

Cooperative Learning as an Innovative Method in Teaching English

Kenjayev Azizbek

Master's degree student of NamSU

Email: Rado-1991@inbox.ru

Sharipova Sabokhat

Senior teacher of NamSU

Email: Aladin2091@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

In this article was given some data about helpful learning as an imaginative strategy in instructing jargon. Having experience and creating ability with this kind of acquiring regularly works with casual and base learning. Agreeable learning is an instructive methodology, which expects to sort out study hall exercises into scholarly and social learning encounters.

Key words: effective helpful learning, generally efficiency, popularity based society, bunch, Base gathering learning, Jigsaw exercises, learning methodology, individual accomplishment

Helpful learning is an instructive methodology, which plans to coordinate homeroom exercises into scholarly and social learning encounters. There is significantly more too agreeable learning than just masterminding understudies into gatherings, and it has been depicted as "organizing positive reliance" Students should work in gatherings to finish assignments on the whole toward scholastic objectives. In contrast to singular realizing, which can be cutthroat in nature, understudies adapting agreeably can benefit from each other's assets and abilities (asking each other for data, assessing each other's thoughts, observing each other's work, and so on) Besides, the educator's job changes from offering data to working with understudies' learning.

Everybody succeeds when the gathering succeeds. Ross and Smyth portray effective helpful learning undertakings as mentally requesting, innovative, open-finished, and include higher request thinking errands.¹

Five essential elements are identified for the successful incorporation of cooperative learning in the classroom:

- positive interdependence
- individual and group accountability
- promotive interaction (face to face)
- teaching the students the required interpersonal and small group skills
- group processing.

As per Johnson and Johnson's meta-investigation, understudies in helpful learning settings contrasted with those in individualistic or cutthroat learning settings, accomplish more, reason better, acquire higher confidence, similar to cohorts and the learning undertakings more and have more seen social help.

Preceding World War II, social scholars, for example, Allport, Watson, Shaw, and Mead started building up agreeable learning hypothesis subsequent to finding that gathering work was

1. ¹ Ross, J., & Smythe, E. (1995). Differentiating cooperative learning to meet the needs of gifted learners: A case for transformational leadership. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 19, 63-82.

more successful and proficient in amount, quality, and generally efficiency when contrasted with working alone. Nonetheless, it wasn't until 1937 when specialists May and Doob found that individuals who participate and cooperate to accomplish shared objectives, were more fruitful in achieving results, than the individuals who strived autonomously to finish similar objectives. Moreover, they tracked down that autonomous achievers had a more prominent probability of showing cutthroat practices.

Savants and analysts during the 1930s and 1940s, for example, John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Morton Deutsch likewise affected the agreeable learning hypothesis rehearsed today. Dewey trusted it was significant that understudies create information and social abilities that could be utilized outside of the homeroom, and in a popularity based society. This hypothesis depicted understudies as dynamic beneficiaries of information by examining data and answers in gatherings, participating in the learning cycle together as opposed to being uninvolved recipients of data (e.g., instructor talking, understudies tuning in). Lewin's commitments to helpful learning depended on building up connections between bunch individuals to effectively complete and accomplish the learning objective. Deutsch's commitment to agreeable learning was positive social association, the possibility that the understudy is answerable for adding to bunch information.

From that point forward, David and Roger Johnson have been effectively adding to the helpful learning hypothesis. In 1975, they recognized that agreeable learning advanced shared enjoying, better correspondence, high acknowledgment and backing, just as shown an increment in an assortment of speculation systems among people in the gathering. Understudies who demonstrated to be cutthroat needed their

cooperation and trust with others, just as in their enthusiastic contribution with different understudies.

Formal agreeable learning is organized, worked with, and observed by the teacher over the long run and is utilized to accomplish bunch objectives in task work (for example finishing a unit). Any course material or task can be adjusted to this kind of learning, and gatherings can shift from 2-6 individuals with conversations enduring from a couple of moments up to a whole period. Sorts of formal agreeable learning methodologies include:

1. The jigsaw technique
2. Assignments that involve group problem-solving and decision making
3. Laboratory or experiment assignments
4. Peer review work (e.g. editing writing assignments).

Having experience and creating abilities with this sort of acquiring regularly works with casual and base learning. Jigsaw exercises are brilliant in light of the fact that the understudy expects the part of the instructor on a given point and is responsible for showing the theme to a cohort. The thought is that if understudies can show something, they have effectively taken in the material.

Casual helpful learning fuses bunch learning with inactive instructing by causing to notice material through little gatherings all through the exercise or by conversation toward the finish of an exercise and commonly includes gatherings of two (for example go to-your-accomplice conversations). These gatherings are frequently transitory and can change from one exercise to another (particularly not at all like conventional realizing where 2 understudies might be lab

accomplices all through the whole semester adding to each other's information on science)

Discussions typically have four components that include formulating a response to questions asked by the educator, sharing responses to the questions asked with a partner, listening to a partner's responses to the same question, and creating a new well-developed answer. This type of learning enables the student to process, consolidate, and retain more information.

In bunch based helpful learning, these friend assembles accumulate over the long haul (for example throughout a year, or quite a while, for example, in secondary school or post-auxiliary examinations) to create and add to each other's information authority on a point by consistently talking about material, empowering each other, and supporting the scholarly and individual accomplishment of gathering individuals.

Base gathering learning (e.g., a drawn out examination bunch) is successful for learning complex topic over the course or semester and builds up mindful, strong companion connections, which thusly inspires and fortifies the understudy's obligation to the gathering's schooling while at the same time expanding confidence and self-esteem. The base gathering approaches additionally make the understudies responsible for teaching their companion bunch if a part was missing for an exercise. This is compelling for both individual learning, just as friendly help.

Johnson placed five factors that intervene the adequacy of collaboration. Earthy colored and Ciuffetelli Parker (2009) and Siltala (2010) examine the fundamental and fundamental components to agreeable learning:

- Positive association
- Students should completely partake and invest energy inside their gathering
- Each bunch part has an assignment/job/obligation hence should accept

that they are liable for their learning and that of their gathering

- Face-to-confront advances collaboration
- Members advance each other's prosperity

Understudies disclose to each other what they have or are learning and help each other with understanding and finishing of tasks

- Individual and gathering responsibility
- Each understudy should show dominance of the substance being considered

- Each understudy is responsible for their learning and work, in this manner taking out "social loafing"

- Social abilities that should be educated all together for fruitful helpful figuring out how to happen

- Skills incorporate compelling correspondence, relational and bunch abilities

- Leadership
- Decision-production
- Trust-building
- Friendship-improvement
- Communication
- Conflict-the executives abilities
- Group preparing

Gathering preparing happens when bunch individuals (a) ponder which part's activities were useful and (b) settle on a choice about which activities to proceed or change.

The motivation behind bunch preparing is to explain and improve the adequacy with which individuals do the cycles important to accomplish the gathering's objectives.

All together for understudy accomplishment to improve extensively, two attributes should be available:

When planning agreeable learning errands and prize constructions, singular duty and responsibility should be recognized. People should know precisely what their obligations are and that

they are responsible to the gathering to arrive at their objectives.

All gathering individuals should be engaged with request for the gathering to finish the assignment. With the goal for this to happen every part should have an errand that they are answerable for which can't be finished by some other gathering part.

References :

1. Augustine, D.K., Gruber, K. D., & Hanson, L. R. (1989-1990). Cooperation works! Educational Leadership, 47, 4-7.
2. Brown, H., & Ciuffetelli, D.C. (Eds.). (2009). Foundational methods: Understanding teaching and learning. Toronto: Pearson Education.
3. Chiu, M. M. (2008). Flowing toward correct contributions during groups' mathematics problem solving a statistical discourse analysis. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 17 (3), 415 - 463.
4. Deutsch, Morton (1949). "A theory of cooperation and competition". Human Relations. 2: 129–152.
5. Johnson, D.W. (2009). "An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning". Educational Researcher. 38 (5): 365–379. Doi:10.3102/0013189x09339057.
6. Johnson, David (1978). "Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning". Journal of Research and Development in Education. 12: 3–15.

RESEARCH
PARKS