division of resources (both times in the information-gap game). However, positive interdependence was not recorded in all its elements, meaning that any of the observed teachers did not use this principle. Individual accountability happened only in one of its elements called each group member's evaluation which was used once in total in the discussion. This principle was not applied either. On the other hand, the principle of face-to-face promoted interaction appeared in all its elements. The groups (2–4) were created four times in total (twice in the information-gap game and twice in the discussion), as well as the element of verbal feedback. Nonverbal feedback occurred five times in total (twice in the information-gap game, twice in the discussion and once in another activity). According to this analysis, the principle of face-to-face promoted interaction was used four times in nine lessons. Social skills were present only by one element of skill knowledge, which was recorded eight times in total (twice in the information-gap game, five times in the discussion and once in another activity). Since only one of the elements was fulfilled, this principle was not applied. Group's reflection was recorded twice in total (once in the information-gap game and once in the discussion). Hence it is the only element of group processing, it can be said that this principle was used twice.

To clarify the data from this analysis, Figure 3 was created, where only CL principles without their elements are found together with the speaking activities in which they appeared.

ACTIVITIES DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS		Acting from script	Communication games		Discussion	Others	Occurrence	%
			Info-gap	Context-gap				
CL PRINCIPLES	Positive interdependence	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Individual accountability	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Face-to-face promoted interaction	–	2	–	2	–	4	66,7
	Social skills	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Group processing	–	1	–	1	–	2	33,3

Figure 3: Total number of CL principles occurrences in individual speaking activities (in 9 lessons)

Figure 3 shows the occurrence of CL principles in individual speaking activities that happened during the nine observed English lessons. The total number of occurrences was analysed in percentages. As shown in the table, three CL principles were not involved in any lecture. They are positive interdependence, individual accountability and social skills. Only two principles appeared, which were face-to-face promoted interaction and group processing. Face-to-face promoted interaction emerged four times (66,7 %), twice in the information-gap game and twice in the discussion. On the other hand, group processing was recorded twice (33,3 %), once in the information-gap game and once in the discussion. It was already mentioned and shown in Appendix 3 that these CL principles were used only in the lessons of two teachers, TA and TC, and not by TB.

The teachers were interviewed to confirm or refute the findings from both observation sheets (questions in section 6.1.3.1 Research Instruments), obtaining their subjective views of the given issue, which were further interpreted. The questions were asked in the above order. The analysis came out of the description of *framework analysis* by Hendel (2012, 217–219), which is based on a so-called tabular method facilitating the organisation of data. After studying each teacher's responses and structures, sub-themes were created for the central theme of CL: Knowledge, Image, Attitude, and Usage. This subdivision helped to find the necessary information in the teachers' answers (Appendix 4). Each topic was marked with a different

colour based on its meaning to avoid confusion. Individual teachers' responses on selected subtopics were compiled into a table (Figure 4) and subsequently interpreted.

Theme: Cooperative Learning

	1. Knowledge	2. Image	3. Attitude	4. Usage
TA	"I am not sure whether I know this term. Yes! Now, I remember cooperative learning is when students learn from each other."	"...it is based on learning from peers, sharing knowledge, task division and cooperation among students."	"I like cooperative learning very much, so my attitude is positive."	"I would not say so. I do not even know the principles, so I cannot use them. ...I instead use traditional group learning."
TB	"Yes, I have heard this term."	"Cooperative learning is when students cooperate in class. ...students work together in pairs or groups on a given topic."	"Positive since I use this learning when the students work in pairs or groups, usually in games."	"For sure, I have an English game based on it."
TC	"Yes, I have already heard this term."	"...the cooperation of students. Nevertheless, cooperation is essential in English lessons for improving language, speaking, grammar, and listening, in fact, in all spheres outside the school too."	"My attitude is positive."	"Well, yes, but it depends on the lesson. ...these principles ensure that even weaker students can experience success since all of them must cooperate."

Figure 4: Teachers' responses on selected sub-themes

As demonstrated in Figure 4, it is evident that there is an existing awareness or knowledge of CL among teachers. They even have a comprehensive idea of what to imagine under this term. They agree that it is learning based on cooperation among students, which is one of the main factors that, according to Kasíková (2010, 27), serves to fulfil predetermined aims and ensure higher learning efficiency, which is guaranteed by CL principles listed by Johnson and Johnson (1999, 70–71). Moreover, TC is aware of the importance of cooperation during learning a new language and its extension into various spheres since it has a positive influence on students, their behaviour, or morals, as recorded in FEP BE (2021, 126). On the other hand, CL is most clearly defined by TA, who claims: "...it is based on learning

from peers, sharing knowledge, task division and cooperation among students," by which she summed up the main essence of CL, stored in its principles. Her statement corresponds with students' cooperative skills that were mentioned in the theoretical part by Johnson et al. (1984, 45–48). These skills ensure the motivation of students and their active involvement in solving the given problem. The teachers have further coincided in their attitudes towards CL, which they all describe as positive.

However, the teachers' responses differ fundamentally in the sub-theme named usage. From the answers, the researcher obtained the teachers' opinions on their teaching, especially their views on whether they use CL principles in their lessons. Bearing in mind that the researcher must take into account that these are the subjective opinions of the teachers, which may differ from the data obtained during the observations, the individual results of which can be found in Appendix 3. These outputs were compared with the interviews.

In agreement with Figure 4, TA believes she does not use CL principles. However, her affirmation differs from the results of data recorded in the observation sheets (Appendix 3), which prove the use of the face-to-face promoted interaction principle during the information-gap game and discussion. Furthermore, she used group processing in the information-gap game as well. In three English lessons, she applied three principles.

In contrast, TB says that she uses the principles, but none of them was recorded in her lessons. Only their partial elements were registered. Appendix 3 proves that even individual elements only occurred a little during the three lectures.

TC declares: "Well, yes, but it depends on the lesson." Although it follows from this that the use depends on the subject being discussed, after the analysis (results in Appendix 3), this assumption was confirmed regardless of the topic of the lesson. In TC classes, the same principles appeared as in TA. These are face-to-face promoted interaction in the information-gap game and discussion, as well as the principle of group processing in the information-gap game. Accordingly, in these lessons, three CL principles were recorded as well. On top of that, it is necessary to point out again that the most individual elements occurred in these classes. To sum up, TC was the only teacher who saw her teaching of English realistically, which was confirmed in the analysis of both observation sheets.

The widespread use of CL principles by the TA and TC is demonstrated in Figure 3. There it is seen that face-to-face promoted interaction occurred four times in total, which makes 66,7 %, and the principle of group processing was recorded twice in total, interpreted as 33,3 % in nine English lessons.

7 CONCLUSION OF PRACTICAL PART

The research findings based on the data analysis from observation sheets and interviews helped to answer two stated research questions formulated in a way to fulfil the overall aim of the thesis. The questions stated were whether the teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school and how the teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. The affirmations from the theoretical part were related to the findings in order to support the answers.

The answer to the first question of whether the teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school would have to be answered in the affirmative since two out of three teachers used CL principles in their lessons. However, only two principles appeared in the lectures; face-to-face promoted interaction and group processing. It must therefore be taken into account that not a single teacher applied all five principles at the same time, i.e., they did not appear simultaneously in any activity. From this, it follows that although two of the observed teachers applied CL principles, it is not CL since its principles create an interconnected system in which all of them must be present. Moreover, as written in the theoretical part, these principles distinguish CL from traditional group learning for the reason that they set the proper conditions for student cooperation, which means that students work together, not just next to each other. This is supported mainly by focusing on each member's learning maximum and good working relationships. Appropriately, the principles used by the teachers ensured learning of a cooperative nature; hence they can be implemented in all teaching forms.

Nevertheless, the findings helped to find the solution for the second interrogation of how the teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school. The answer is that the teachers involved

in the research used CL in activities developing speaking. Following the discovery in Figure 3, these are mainly two activities called information-gap game and discussion. As stated in the theoretical part of the thesis, the learners must rely on their knowledge of the language to discuss and solve the problem in these activities. Moreover, communication-gap games and discussions are based on transactional interactions aiming to inform the working partners and interpersonal interactions calling for cooperation among students while practising speaking, knowledge of the language, discourse, and many other strategies to produce language effectively in real conversations. Accordingly, this should be the main aim of learning languages.

Even though the research proved that CL principles are used very little in teaching, let alone to develop speaking during English classes, it cannot be said that these findings are applicable to all lower secondary schools in the Czech Republic. It is clear that more surveys in this field should have been carried out that would concern, for example, why English teachers do not use CL or its principles. Furthermore, this discipline should be supported by the greater enlightenment of this learning since there are existing pieces of evidence of its positive influence on whole-person development.

CONCLUSION

This bachelor thesis was devoted to cooperative learning and its use in English lessons at a lower secondary school. The aim was to investigate whether and how teachers use the principles of cooperative learning to develop speaking during English classes at a lower secondary school.

The thesis, divided into two main parts, starts with the theoretical part, which aimed to introduce communicative competence, speaking and cooperative learning with its principles and other specifics to create a base for the research. These topics were shown on more than a descriptive level, occasionally with a critical viewpoint. As determined by this section, it is apparent that cooperative learning enables students to acquire the necessary academic knowledge and social skills, thereby ensuring their personalities' overall development. Furthermore, the emphasis is primarily placed on social interaction between learners, meaning that the role of the teacher is sidelined. On account of that, many specialists consider cooperative learning appropriate for language acquisition and, above all, for the development of speaking since they have more opportunities to produce language and advance their communicative competence.

The second part focused on a research project based on observing three English language teachers from two different schools during their lessons. The aim was to answer two research questions formulated in order to fulfil the overall objective. The research consisted of several parts. In the beginning, the samples, research methods and instruments, and other influential aspects were defined before the research started. Two observation sheets were drawn up for data collection. The first protocol (Observation Sheet I) consists of pre-defined elements of cooperative learning principles and activities suitable for the development of speaking. There were written the findings from the second protocol (Observation Sheet II), which contained a description of the speaking activities and activities of the teacher and students. To confirm or refute the results of the analysis of the protocols, interviews were conducted with the teachers. The research result showed that two out of three teachers used two principles of cooperative learning during activities developing speaking – information-gap games and discussion. However, this is shallow use of these principles.

Although the response to the pre-set aim was positive, it must be resolved that all five principles were not used in one activity simultaneously. Thus, it was not cooperative learning but learning of a cooperative nature since cooperative principles can occur in all teaching styles. The findings of the study raised other issues that may be the focus of different projects. It is crucial to mention that the research was only conducted at two schools, and for this reason, the conclusion cannot be applied generally.

RESUMÉ

Tato bakalářská práce se zbývá kooperativním učením a jeho využitím pro rozvoj mluvení během hodin anglického jazyka. Cílem práce je zjistit, zda a jak učitelé využívají principy kooperativního učení k rozvoji mluvení během hodin anglického jazyka na druhém stupni základní školy. Práce je rozdělena do dvou hlavních částí – teoretické a praktické. V teoretické části jsou představeny klíčové pojmy, které vytváří teoretický základ pro výzkumný projekt. Praktická část je založena na výzkumu provedeném v rámci observací tří učitelek během jejich hodin anglického jazyka. Obě hlavní části jsou dále členěny do kapitol a podkapitol.

První kapitola teoretické části je věnována komunikační kompetenci, tedy schopnosti efektivně aplikovat jazyk v praxi a adekvátně v konkrétních sociálních situacích, což naplňuje hlavní cíl výuky anglického jazyka. V první podkapitole je představen model tří hlavních složek komunikační kompetence podle Canala a Swainové, který sloužil jako vzor dalším modelům. Jedním z nich je dále popsané schéma komunikační kompetence uvedené ve Společném evropském referenčním rámci pro jazyky, které rozlišuje lingvistickou, sociolingvistickou a pragmatickou kompetenci. Pro další účely této práce je v druhé podkapitole zmíněn další model komunikační kompetence navržený Gohovou a Burnsovou, tentokrát se zaměřením na angličtinu jako druhý jazyk. Z modelu vyplývá nutná znalost jazyka a diskurzu, základních řečových dovedností a komunikačních strategií, jedině tak bude žák schopen plynule a vhodně komunikovat.

Do druhé kapitoly teoretické části je zahrnuta jazyková dovednost mluvení. Nejprve je mluvení popsáno jako kombinace vědomostí o jazyku a dovedností v jeho produkci. Poté se práce v další podkapitole zabývá charakteristikou mluveného jazyka, která ho odlišuje od další řečové dovednosti psaní. Obě tyto dovednosti spadají do produktivních, proto jsou často srovnávány. Další podkapitola se zabývá několika teoriemi, které lze použít během výuky mluvení. V krátkosti jsou zde uvedeny dva přístupy – průzkumný a konečné návrhové učení. Detailněji jsou zmíněny tři přístupy od Thornburyho, jejichž cílem je, aby se žák stal nezávislým v mluvení. Nejprve uvádí behavioristický přístup založený na utváření si návyků. Dalším je konstruktivistický přístup, kde je mluvení viděno jako přechod od řízené k automatické produkci na základě neměnného postupu. Poslední je sociokulturní teorie, vycházející z názoru, že jazyk si žáci nejlépe osvojují během sociální interakce. V poslední podkapitole jsou zmíněny

aktivity využívané k rozvoji mluvení. Tyto aktivity jsou dále využity ve výzkumu k navržení observačních archů.

Ve třetí kapitole se práce zabývá žákem na druhém stupni základní školy. Nejprve je definován druhý stupeň základní školy pomocí Mezinárodní normy pro klasifikaci vzdělání ISCED. Poté je rozebrán žák na druhém stupni základní školy a důležitost vrstevnických vztahů v tomto věku. Kapitola je zakončena očekávanými výstupy u cizího jazyka, ke kterým musí devítileté vzdělávání směřovat.

Čtvrtá a nejrozsáhlejší kapitola teoretické části představuje kooperativní výuku a její specifika. Nejprve je definován termín kooperativní výuka, z čehož vychází, že se jedná o výuku založenou na sociální interakci mezi žáky v malých skupinách, kde úspěch jednoho závisí na úspěchu celé skupiny a naopak. Jde tedy o aktivní učení založené na sdílení a spolupráci, které se práce individuálně věnuje v další části. Kooperativní učení je často chybně zaměňováno s tradiční skupinovou výukou, proto je této problematice také věnován prostor. Dále je zde několik podkapitol, týkajících se kooperativních principů, metod, technik a struktur, které zaručují efektivní podmínky pro osvojování jazyka a různých dovedností studentů, jelikož vytváří situace, kdy žáci sami produkují jazyk. Popsání kooperativních principů bylo dále využito v praktické části pro tvoření výzkumného nástroje. Tato část se mino jiné zabývá rolemi učitele a studentů, které se v kooperativní výuce mohou vyskytnout. Poslední podkapitola se zaměřuje na nevýhody kooperativního učení, které slouží jako protiváha všem výhodám zmiňovaným v průběhu této části.

Poslední kapitolou teoretické části je její samotný závěr. Zde jsou shrnuta všechna teoretická východiska, o které se dále opírá praktická část.

Praktická část se skládá ze dvou hlavních kapitol nazvané v překladu „Výzkum" a „Závěr praktické části". První kapitola je rozdělena do několika podkapitol. V jejím úvodu nejprve došlo k seznámení s výzkumem, jeho cílem, relevantností a plánem na realizaci. První podkapitola se věnuje přípravné fázi projektu, během které byly představeny dvě školy a tři učitelky, u kterých výzkum probíhal. Dále byly formulovány výzkumné otázky, které byly vytvořeny tak, aby naplňovaly celkový cíl práce. Tato část také popisuje zvolené výzkumné metody a nástroje použité v pilotním pozorování, na jehož základě byly upraveny pro oficiální sběr dat. Výzkum byl realizován za pomoci dvou observačních archů a rozhovorů s učitelkami.

Další podkapitola pojednává o sběru dat, kde je popsáno, jak tento proces probíhal a kdy k observacím došlo. V Příloze 1 a 2 (Appendix 1 and 2) jsou přiloženy k náhledu oba záznamové archy vyplněné během jedné pozorované hodiny učitelky C, označované jako TC. Observační arch č.1 (Appendix 1) je založen na předem uvedených, nejčastěji používaných úkolech, rozvíjejících mluvení a na principech kooperativního učení, z jejichž popisu v teoretické části byly vydefinovány dílčí znaky každého z nich. Tyto znaky byly dále využity k analýze. Observační arch č. 2 (Appendix 2) obsahuje popisy aktivit společně s činností učitele a žáků během ní. Oba protokoly jsou na začátku označené, aby nedošlo k záměně.

Poslední podkapitola části „Výzkum" je zaměřena na proces analýzy a interpretaci dat, je zde tedy popsán postup, dle kterého byly observace i rozhovory rozebrány. Nejprve byly zanalyzovány hodiny jednotlivých učitelek. V observačním archu č. 2 byly vyhledávány dílčí znaky každého principu využité v dané aktivitě rozvíjející mluvení. Toto bylo následně zapsáno do observačního archu č.1, zaznamenávající výskyt jednotlivých znaků v úkolech. Užití jednotlivých elementů každou učitelkou bylo zapsáno do tabulek (Appendix 3). K souhrnu poznatků byla vytvořena jedna tabulka, která obsahuje principy s jejich individuálními znaky, sloužící k celkovému zaznamenání využití jednotlivých znaků při mluvících aktivitách (Figure 2) a posléze vznikla i tabulka pouze s principy (Figure 3), zhotovená s cílem zobrazit celkové užití principů. Na základě této tabulky bylo rozhodnuto, zda a jak byly využity dané principy. Pro rozbor rozhovorů byla vytvořena podtémata, která byla vyhledána v přepisech dialogů (Figure 4). Výsledky rozhovorů byly zobecněny a propojeny se závěry ze záznamových archů, aby došlo k jejich potvrzení či vyvrácení.

Druhá kapitola praktické části se zabývá jejím závěrem. Zde jsou shrnuty veškeré poznatky z praktického výzkumu. Znovu jsou připomenuty výzkumné otázky projektu, na které se na základě výzkumu podařilo odpovědět. Bylo zjištěno, že dvě ze tří učitelek během svých hodin několikrát použily dva stejné principy kooperativní výuky. Ačkoliv jejich využití bylo malé, byly použity právě v předem definovaných úkolech rozvíjející mluvení. Jelikož se v žádné aktivitě neobjevily všechny principy najednou, nemůže se výuka těchto učitelek považovat za kooperativní, ale pouze za výuku kooperativního charakteru.

Poslední částí je samotný závěr celé bakalářské práce, kde je znovu připomenut cíl této práce, zjištění vycházející z teoretické části propojená se zjištěními vzešlými z výzkumného projektu. Ačkoliv výzkum dokázal odpovědět na předem vymezené výzkumné otázky, výsledky získané

během šetření byly doprovázeny novými otázkami v této problematice, což by mohlo sloužit jako podmět k dalšímu projektu. Avšak je důležité zmínit, že výzkum byl proveden pouze na dvou školách, a proto nelze závěry práce aplikovat obecně.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almond, Mark. 2005. *Teaching English with Drama.* London: Modern English Publishing.

Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bygate, Martin. 2006. *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching." *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Merrill-Swain/publication/31260438_Theoretical_Bases_of_Communicative_Approaches_to_Second_Language_Teaching_and_Testing/links/0c960516b1dadad753000000/Theoretical-Bases-of-Communicative-Approaches-to-Second-Language-Teaching-and-Testing.pdf

Council of Europe. 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume. Strasbourg:* Council of Europe Publishing. https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4

Eggins, Suzanne. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum.

Gavora, Peter. 2000. *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu*. Brno: Paido.

Goh, Christine C. M., and Anne Burns. 2012. *Teaching Speaking – A Holistic Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Hasanova, Nasiba, Bunyod Abduazizov, and Ravshan Khujakulov. 2021. "The Main Differences Between Teaching Approaches, Methods, Procedures, Techniques, Styles and Strategies" *JournalNX – A Multidisciplinary peer Revied Journal* 7(2): 371–375. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/342865-the-main-differences-between-teaching-ap-24a0895b.pdf

Hendl, Jan. 2012. *Kvalitativní výzkum – základní teorie, metody a aplikace.* Praha: Portál.

Hunterová, Madeline. 1999. *Účinné vyučování v kostce*. Praha: Portál.

Johnson, David W., Roger T. Johnson, Edythe Johnson Holubec, and Patricia Roy. 1984. *Circles of Learning: Cooperation in the Classroom*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnson, David W., and Roger T. Johnson. 1999. "Making Cooperative Learning Work." *Theory Into Practice* 38 (2): 67–73. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243775553_Making_cooperative_learning_work

Johnson, David W., and Roger T. Johnson. 2008. "Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning: The Teacher's Role" In *The Teacher's Role in Implementing Cooperative Learning in the Classroom*, edited by Robyn M. Gillies, Adrian F. Ashman, and Jan Terwel, 9–37. New York: Springer.

Kagan, Spencer. 1985. "Dimension of Cooperative Structures." In *Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learning*, edited by Robert Slavin, Shlomo Sharan, Spencer Kagan, Rachel Hertz Lazarowitz, Clark Webb, and Richard Schmuck, 67–96. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.

Kagan, Spencer. 1999. "Cooperative Learning: Seventeen Pros and Seventeen Cons plus Ten Tips for Success." *Kagan Online Magazine*, Winter, 1999. https://www.kaganonline.com/free_articles/dr_spencer_kagan/ASK06.php

Kagan, Spencer, and Julie High. 2002. "Kagan Structures for English Language Learners." *Kagan Online Magazine*, Summer, 2002.

https://www.kaganonline.com/free_articles/dr_spencer_kagan/279/Kagan-Structures-for-English-Language-Learners

Kasíková, Hana, and Josef Valenta. 1994. *Reformu dělá učitel, aneb, Diferenciace, individualizace, kooperace ve vyučování: (Pohledy pedagogické)*. Praha: Sdružení pro tvořivou dramatiku.

Kasíková, Hana. 2004. *Kooperativní učení a vyučování. Teoretické a praktické problémy*. Praha: Karolinum.

Kasíková, Hana. 2010. *Kooperativní učení, kooperativní škola*. Praha: Portál.

Kasíková, Hana. 2011. "Výuka v kooperativních strukturách." *Metodický portál RVP.CZ*, October 19, 2011.
https://clanky.rvp.cz/clanek/c/Z/14191/vyuka-v-kooperativnich-strukturach-.html

Kasíková, Hana. 2017. "Kooperativní učení ve výuce: teorie – výzkum – realita." *Pedagogika* 67(2): 106–125.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320563868_Kooperativni_uceni_na_skolach_tri_pohledy_tri_vyhledy

Mazáčová, Nataša. 2014. *Vybrané problémy obecné didaktiky*. Praha: Pedagogická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.
http://www.vyzkum-mladez.cz/zprava/1434886741.pdf

Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, s.v. "method," accessed December 19, 2022, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/method.

MŠMT. 2021. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání*. Praha: MŠMT.
https://www.msmt.cz/file/56005/

Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, s.v. "technique," accessed December 19, 2022,
https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/american_english/technique.

Palmer, Guinevere, Rachel Peters, and Rebecca Streetman. 2018. "Cooperative Learning." In *Instructional Methods, Strategies and Technologies to Meet the Needs of All Learners*, edited by Paula Lombardi, 121–146. E-book licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. https://granite.pressbooks.pub/teachingdiverselearners/

Pelikán, Jiří. 2007. *Základy empirického výzkumu pedagogických jevů*. Praha: Karolinum.

Richards, Jack, and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.* Harlow: Longman.

Sitná, Dagmar. 2013. *Metody aktivního vyučování: Spolupráce žáků ve skupinách*. Praha: Portál.

Skalková, Jarmila. 2007. *Obecná didaktika*. Praha: Grada

Slavin, Robert. 1985. "An Introduction to Cooperative Learning Research." In *Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learning*, edited by Robert Slavin, Shlomo Sharan, Spencer Kagan, Rachel Hertz Lazarowitz, Clark Webb, and Richard Schmuck, 5–15. New York: Spinger Science+Business Media.

Stenlev, Jette. 2003. "Cooperative Learning in foreign language teaching" *Sprogforum* 25: 33–42. https://islped2013.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/cooperative-learning-in-foreign-language-teaching.pdf

Stern, Hans. 1993. *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Švaříček, Roma, and Klára Šeďová. 2007. *Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických vědách.* Praha: Portál.

Thornbury, Scott. 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow: Longman.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. 2012. *International Standard Classification of Education ISCED 2011*. Montreal: UNESCO.
https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf

Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vágnerová, Marie. 2000. *Vývojová psychologie – Dětství, dospělost, stáří*. Praha: Portál

APPENDICES

A list of Appendices:

Appendix 1 – Observation Sheet I

Appendix 2 – Observation Sheet II

Appendix 3 – Elements of CL Principle Used by Each Teacher During Three English Lessons

Appendix 4 – Transcriptions of Interviews

Appendix 1

Teacher: C

Class: 9

Topic: Grammar – reported speech

Number of students: 11

Date: 08/02/2023

ACTIVITIES DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS			Acting from script	Communication games		Discussion	Others
				Info-gap	Context-gap		
CL PRINCIPLES	Positive interdependence	Setting the goal				/	/
		Joint reward					
		The division of roles					
		The division of resources					
		The division of task					
	Individual accountability	Each group member's evaluation				/	
		Results used for the whole group					
	Face-to-face promoted interaction	Groups (2–4)				/	
		Verbal feedback				/	
		Nonverbal feedback				/	
	Social skills	Skill knowledge				/	/
		From the simplest to the most complex					
	Group processing	Group's reflection				/	

The lesson: The teacher starts the lesson with the student's disciplinary problems and excuses for illness. Then she hands out the corrected essays the students wrote last class. She mentions the most common mistakes and answers the questions from students in Czech.

Then the teachers ask the students what they know about the reported speech, which changes into a short discussion. (see observation sheet II). Then she gives a brief explanation of the problem.

Talk about the given topic – Travelling. (see observation sheet II) -> for the rest of the lesson

Appendix 2

Teacher: C   Topic: Grammar – reported speech

Class: 9   Number of students: 11   Date: 08/02/2023

	1	2	3
Speaking activity	Discussion on reported speech	The students are supposed to discuss travelling in pairs (one group of 3). They must create questions (at least 3); the topic has no structure. They have 10 minutes to do so. After, they will tell the class what they learnt about their partner and travelling in two sentences. They must use reported speech.	
Teacher's activity	The teacher asks the students what they know about reported speech. She does not stop the unplanned discussion but instead controls and ends it with a short summary.	The teacher describes the activity and says they must use detailed answers. She observes the class. After 10 minutes, the teacher stops the conversation. And gives the students a few seconds to revise what they asked about and evaluate how they worked together and stayed on the topic. They must also assess their contributions. Then she asks the first person to tell the class what he learnt about his partner and travelling, this way she asks all. She corrects grammar when each student speaks.	
Students' activity	The students try to define the reported speech by giving examples of sentences in direct speech and backshifting it in indirect. Then they determine its structure. They react to, correct, and complement each other's opinions. They do not shout, respect their classmates' reactions, and do not interrupt their speaking.	Firstly, the students create pairs, and then they must think of at least three questions. When both in the team are ready, they ask their partner and answer the constructed questions. The class is noisy; the observer cannot hear the closest pair. The students do not sit; they can change their position to feel comfortable but still face to face to give feedback or ask for clarification. They train fluency and the ability to react on the spot. Then each student shares what he learnt about his partner and travelling. Usually, they give the most surprising answer to one of their questions. They use reported speech. They also evaluate their discussion (how well they managed to stay on topic).	

Appendix 3

Teacher A (TA, 3 lessons)

ACTIVITIES DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS			Acting from script	Communication games		Discussion	Others	Occurrence	%
				Info-gap	Context-gap				
CL PRINCIPLES	Positive interdependence	Setting the goal	–	1	–	1	–	2	16,7
		Joint reward	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of roles	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of resources	–	1	–	–	–	1	8,3
		The division of task	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Individual accountability	Each group member's evaluation	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		Results used for the whole group	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Face-to-face promoted interaction	Groups (2–4)	–	1	–	1	–	2	16,7
		Verbal feedback	–	1	–	1	–	2	16,7
		Nonverbal feedback	–	1	–	1	–	2	16,7
	Social skills	Skill knowledge	–	1	–	1	–	2	16,7
		From the simplest to the most complex	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Group processing	Group's reflection	–	1	–	–	–	1	8,3

Teacher B (TB, 3 lessons)

ACTIVITIES DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS			Acting from script	Communication games		Discussion	Others (Chinese whisper)	Occurrence	%
				Info-gap	Context-gap				
CL PRINCIPLES	Positive interdependence	Setting the goal	–	–	–	1	1	2	40
		Joint reward	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of roles	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of resources	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of task	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Individual accountability	Each group member's evaluation	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		Results used for the whole group	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Face-to-face promoted interaction	Groups (2–4)	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		Verbal feedback	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		Nonverbal feedback	–	–	–	–	1	1	20
	Social skills	Skill knowledge	–	–	–	1	1	2	40
		From the simplest to the most complex	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Group processing	Group's reflection	–	–	–	–	–	0	0

Teacher C (TC, 3 lessons)

CL PRINCIPLES	ACTIVITIES DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILLS		Acting from script	Communication games		Discussion	Others	Occurrence	%
				Info-gap	Context-gap				
	Positive interdependence	Setting the goal	–	1	–	3	–	4	23,5
		Joint reward	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of roles	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
		The division of resources	–	1	–	–	–	1	5,9
		The division of task	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Individual accountability	Each group member's evaluation	–	–	–	1	–	1	5,9
		Results used for the whole group	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Face-to-face promoted interaction	Groups (2–4)	–	1	–	1	–	2	11,8
		Verbal feedback	–	1	–	1	–	2	11,8
		Nonverbal feedback	–	1	–	1	–	2	11,8
	Social skills	Skill knowledge	–	1	–	3	–	4	23,5
		From the simplest to the most complex	–	–	–	–	–	0	0
	Group processing	Group's reflection	–	–	–	1	–	1	5,9

Appendix 4

Interview with teacher A

The interview was recorded with the teacher's permission for other purposes of the bachelor thesis. After the transcription of the interview, the audio was deleted. The interview took place in the teacher's office. For ethical reasons, the teacher's name is replaced by the term Teacher A (TA). The researcher is shortened by R in the transcription.

<mark style="background:yellow">Knowledge</mark> <mark style="background:lime">Image</mark> <mark style="background:red">Attitude</mark> <mark style="background:cyan">Usage</mark>

R: Do you know cooperative learning?

TA: <mark style="background:yellow">I am not sure whether I know this term</mark>. Probably, it is like learning in groups or pairs when the students cooperate, but this sounds more like traditional group learning. Still, cooperative learning is learning in groups. Am I right?

R: Yes.

TA: <mark style="background:yellow">Yes!</mark> <mark style="background:yellow">Now, I remember cooperative learning is when</mark> <mark style="background:yellow">students learn from each other</mark>. That is what a geography teacher does here. I visited one of his lessons, and I liked it.

R: What do you imagine behind the term cooperative learning?

TA: According to what I saw in that geography class, <mark style="background:lime">it is based on</mark> <mark style="background:lime">learning from peers, sharing knowledge, task division and cooperation among students</mark>. Unfortunately, at the time, I did not know it was called cooperative learning.

R: What is your attitude towards cooperative learning?

TA: Now, I know what this term means; I can connect the term with the activities happening in the classroom, so <mark style="background:red">I like cooperative learning very much, so my attitude is positive</mark>. After observing the geography lesson, I started thinking about incorporating cooperative learning into my lessons. I already have an idea about history lessons, but I still cannot imagine it in language lessons, mainly because of the thematic teaching plans.

R: Do you think you use cooperative learning principles in your lessons?

TA: <mark style="background:cyan">I would not say so</mark>. <mark style="background:cyan">I do not even know the principles, so I cannot use them</mark>. As I already said, <mark style="background:cyan">I instead use traditional group learning</mark>.

Interview with teacher B

The interview was recorded with the teacher's permission for other purposes of the bachelor thesis. After the transcription of the interview, the audio was deleted. The interview took place in the teacher's office. For ethical reasons, the teacher's name is replaced by the term Teacher B (TB). The researcher is shortened by R in the transcription.

==Knowledge== ==Image== ==Attitude== ==Usage==

R: Do you know cooperative learning?
TB: Cooperative learning is when students cooperate in class. Yes, I have heard this term.

R: What do you imagine behind the term cooperative learning?
TB: Like when students work together in pairs or groups on a given topic.

R: What is your attitude towards cooperative learning?
TB: Positive since I use this learning when the students work in pairs or groups, usually in games. Of course, it is not the whole lesson, but one-third of the lesson is devoted to it.

R: Do you think you use cooperative learning principles in your lessons?
TB: For sure, I have an English game based on it, so sometimes I use it in the lessons to engage the students more.

Interview with the teacher C

The interview was recorded with the teacher's permission for other purposes of the bachelor thesis. After the transcription of the interview, the audio was deleted. The interview took place in the teacher's office. For ethical reasons, the teacher's name is replaced by the term Teacher C (TC). The researcher is shortened by R in the transcription.

Knowledge Image Attitude Usage

R: Do you know cooperative learning?
TC: Yes, I have already heard this term.

R: What do you imagine behind the term cooperative learning?
TC: What do I imagine? As the term suggests, it is all, above all, the cooperation of students.

R: What is your attitude towards cooperative learning?
TC: My attitude is positive. Overall, my attitude to cooperation in general, not only among students but also among teachers. Our small teaching staff only confirms this. Nevertheless, cooperation is essential in English lessons for improving language, speaking, grammar, and listening, in fact, in all spheres outside the school too.

R: Do you think you use cooperative learning principles in your lessons?
TC: Well, yes, but it depends on the lesson. I cannot remember them namely, but these principles ensure that even weaker students can experience success since all of them must cooperate. It motivates them. When one share success, then it encourages the rest. I also emphasise positive motivation and positive evaluation in general.