Student Perception of the Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning

Moe Thuzar Kyaw[1]

Abstract

The paper analyzed student perception of the effectiveness of collaborative learning. The purpose of the paper was to investigate second year students' perceptions of collaborative learning in Sagaing University of Education. Thirty eight percent of second year students who involved in collaborative learning were selected as the participants of this study by using purposive sampling method. In this study, a questionnaire for students was used to collect require data and demographic information of these students. In addition, a set of open-ended question was used to know students' opinions and recommendation for their learning. This study used a descriptive research method. Questionnaire responses indicated that students got a number of advantages in the collaborative learning. Firstly, they promoted social skills by interacting in small groups. Secondly, they got learning benefits because collaborative learning approach would help their deeper understanding. Thirdly, we hoped that they would develop communication skill and interpersonal skill for their future careers.

Key words: collaborative learning, active learning, small group learning.

Introduction

The picture of traditional classroom can be seen orderly and most students look like very hard-working. This is not real situation. In really, the students want to make sure that they understand what is being taught through their teacher's presentation. Commonly in Myanmar, after presentation, the teacher asks the whole class like "Do you understand? and students say "yes". In this situation, all students cannot reach to their learning goals. Slow learner students, shy students may leave from the lesson. Moreover, they lost their confidence and go away from the class. Therefore, the teachers need to create a collaborative learning environment where all students can engage actively.

At Sagaing University of Education, the teachers moved towards collaborative learning technique in second year students. This technique involves the following;

- divide the class into ten groups (Each group includes eight members)
- give two weeks to gather information about their topic
- discuss their findings within group and write a paper
- present their paper to the entire class (Every member must prepare to present as a presenter)

During presentation time, the teacher moved between groups by listening to the presentation, acting to promote discussion and clarify points. Teacher facilitated discussion but did not lead it or take it over.

After presentation, most students said that this learning is a more intense and meaningful experience for them. One of the ideas behind this learning is to explore student perceptions of a collaborative learning method.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of second year students' based on collaborative learning at Sagaing University of Education.

The specific objectives of the research are as follows;

(1) To study the perceptions of second year students base on collaborative learning at Sagaing University of Education;

(2) To compare the perceptions of second year students on collaborative learning according to their gender, and

(3) To compare the perceptions of second year students on collaborative learning according to their specialization.

[1]Lecturer, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education

Research Questions

The research questions for the study were as follows:

1. Is there any particular perception of students on their collaborative learning at Sagaing University of Education?
2. Is there any significant difference in the perceptions of second year students on their collaborative learning in terms of gender?
3. Is there any significant difference in the perceptions of second year students on their collaborative learning in terms of specialization?

Definitions of Key Terms

Collaborative Learning

Collaborative learning (CL) is an umbrella term for a variety of educational approaches involving joint intellectual effort by students, or students and teachers together. Usually students are working in groups of two or more, mutually searching for understanding, solutions, or meanings, or creating a product. CL activities vary widely, but most centre on student's exploration or application of the course material, not simply the teacher's presentation or explication of it (Smith & MacGregor, 1992).

Active learning

To learn new information, ideas or skills, our students have to work actively with them in purposeful ways. They need to integrate this new material with what they already know-or use it to reorganize what they thought they knew (Smith & MacGregor, 1992).

Small Group Learning

The shared learning gives learners an opportunity to engage in discussion, take responsibility for their own learning, and thus become critical thinkers (Totten, 1991, cited in Laal & Laal, 2012).

Review of Related Literature

Definition of Collaborative Learning

There are many definitions of collaborative learning (CL). Among them, some experts presented as follows;

- ***Collaborative teaching and learning*** is a teaching approach that involves groups of students working to solve a problem, complete a task or create a product. (MacGregor, 1990, cited in Laal, & Laal, 2012).
- ***CL*** is an umbrella term for a variety of educational approaches involving joint intellectual effort by students, or students and teachers together. Usually students are working in groups of two or more, mutually searching for understanding, solutions, or meanings, or creating a product. CL activities vary widely, but most center on student's exploration or application of the course material, not simply the teacher's presentation or explication of it (Smith, & MacGregor, 1992, cited in Laal, & Laal, 2012).
- ***CL*** is based on the idea that learning is a naturally social act in which participants talk among themselves. It is through the talk that learning occurs (Gerlach, 1994, cited in Laal, & Laal, 2012).
- ***CL*** has as its main feature a structure that allows for student talk, in which students are supposed to talk with each other, and it is in this talking that much of learning occurs (Golub, et al., 1988, cited in Laal, & Laal, 2012).
- ***CL*** is a situation in which two or more people learn or attempt to learn something together. Two or more may be interpreted as a pair, a small group (3-5 subjects) or a class (20-30 subjects). Learn something may be interpreted as follow a course; perform learning activities such as problem solving. Together may be interpreted as

different forms of interaction which may be face-to-face or computer mediated (Dillenbourg, 1999, cited in Laal, & Laal, 2012).

Collaborative Versus Cooperative Learning

Collaboration is a philosophy of interaction and personal lifestyle whereas cooperation a structure of interaction is designed to facilitate the accomplishment of an end product or goal. Collaborative learning (CL) is a personal philosophy, not just a classroom technique. In all situations where people come together in groups, it suggests a way of dealing with people which respects and highlights individual group members' abilities and contributions. There is a sharing of authority and acceptance of responsibility among group members for the group actions. The underlying premise of collaborative learning is based upon consensus building through cooperation by group members, in contrast to competition in which individuals best other group members. CL practitioners apply this philosophy in the classroom, at committee meetings, with community groups, within their families and generally as a way of living with and dealing with other people.

Cooperative learning is defined by a set of processes which help people interact together in order to accomplish a specific goal or develop an end product which is usually content specific. It is more directive than a collaborative system of governance and closely controlled by the teacher. While there are many mechanisms for group analysis and introspection the fundamental approach is teacher centered whereas collaborative learning is more student centered (Panitz, 1996).

Rocky Rockwood (1995, cited in Panitz, 1996) describes the differences by acknowledging the parallels they both have in that they both use groups, both assign specific tasks, and both have the groups share and compare their procedures and conclusions in plenary class sessions. The major difference lies in the fact that cooperative deals exclusively with traditional (canonical) knowledge while collaborative ties into the social constructivist movement, asserting that both knowledge and authority of knowledge have changed dramatically in the last century. "The result has been a transition from "foundational (cognitive) understanding of knowledge", to a non-foundational ground where "we understand knowledge to be a social construct and learning a social process" (Brufee, 1993, cited in Panitz, 1996).

Background History

Much of the research on collaborative and cooperative learning is rooted in the work of Piaget and Vygotsky (Dillenbourg et al., 1996, cited in Emily 2011). For example, socio-constructivists borrow Piaget's system of developmental stages describing children's cognitive progress, as well as ideas related to cognitive conflict, which refers to the sense of dissonance experienced when one becomes aware of a discrepancy between one's existing cognitive framework and new information or experiences. According to the socio-constructivist approach, cognitive conflict is critical in triggering growth. Social interactions help to facilitate such conflict to the extent that students interact with peers at more advanced developmental levels. Within this school of thought, group heterogeneity is an important consideration, as group mates are expected to possess different knowledge, different knowledge representation schemes, and different reasoning mechanisms. For example, research in the Piagetian tradition suggests that when conservers (i.e., children who realize that pouring a glass of water into another glass that is differently-sized and differently-shaped does not change the quantity of water) are paired with non-conservers on a conservation task, non-conserving members are highly likely to reach conservation as a result of interaction, whereas the regression of conserving members is rare. Dillenbourg et al. (1996, cited in Emily 2011) point out that this approach is probably too mechanistic, that disagreement and conflict in and of themselves are not as important as the communication they engender.

Vygotsky's work placed more emphasis on the value of social interaction itself for causing individual cognitive change, as opposed to being merely stimulated by it. In this formulation, social interaction is internalized, which causes conceptual changes as participants' appropriate new understandings. Like Piaget, Vygotsky emphasized the importance of heterogeneous groupings of collaborators. According to Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development is the distance between what a student can accomplish individually and what he/she can accomplish with the help of a more capable "other." Whereas Piagetian studies typically pair children from different developmental stages to facilitate cognitive conflict, studies in the Vygotskian tradition frequently pair children with adults. Rather than focusing on cognitive conflict as a trigger for conceptual change, socio-culturalists view collaborative learning as learning that occurs within the zone of proximal development (Emily, 2011).

More recently, the shared or situated cognition approach—informed by researchers in sociology, anthropology, and even computer science—emphasizes the social structures in which interactions occur (Dillenbourg et al., 1996, cited in Emily 2011). This approach sees the environment as an integral part of cognitive activities associated with collaboration. Accordingly, attempts to investigate collaboration that ignore social structures are likely to be biased. Under this view, knowledge is not something that is handed down from one partner to another. Rather, knowledge is co-constructed through interactions among collaborators. This approach emphasizes that the whole of group behavior is more than the sum of its individual parts. In other words, group interactions evolve in ways that are not necessarily predictable based on the inputs of group members. This latter insight suggests that viewing the group rather than individual group members as the unit of analysis could produce qualitatively different conclusions about collaboration (Dillenbourg et al., 1996, cited in Emily 2011). Since the late 1990s, a new strand of research on collaborative learning focusing on new technologies for mediating, observing, and recording interactions during collaboration has emerged (Kreijns et al., 2003, cited in Emily 2011).

Qualities of Collaborative Learning

As Dillenbourg (1999, cited in Emily, 2011) notes, there are several qualities that characterize truly collaborative interactions. First, collaboration is characterized by a relatively symmetrical structure, however that symmetry is accomplished. For example, in situations with symmetry of action, each participant has access to the same range of actions. This contrasts with the typical division of labor in cooperative learning structures; partners split up the work, solve sub-tasks individually, and then put their respective contributions together. Symmetry of knowledge occurs when all participants have roughly the same level of knowledge, although they may have difference perspectives. Symmetry of status involves collaboration among peers rather than interactions involving supervisor/subordinate relationships. Finally, symmetry of goals involves common group goals rather than individual goals that may conflict.

Another marker of true collaboration is the quality of interactions, especially the degree of interactivity and negotiability. Interactivity refers to the extent to which interactions influence participants' thinking. Negotiability refers to the extent to which no single group member can impose his view unilaterally on all others, but rather all group members must work toward common understanding. He points out that trivial, obvious, and unambiguous tasks provide few opportunities to observe negotiation because there is nothing about which to disagree. Moreover, misunderstandings may actually be important from a learning standpoint; they force participants to construct explanations, give reasons, and justify their positions.

General Approaches to Teaching Collaboration

Few studies investigate whether students can be successfully trained to collaborate. As Bossert (1988, cited in Emily 2011) observed that specific training in cooperative roles is not offered in most studies of cooperative learning methods: The activity itself constitutes the training. However, many researchers recommend providing explicit instruction in collaboration skills (Fall et al., Webb, 1995, cited in Emily 2011). For example, educators are urged to devote explicit instruction to developing collaboration skills. Such training could include instruction in effective communication, how to seek help, and how to provide help to others (Fall et al., 1997, cited in Emily 2011). Similarly, Webb (1991& 1995, cited in Emily 2011) recommends training students in general interpersonal and teamwork skills, including coordination, communication, conflict resolution, decision making, problem solving, and negotiation. Such training could emphasize how to give explanations, how to directly and explicitly ask for help, and how to respond appropriately to others' requests for help. Teachers should also provide ample opportunities for students to practice collaboration skills, using tasks that are similar to those used during group-based assessments. Teachers should encourage students to actively participate during group work (Fall et al., 1997, cited in Emily 2011). Teachers should also emphasize that multiple skills are necessary to complete group tasks and each person in the group is going to be skilled in at least one area (Webb, 1995, cited in Emily 2011).

In addition to preparing students for collaboration by providing explicit instruction, teachers should also structure tasks to support collaboration (Bossert, 1988; Dillenbourg, 1999; Mercer, 1996; Webb, 1995, cited in Emily 2011). For example, teachers can embed specific roles within tasks (Dillenbourg, 1999; Webb, 1995, cited in Emily 2011). These roles can be based on knowledge complementarities or on conflicting viewpoints. Dillenbourg points out; however, that decomposition of the task into independent sub-tasks reduces the level of collaboration required. Thus, individual student roles should define horizontal rather than vertical division of labor. For example, one student may assume responsibility for the task level, whereas the other group member oversees meta-task aspects (e.g., planning). Webb (1995, cited in Emily 2011) describes roles such as learning leader, responsible for summarizing and recounting the main points of the material, and learning listener, responsible for detecting errors or omissions in the summary and asking questions to clarify the material.

Teachers can also specify rules for interaction, requiring, for example, that every group-member ask at least one question (Dillenbourg, 1999, cited in Emily 2011). Mercer (1996, cited in Emily 2011) argues that when teachers establish ground rules for collaboration, student motivation and performance improve. Such ground rules can include sharing all relevant information and suggestions, providing reasons to back up assertions and suggestions, asking for reasons where appropriate, agreeing about what action to take, and accepting that the group rather than the individual is ultimately responsible for decisions and actions. In the Mercer study, when teachers provided such ground rules for guiding interactions, student interactions featured higher-quality discourse in comparison to classrooms without such rules. In particular, students were more likely to engage critically and constructively with one another, making their reasoning and justifications visible for others to evaluate.

Teachers should also monitor and regulate such interactions. For example, Fall et al. (1997, cited in Emily 2011) found that when teachers actively circulate among groups and encourage students to share their ideas, students are more engaged and discussion is more fruitful. In addition, Tudge's study demonstrates the importance of providing groups with feedback to confirm or disconfirm the group's direction (1992). In the absence of tools for monitoring interactions at different times and places (e.g., an automated computer interface)

teachers are encouraged to provide group members with tools to monitor and evaluate their own interactions, a topic that will be explored more fully in the section on assessing collaboration (Dillenbourg, 1999, cited in Emily 2011).

Paper Seminar

In this study, Barkley et al (1990)'s collaborative learning technique 30 (paper seminar) was used. Every student of each group may be chosen as a presenter in class. Therefore, every student must have a chance to take part in multiple roles such as presenter, respondent, group member etc. Second year classes were divided into ten groups and each group included eight members. Paper seminar provided a framework for groups to engage in deep discussion, exchanging and probing ideas that students have brought from their paper. It also gives individual students focused attention and feedback on their work.

For preparation, every group was assigned to find information for their topics. Every group had adequate time to prepare for and conduct the seminar. This activity needed to divide ten sessions over several days because each paper took approximately 40 minutes (presentation time for 20 minutes and question and discussion time for 20 minutes). For a group of four that means 160 minutes. It is best to have one or two papers per class session. Before presentation, they needed to write their papers and distribute copies to group members and discuss it within groups. On the day of paper seminar, the presenter was randomly selected. In the question and discussion session, all members of presenting group could respond to the questions. In this activity, the teacher explained the procedure clearly.

Methodology

In this study, a quantitative method was used to collect the information about collaborative learning of second year students at Sagaing University of Education. A questionnaire survey method and a descriptive research design were used. Descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer questions concerning the current status of the subjects of the study.

Subjects

This study intended to present students' perceptions on their collaborative learning at Sagaing University of Education. Thirty eight percent of second year students who involved in collaborative learning were selected as the participants of this study by using purposive sampling method. The second year students were mainly considered as the sample of the research. A total of (160) student was selected. The entire population is (420) second year students in Sagaing University of Education.

Instrument

In this study, a questionnaire for the perceptions of students on their collaborative learning was constructed on the basis of the questionnaire of Gleeson, McDonald and Williams (2004). The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part of the questionnaire included demographic data which sought to ascertain among second year students such as gender, specialization and age. The second part of the questionnaire included five point Likert-type items for three categories: Social benefits, Developing small group communication skills, and Learning benefits. There are fifteen Likert-type items (strongly disagree to strongly agree) in this instrument including items (1 and 2) for social benefits, (5 and 10) for developing small group communication skills, and (3, 4 ,6-9 and 11-15) for learning benefits.

Procedure

Firstly, the researcher studied the relevant literature concerned with the research. Secondly, in order to get the required data, the researcher constructed an instrument under the guidance of Head of department. The questionnaire was translated into Myanmar by the

researcher. To enhance the suitability of the questionnaire in Myanmar context, at least three educators in Sagaing University of Education agreed all the items to make modifications to translate a draft questionnaire. Next, the questionnaires were returned (100%) from the subjects in the sample University under study. Then, the collected data were statistically analyzed and interpreted. Finally, based on the findings, suggestions and recommendations were made.

Analysis of the Data

To analyze the quantitative data, the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version (23) was used. The data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics, independent samples *t* test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In order to examine the means and standard deviations for students' perceptions towards collaborative learning, descriptive statistics was used. Independent samples *t* test was used to compare the students' perceptions towards collaborative learning in terms of gender.

Findings

Descriptive Statistics of the Perceptions of Students towards Collaborative Learning on Each Dimension

To know the students' perceptions for each dimension, descriptive statistics was used. Table 1 shows the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values of the dimensions.

Table 1 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of the Perceptions of Students towards Collaborative Learning on Each Dimension

No.	Dimension	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Minimum	Maximum
1	Social Benefits	160	4.20	0.512	3	5
2	Developing Small Group Communication Skill	160	4.22	0.560	2	5
3	Learning Benefits	160	4.16	0.453	3	5
	Total	**160**	**4.18**	**0.407**	**3**	**5**

Based on the results of mean values, Table 4.4 is illustrated. It demonstrates the comparison of the mean values of students' perceptions on each dimension of the effectiveness of collaborative learning. According to Table 1, the mean value for first dimension was 4.20, the mean value for second dimension was 4.22 and the mean value for third dimension was 4.16. Among them, it can be found that the mean value for developing small group communication skills was the highest and the mean value for learning benefits was the lowest.

Findings Related to the Perceptions of Students on Collaborative Learning according to their Gender

In order to know the perceptions of students towards collaborative learning in terms of gender, the independent samples *t* test was used. The independent samples *t* test was performed in order to determine whether there was a significant difference in terms of gender among the perceptions of students towards collaborative learning. The results of *t* test are given in Table 2.

Table 2 Independent Sample *t* Test for the Perceptions of Students towards Collaborative Learning according to Gender

No.	Dimension	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
1	D1	Male	80	4.19	.524	-0.308	158	.758
		Female	80	4.21	.502			
2	D2	Male	80	4.18	.612	-0.917	158	.361
		Female	80	4.26	.503			
3	D3	Male	80	4.08	.485	-2.484	158	.014*
		Female	80	4.25	.402			
	Overall	Male	80	4.10	.438	-2.240	158	.026*
		Female	80	4.25	.363			

Note: *p < 0.05

D1= Social Benefits

D2= Developing Small Group Communication Skills

D3= Learning Benefits

When Table 2 was examined, it can be seen that the perceptions of students towards collaborative learning demonstrated a significant difference in terms of gender. The mean values of female students were more than that of male students in all dimensions. Overall finding integrated that there was a significant difference in terms of gender as a variable (t=-2.24, df =158, p<0.05). In order to see at glance, the comparison of mean values for perceptions of students on collaborative learning in terms of gender was presented by graph for each dimension. It was found that the mean values of female students were higher than that of male students. This finding showed that female students had more positive point of view on collaborative learning than male students. Therefore, it can be considered that female can see social benefits and learning benefits rapidly and develop small group communication skills.

Findings Related to the Perceptions of Students on Collaborative Learning according to their Specialization

In order to compare mean and standard deviation on each dimension, the obtained data was analyzed by using descriptive statistics. The subjects were divided into three specializations such as science, Arts and Combined. Table 3 shows the comparison of means and standard deviations on each dimension.

Table 3 Mean and Standard Deviations for Collaborative Learning Perceived by Students on Each Dimension according to their Specialization

Groups	*N*	*M/SD*	Dimension			Overall
			D1	D2	D3	
Science	74	*M*	4.14	4.23	4.12	4.13
		SD	.587	.592	.480	.431
Arts	28	*M*	4.23	4.16	4.19	4.20
		SD	.396	.510	.400	.366
Combined	58	*M*	4.27	4.24	4.21	4.22
		SD	.451	.548	.442	.396

Note: D1= Social Benefits
D2= Developing Small Group Communication Skills
D3= Learning Benefits

According to the comparison of mean values for the perceptions of students on collaborative learning in terms of specialization, the mean values of combined specialization was the highest in all dimensions. Therefore, it can be concluded that students from combined specialization had more positive perceptions towards collaborative learning than that of other specializations.

In order to determine where there is a significant difference between the perceptions of students in terms of specialization, the collected data was analyzed by using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of ANOVA are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 ANOVA Results for all Dimensions on the Perceptions of Students towards Collaborative Learning in terms of their Specialization

Dimension		Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Social Benefits	Between Groups	.603	2	.301	1.154	.318
	Within Groups	40.997	157	.261		
	Total	41.600	159			
Developing Small Group Communication Skill	Between Groups	.131	2	.066	.207	.813
	Within Groups	49.742	157	.317		
	Total	49.873	159			
Learning Benefits	Between Groups	.291	2	.145	.707	.495
	Within Groups	32.294	157	.206		
	Total	32.585	159			
Overall	Between Groups	.244	2	.122	.732	.483
	Within Groups	26.135	157	.166		
	Total	26.379	159			

It was found that there was no significant difference among three specializations on the perceptions of students towards collaborative learning in terms of specialization. This means that they have same perceptions towards collaborative learning among three specializations.

Discussion, Recommendation and Conclusion

Discussion

The present study was conducted to investigate the perceptions of second year students' base on collaborative learning at Sagaing University of Education. In the study, the participants were second year students in Sagaing University of Education. The questionnaire for the students' perceptions on their collaborative learning was constructed on the basis of the questionnaire of Gleeson, McDonald and Williams (2004). It consisted of three dimensions. They are social benefits, developing small group communication skills and learning benefits.

On the basis of research findings, the mean of the perceptions of the students in each dimension indicated that the students had positive perceptions. It was consistent with the finding of Gleeson et al., (2004).

The mean of students' perceptions in small group communication skill was the highest score in all dimensions. Then, the mean of students' perceptions in learning benefits was the

lowest score in all dimensions. Thus, the study indicated that students need to be developed social benefits and learning benefits.

In this study, there was a significant difference in the perceptions of students on their collaborative learning in terms of gender. The means of female students were higher than those of male students in all dimensions. It was found that female students had more positive perceptions than male students. It can be due to the fact that female students had more optimistic attitude and interest in collaborative learning. Moreover, male students had different learning styles. Therefore, they should be encouraged to promote collaborative learning skills.

In addition, the research findings showed that there was no significant difference in the perceptions of students in terms of specialization. It showed that any students who possess any specialization had positive perception on collaborative learning.

According to the findings of the open-ended responses, it can be concluded that most students could understand team spirit, importance of unity, responsibility through collaborative learning. They developed social skills and helped each other's. Therefore , they had confidence to present their findings in front of the class . They recognized other's views and discussed openly. Moreover, they could respond other's questions. However, few had worry about no engaged student in group. Some wanted to get reward for their presentation. Furthermore, most students got more attention to others and self-motivated to study. They favoured that they have more time to discuss and think about lessons. Finally, they proposed that collaborative learning can support exam because they could memorize their lessons easily.

Recommendation

This study was concerned with the students' perceptions towards their collaborative learning. Due to the limitations of time and resources, this research study was conducted with students from Sagaing University of Education. It was a small scale study and did not cover all the students in University of Education. On the basis of this study, some suggestions are made.

- This study will provide a foundation for further research. A longitudinal study is needed to undertake to validate and confirm the findings of the study.
- This research studied second year students from Sagaing University of Education. Thus, it should be expanded to various years in Sagaing University of Education, Yangon University of Education, and University for Development of National Races and other Education Colleges.
- This research study was delimited to only three dimensions. Further researches should be conducted with many other categories of collaborative learning suggested by educationists.
- And this study compared only two variables. Further researches should be carried out by using other variables.

Conclusion

The twenty-first century poses a paradox for higher education. When higher education introduces collaborative learning in their classrooms, a number of research and wisdom grew. There was empirical evidence that small groups of peers learning together have advantages for academic achievements, motivation, and satisfaction. Investigation into the students' perceptions on their collaborative learning was the major purpose of this study. According to the results, the research showed that the most students generally accept the collaborative learning with a clear majority seeing social, learning and skill development advantages.

This research points out that the University of Education to explore the perceptions of students concerning with their learning. This study could supply university teachers to better

understand how they teach by evaluating students' perceptions on their learning. This study will assist teachers to understand students' attitudes toward learning and, to encourage students' participation in learning, to solve students' difficulties, to espouse proper and efficient teaching strategies to achieve a better performance in teaching. It can get the message that students' perspectives of collaborative learning would depend on collaborative learning skills. Therefore, teachers need to create collaborative learning environment for their students in order to get these skills and maximize their learning. Collaborative learning can offer students opportunities to learn valuable interpersonal skill, problem solving skill and critical thinking skill that prepare them for careers.

Acknowledgements

I would to offer my respectful gratitude to Dr. Saw Pyone Naing (Rector), Dr. Myat Myat Thaw (Pro Rector), Dr. Zin Nwe Than (Associate Professor and Head, Department of Educational Theory) and Daw Kyi Kyi Sein (Lecturer and Head, Department of English). Finally, I am intended to express my thanks to all people who supported to complete this study.

References

Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H., (2005). Collaborative learning techniques. (1st ed.). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Barros, E. H., (2011). *Collaborative learning in the translation classroom: Preliminary survey results.* Retrieved March 22, 2018, from http://www.jostrans.org/issue16/art_barros.pdf

Emily R. L., (2011). *Collaboration: A literature review*. Retrieved March 22, 2018, from http://images. pearsonassessments.com/images/tmrs/collaboration-review.pdf

Gettinger, M., & Ball, C. (2007). Best practices in increasing academic engaged time. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 1043- 1075). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists. Retrieved March 14, 2018, from https://www.readinghorizons. com/blog/seven-ways-to-increase-student-engagement-in-the-classroom

Gleeson, A., McDonald, J., & Williams, J., (2004). *Student perception of the effectiveness of collaborative learning tutorials.* Retrieved March 12, 2018, from http://www.flinders.edu.au/sabs/business/ research/papers/07-05.pdf

Laal, M., & Laal, M., (2012). Collaborative learning: What is it? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 31, 491 – 495. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.092

Panitz, T. (1996). *A definition of collaborative vs cooperative learning.* Retrieved March 22, 2018, from http://colcct.colfinder.org/sites/default/files/a_definition_of_collaborative_vs_cooperative_learning.pdf

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. T., (1992). *What is collaborative learning?* Retrieved March 30, 2018, from http://healthystartacademy.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/09/WhatisCollaborativeLearning.pdf