

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL



Volume 1 Number 4
January - December 1999



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

*Department of Educational Foundations,
Leadership, and Technology*

Department of Educational Foundations,
Leadership, and Technology
College of Education
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36849
334.844.4460

J. R. Llanes, Auburn University

What Do Students Learn in Groups? Assessment of Quality in Higher Education

[Liesel Hermes](#) *University of Koblenz, Germany*

All rights are reserved by copyright.

Authors retain intellectual property rights to their articles and may re-publish their articles in other publications. The Continuous Improvement Monitor may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-profit use for the purposes of education, research, library reference, or stored or distributed as a public service by any networked computer. Any commercial use of this journal in whole or in part by any means is strictly prohibited without written permission. Any use of this journal in whole or in part, including by authors, should include customary bibliographic citation, including author attribution, date, article title, edition, and electronic retrieval instructions.

In APA style cite article as: Hermes, Leisel. (2000). What do students learn in groups? Assessment of quality in higher education. *International Journal: Continuous Improvement Monitor*, 1, 4. December 1999. Edinburg, TX, The University of Texas-Pan American. Available on the web:

<http://llanes.auburn.edu/cimjournal/Vol1/No4/hermes.pdf>

Introduction

In this paper I will take up thoughts I developed in a presentation at the 10th AQHE conference in Penang in 1998. My concern is student interaction in university seminars and how it can be improved. Last year I looked into subjective theories of the students and their teachers and the effects these have on teacher-student and student-student interaction in seminars. Together with the students I developed ways and means to improve the students' active participation in class. The important point was that any improvement in teaching and in conditions of learning can only be achieved in a joint venture. The students learned to become more self-determined, to assume responsibility for class discussions, and the teacher learnt to yield "power" to the students, to give up her domination of class management, developments which greatly improved the work and also the social atmosphere ([Hermes, 1999](#)).

Whereas last year I concentrated on students' interaction in plenary discussions after stages of group work, I have now turned my research interest to what is actually going on in the students' group work before the plenary phase. My point of departure was very fruitful discussions in an Interest Group "assessment of learning", in which it was agreed that far too little is known about what students actually learn in class.

I therefore propose to look briefly into theories of group work, into learner autonomy and then turn to my own group of students and the project I did with them in the winter semester 1998/99 at the University of Koblenz, Germany.

Group Work

Theories of group work and group dynamics abound, although an overall consistent theory of group work does not exist ([Gohla, 1977, p. 21](#)), and I will therefore restrict myself to

those aspects which relate to the pedagogical field, namely learning groups in school or at university. If one differentiates between formal and informal groups, a class of students is a formal group, which is characterised e.g. by a sort of membership for one semester. If within this class of students spontaneous group work is done, the students will work in informal groups, which only form for one session working on a specific task. Afterwards they will return to the formal group of the whole class (H. Meyer, 1990, p. 238 ff.; Gohla, 1977, p. 31). If one follows a suggestion that there are four kinds of group work, namely for information, training, discussion and problem solving (Dahmer, 1993, p. 76 f.), I will only concentrate on the discussion group.

In pedagogy the term "group work" was first used at the end of the 19th century, although the idea of student cooperation goes back to the Middle Ages (E. Meyer, 1983, p. 35). It developed with the idea of a more democratic framework of learning in the 60s and 70s of this century, which was meant to lead to students' self-determination and — in the long run — to learner autonomy. The 80s did not yield any substantial new impulses (H. Meyer, 1990, p. 241), while the buzz word of the 90s seems to be "learner autonomy" (Pemberton, 1996, p.2).

Whereas in a lockstep lesson "all the learners and the teacher interact together", march in step "at the same tempo" and deal with the same teaching and learning material (Allwright/Bailey, 1991, p. 147), group work splits up this lockstep procedure. The class divides into smaller units which for a fixed amount of time either deal all with the same task or work on different tasks. They then convene in the plenary again to discuss the findings of their work. This procedure sounds very simple, but is in fact highly complicated and requires careful preparation and monitoring on the side of the teacher. Since I am concerned with adult learners, I will concentrate on aspects that seem to me to be characteristic for those.

Students often experience isolation and alienation in their university lives. They learn that one has to fend for oneself and compete with other students for grades (Gohla, 1977, p. 12). They are used to teacher-centered frontal teaching, in which their role is reduced to taking notes. Their learning is other-determined. The initiative to let the students work in groups at all therefore rests with the teacher, and he/she has to assume responsibility not only for the overall organization, but for motivating the students through the setting of tasks that really lend themselves to group work.

Groups can be formed arbitrarily on the basis of the accidental seating arrangement. This seems to me to be the worst possible case, since the students are then forced to work in an accidental social framework they may not actually favour, which has consequences for the quality of their work. Group formation can also be carefully planned and calculated, e.g. on the basis mutual knowledge of each other, which has the advantage that the group members can skip the stage of getting to know each other. Spontaneous group formation can also occur on the basis of special interests. Once the tasks are set, groups form spontaneously according to what specific task they would like to work on.

Of equal importance is group dynamics. Groups of even numbers may be of disadvantage, because they can form subgroups (Gutte, 1976, p. 67), whereas groups of uneven numbers cannot subdivide so easily. It is uniformly agreed in theories of group work that each member in a group assumes a certain role (Gohla, 1977, p. 93). The larger the group, the easier it seems to be for the group members to play their specific roles. It seems rather difficult in a small group of three, but it is also possible here for someone to assume leadership. Leadership suggests a hierarchy which often evolves even in small groups. One person becomes the leader, challenged or unchallenged, usually the latter. This person

normally has the longest speaking time, gets the other persons' attention including eye-contact, takes the initiative, comes up with ideas, steers the discussion, after a digression leads the others back to work and often structures the whole process. The others follow suit, possibly unaware of the fact that they are re-enacting the well-known procedure of more or less frontal teaching. They fall back into the role of obedient followers or pupils. Other roles may be those of supporters, the clown or the quiet ones who just sit back and relax. (All this can be clearly shown in the videos that were made.) This scenario can only be partly prevented even if the teacher makes the whole group responsible for reporting back to the plenary.

Assuming that group dynamics work satisfactorily, group work has a number of functions to fulfill. Most important, it gives the students a kind of protection they usually do not experience in a large seminar, i.e. they experience a learning arrangement where their own contributions are not evaluated by 30 or 40 others, but by just three or four. In other words, communication is more intensive and made easier especially for the introverted ones (Allwright/Bailey, 1991, p. 148). In small groups, shy students can overcome their fear of contributing at all: it is a lot easier than in a large class to make very personal comments, to utter feelings, to be emotional. Thus group work has important psychological functions especially for the otherwise quiet students.

Group work creates a social framework in which interaction occurs very directly. Students exchange information, come up with different ideas and perspectives, ask questions, discuss and experience immediate response and feedback from the others. Thus group work means social learning. In groups, students have to find their own objectives, or if the tasks have been set, their own ways of reaching the objectives. They have to negotiate the significance of their tasks as well as methods to choose. This entails a high degree of self-determination (H. Meyer, 1990, p. 245). They also experience themselves in new roles, which have to do with the functions mentioned above (H. Meyer, 1990, p. 249). In learning to reflect on their own and the others' roles, group work can make a significant contribution to personality development. It can help a student mature intellectually as well as socially (Dahmer, 1993, p. 73).

The objectives of group work therefore address students' communicative and social abilities as well as their intellectual and personality development. Experiential learning in groups enables the students to understand the basic principles of group work from a different perspective, that of a pupil. Whereas the plenary mode means

- * a large group of students,
- * lack of protection for the shy ones,
- * implicit support for the extroverted ones, who create their own public,
- * lack of addressing specific needs and/or interests,
- * little flexibility,
- * little student initiative,
- * little student responsibility,
- * teacher-centeredness and teacher guidance,
- * lockstep procedure for everyone,
- * group work means a breaking-up of all these characteristics in favour of protection for the shy ones,
- * support for each member, if group dynamics work,
- * student initiative,
- * individualized procedure,

- * negotiating of meaning and working methods,
- * responsibility,
- * experiential learning for future teachers,
- * self-determination.

Group work offers a much more communicative framework than any plenary. It is a highly dynamic process with a lot of interaction and turn-taking. This involves careful listening to what is being said, reacting immediately, arguing, pleading, contradicting, opposing, convincing, persuading, agreeing, confirming, supporting, giving feedback, in other words, participating communicatively. Refusing to cooperate or dropping out is a lot more difficult than in any plenary, and will be noticed at once by the others and experienced as uncooperative. In other words, the communicative situation forces the members of the group to be cooperative.

The social framework of group work means cooperation and responsibility. Finding one's own aims, negotiating one's working methods and carrying out a discussion that is based on mutual respect of each other's contributions will result in growing self-determination. If the group members see their work as a self-determined joint effort, the outcome will consequently be seen as their joint achievement. This can very often result in a feeling of group solidarity, of corporate identity, a sense of team spirit or community spirit. It may lead to more self-assurance on the part of the otherwise silent students. At the same time, reflecting on these processes as future teachers fosters students' awareness of social learning. Ultimately, group work paves the way to learner autonomy.

For the sake of objectivity, some possible objections should be mentioned. The learning process in group work is more time consuming than in a lockstep class. However, who knows what students take home from a plenary and what, by the same token, they take home from a group work session? Group work is bound to fail if there is a general lack of energy or commitment or if the teacher does not supervise the students. It may fail, too, if group dynamics intimidate one member or a leader takes over immediately and entirely controls the whole process, or if a group splits into subgroups that disengage themselves from the activities agreed upon or refuse to cooperate. Lastly, group work may fail if the members of the group are incompatible or refuse to work in a group at all.

Learner Autonomy

The most comprehensive definition of learner autonomy was provided by Holec, who described autonomy as the "ability to take charge of one's own learning" and elaborated on the decisions concerning

"all aspects of this learning, i.e.:

- determining the objectives;
 - defining the contents and progressions;
 - selecting methods and techniques to be used;
 - monitoring the procedure of acquisition properly speaking (rhythm, time, place, etc.);
 - evaluating what has been acquired."
- (Holec as in Nunan_[Benson/Voller], 1997, p. 193)

The comprehensiveness of this concept seems to me somewhat dangerous. In my experience it is an illusion to assume that even mature adult students would be able to

reach such a degree of autonomy. One will consequently have to be content with more modest proposals, such as David Little's wording: "... the basis of learner autonomy is acceptance of responsibility for one's own learning" (Little, 1997, p. 227) He envisages the development of learner autonomy as a "never-ending effort to understand what one is learning, why one is learning, how one is learning, and with what degree of success" (ibid.). That is why he also includes "learning how to learn" (Little, 1994, p. 431).

This concept presupposes an immensely optimistic vision of the human being as an ever-learning person. For autonomy to be developed, human beings have to be mature, intellectually advanced and self-assured. They have to know what they actually want to learn and therefore have to have pre-knowledge including world-knowledge in general. They have to be highly motivated and dedicated to their work. They must have a natural and sustainable drive to learn. They have to be highly critical of the whole process of learning and critical of themselves when it comes to the stage of self-evaluation. Therefore they have to be very honest and to start working again unfailingly once they have recognized that they have not yet reached the objective they have set for themselves. If autonomy is to be achieved by group work processes the human beings have to show good social as well as communicative competences on top of the ones just mentioned. Ultimately, autonomy does not come by itself but has to be introduced, prepared and practically "taught" by the teacher, which means living with the paradox that autonomy can only be reached after being denied it in the process of instruction (Benson/Voller, 1997).

Learner autonomy is often seen as being practically the same as self-access learning (cf. some of the contributions in Benson/Voller, 1997). Critical voices, however, draw attention to the fact that self-access learning materials work on the principle of strict guidance and leave the user little choice apart from when to use the materials at all.

In the present context, autonomy is seen as an ultimate goal to be approached through group work. It proceeds from an individual learner's "needs, purposes, capacities" (Little, 1994, p. 431), which he/she brings into the group and which are addressed in the process of the interaction of the group members. This strategy takes account of the individuals and at the same time of communicative processes within the group, negotiating of objectives, finding problems and questions to ask, negotiating methods of how to reach the objectives and reflecting on the process of learning as the group discussion moves along. Autonomy in this understanding can only be reached after the learners have reached adulthood, and if they have a thorough pre-knowledge of their subject, are mature enough to want to achieve some objective and have basic social and communicative competences.

Even if these prerequisites are given, it takes a lot of time and indeed effort on the side of the learners to move towards autonomy. Most of our university students are so used to instruction, to being spoon-fed, to being taken by the hand, to answering instructors' questions instead of answering their own that they find it hard work to give up relying on the teacher's guidance and take their destiny into their own hands, so to speak. Therefore the first steps towards autonomy have to be taken by the teacher, who introduces his/her students to the concepts and ultimate ideals of autonomy. This can only be done in a process of continuous reflection together with the students about what they can decide for themselves and what effort it will cost them. Demands on the teacher are therefore high, he/she has most of all to create a learning environment which is favourable to learner autonomy, and then "autonomy is possible only to the extent that students possess the willingness and the ability to act independently" (Littlewood, 1997, p. 82). They not only have to be highly motivated for the work, they also have to be prepared to assume more and more responsibility for their individual learning as well as for the activities in their

groups, in other words: "The autonomous learner ... needs to be able to negotiate between the strategic meeting of their own needs and responding to the needs and desires of other group members." (Breen/Mann, 1997, p. 136) In this understanding learner autonomy is not isolated work, but eminently teamwork, progress through dialogue, exchange, active participation, joint self-determination. It is more effective, the more each individual contributes and takes an active part in the learning process.

Group Work Project

Social and communicative competences as well as the ability to work in teams have come to be highly valued in Germany in the 1990s, and these competences are also required of school pupils. Consequently, teachers should be able to prepare the ground for the development of these competences in their classes. That is, however, only possible if they themselves are convinced of the legitimacy of these objectives and if they are familiar with them and the ways and means to reach them. The way can be paved at university, if the students are not only made familiar with theoretical concepts and ideas, but learn them themselves experientially by putting themselves into the pupils' situation. Therefore it seems justified that students, too, should aspire to learner autonomy. Learning in groups is just one way, but an important one. The framework can be created in any seminar format of university class.

The basis for each step towards more autonomy is discussion with the students themselves, in order not only to make them familiar with the advantages of group learning, but also to make them aware that the path to responsibility and self-determination is an arduous one that requires more motivation and dedication as well as persistence than they are normally used to.

Previous research into student interaction has shown clearly that the overall structure of a session has to be imposed by the teacher (Hermes 1999, p. 199). This sounds counterproductive, but it is a given that time is limited and that each semester is too short for all the ideal objectives to reach. It therefore makes sense that the teacher prestructures the session in order to save time for the students' learning process. In the case of my concrete project, which was an advanced literary seminar about Australian short stories, it meant that each story had been prepared at home by the students and was made the object of discussion in one or two sessions. Prestructuring in the present understanding means that the teacher in a plenary discussion develops the most important structural elements of the text in hand, namely those that normally go beyond the students' immediate interest because they are more on the theoretical side (e.g. narrative techniques, points of view, frame story, intricacies of time scheme, aspects of style). After this clarification of basic structural aspects of a short story there follows a brainstorming phase. The students brainstorm their ideas of the story, which they would later on like to deal with. These are collected and then — again in plenary discussion — structured. In this way a learning environment is created for group work with different tasks to fulfill. The tasks can be chosen by the students themselves. One risk is of course that several groups want to deal with some popular topic (such as human relationships). But here again negotiation of division of labour is possible if one appeals to the students' common sense.

The following stage is group work proper with the groups forming in various possible ways. One possibility is the formation of interest groups on the basis of the results of the brainstorming phase. An alternative way is the spontaneous formation of groups, who after establishing themselves as a group negotiate which points they want to deal with. The last stage is a plenary again, in which the results of the individual groups are presented and

discussed. Each group assumes responsibility as a whole for the presentation. Thus the mental relaxation or dropping out during the group work stage can be avoided.

Group work changes the format of a seminar. In the course of a whole semester the students get used to the ritual of the five stages:

- * structuring,
- * brainstorming,
- * group formation,
- * group work stage,
- * plenary with discussion of the results.

But one has to take into account that the ordinary time rhythm of 90 minutes of a usual seminar in German universities is too short for the students to work effectively in groups. In the project the students agreed to overcome this time constraint and to extend the time of some of the sessions to 120 minutes. That meant that the structuring phase lasted for about 45 minutes, while the forming of the groups and settling down to work took about 10–15 minutes. The rest of the class was devoted to group work. The following session then meant 90 minutes of plenary discussion. The slowing down of pace is one sacrifice one has to make to the goal of giving the students time to negotiate the aims and methods of their work and to actually agree on topics to discuss, to do the work and note it down and, at the end, briefly reflect on their achievement. Once this ritual is agreed on it works smoothly, and the students organize themselves in a very brief time. After one half of the semester they mostly seated themselves in class in the group arrangement that later worked together.

Data

Since the aim of the project was to learn about what actually went on in group work, the whole project was discussed with the students, not only at the beginning of the semester, but also as a process in some of the sessions. Admittedly it may seem unfortunate if one takes valuable time of a session for meta discussion. On the other hand, most of the students are training to become teachers, and it will be part and parcel of their day-to-day work to ask their pupils to work in groups. Therefore it was not felt as a loss, but rather as an enrichment for the students to reflect about activities which they themselves experience and the merits of which they will therefore be able to judge in a given context.

The data collected in the course of the semester were the following:

- * a questionnaire at the beginning of the semester about students' motivation for the topic, pre-knowledge as well as learning preferences,
- * a similar questionnaire at the end of the semester about students' motivation for the topic, knowledge acquired as well as learning preferences and possible changes in the course of the semester,
- * four diary entries of each student about their learning experience in selected sessions,
- * video-films of alternating groups (these groups were allocated a room of their own, in which they worked undisturbed by the other groups),
- * reports of observers on the group that was filmed,
- * two structured interviews of six students in two groups in the middle of the semester about their learning experience in various groups.

The two questionnaires yielded some interesting results as to changes in learning preferences. At the end of the semester more students preferred group discussion to other forms of learning than at the beginning. The reports of the observers were too vague and sketchy to be expressive or convincing. The most rewarding data were the videos, the diary entries and the interviews. The videos clearly showed how differently group dynamics work and await further analysis. The diaries were very candid pieces of self-analysis, all the more so since most of the students were used to writing diaries from previous classes. What very clearly emerged was a growing insight into the process of group work itself, the prerequisites and the dynamics that make it successful. This awareness was reflected in the interviews, which again for lack of time I cannot deal with here.

Evaluation and Conclusion

The most important result of the project is the heightened self-awareness of the students as to their own learning. Increase in factual knowledge can only be measured with respective tests. However, that was not the aim. What was aimed at was that the students learnt experientially in groups. This experiential learning enabled them to understand basic principles of group work and its value for their own future work as teachers. Constant reflection and self-reflection in the process fostered their learning and growing awareness of the potential of this procedure for their personality development.

They learnt to take responsibility into their own hands and work in groups as autonomous learners. In order to be able to do this for the benefit of each group member and that of the plenary, it was absolutely necessary for each group member to be well prepared. Lack of preparation immediately showed in the group discussion and was heavily frowned upon. Since the students felt responsible for their group, they showed growing motivation for thorough preparation of the texts assigned. The consequence was that the discussions in the groups were lively and to the point, since they all profited from their pre-knowledge of methods of literary analysis.

They experienced group work as a framework for social learning and for team orientation. Working together became a social event to which each member contributed as much as possible and for which they felt responsible. Each member was only accepted if he or she had carefully prepared the text under consideration. Thus not only an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence was gradually built, but some of the rather quieter students' self-assurance also increased. This had positive consequences for these students' participation in the plenary stages.

There are some literature specific results: students did not have any teacher's questions to answer, consequently guidance ended as soon as the structuring stage was over. Instead, they began asking their own questions and questioned each other about doubts or unclear or obscure points. They experienced literature as an ideal basis for dialogue, interaction and negotiation. Literature in point of fact is a dialogue between text and reader(s); it is a sharing of meaning.

The method on the whole proved to be practicable and seems to be generalizable if a text forms the basis of the group work. Moreover, the method can be generalized as long as the students agree to the underlying philosophy of group work and learner autonomy. The ritual of the five stages can of course be adapted to the individual needs of a course, because the steps are readily internalized.

A few provisos should, however, be mentioned:

- * A university seminar cannot do without the teacher's input. The teacher has to give information and pave the way for the activities to come.
- * Structuring is necessary. Time is valuable in university seminars and should not be wasted.
- * Group work is more time-consuming than a lockstep session. Therefore more time is needed than in ordinary sessions and the usual time constraints should be loosened.
- * Group work also slows down the overall pace of learning, something that is more than compensated for by the thoroughness and depth of the individual learning experience.

The overall advantages justify the work that is put into it. Whoever has to do with human beings in their professional lives should learn at some time in their training, what it means to learn in a group, should become aware of his/her role in a group and should experience personality development to the point of becoming a mature, fair and responsible partner in a joint event. The university seems to be an excellent place not for lectures about theories of group learning, but for experiential learning in a group. The students felt a growing team spirit, a growing confidence in their joint achievements and in their autonomy as mature learners.

References

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Amann, I., et al. (1991). *Beachte Die Körpersignale...'* Körpererfahrung in Der Gruppenarbeit, Mainz, ? : Matthias-Grünwald Verlag.

Benson, P., & Voller, P. (Eds). (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. London & New York: Longman.

Breen, M. P., & Mann, S. J. (DATE). Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy." In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 132-149).

Büttner, C. (1995). *Gruppenarbeit. Eine Psychoanalytisch-Pädagogische Einführung*. Mainz, Matthias-Grünwald Verlag.

Bradford, L. P., et al. (1972). *Gruppentraining*. Stuttgart.

Dahmer, H. (1993). *Effektives Lernen: Anleitung Zu Selbststudium, Gruppenarbeit Und Examensvorbereitung*. Stuttgart: Schattauer.

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy. Vol. 3: From Theory to Classroom Practice*. Dublin: Authentik.

Däumling, A. M., Fengler, J., et al. (1974). *Angewandte Gruppendynamik*. Stuttgart.

Dickinson, L. (1992). *Learner autonomy. Vol. 2: Learner Training for Language Learning*. Dublin: Authentik.

Ellis, G., & Sinclair, B. (1989). *Learning to learn English. A course in learner training*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gohla, Gangolf. (1977). *Theorie Und Praxis Der Gruppenarbeit. Ein Lern- Und Arbeitsprogramm Für Gruppensoziologische Studien*. Heidelberg, Germany: Quelle & Meyer.

Gutte, Rolf. (1976). *Gruppenarbeit: Theorie Und Praxis Des Sozialen Lernens*. Frankfurt, Germany: A. M., Diesterweg.

Head, K., & Taylor, P. (1997). *Readings in teacher development*. London: Heinemann.

Henrici, G. (1995). *Spracherwerb Durch Interaktion? Eine Einführung In Die Fremdsprachenerwerbsspezifische Diskursanalyse*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.

Hermes, L. (1999). Learner assessment through subjective theories and action research. *Assessment & Evaluation In Higher Education*, 24(2), 193-200.

Hofstätter, P. R., (1972). *Gruppendynamik*. Hamburg.

Kern, H. J., 1974, *Verhaltensmodifikation In Der Schule*, Heidelberg, Germany: Stuttgart.

Little, D. (1994). Learner autonomy: A theoretical construct and its practical application. *Die Neueren Sprachen*, 93(5), 430-442.

Little, D. (1995). *Learner autonomy. Vol. 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D. (1997). Learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom: Theoretical foundations and some essentials of pedagogical practice. *Zeitschrift Für Fremdsprachenforschung (Zff)*, 8(2), 227-244.

Littlewood, W. Self-access: Why do we want it and what can it do? In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 79-92).

Meyer, E. (1983). *Gruppenunterricht. Grundlegung Und Beispiel*, (Oberursel/Ts.: Ernst Wunderlich Verlagsbuchhandlung).

Meyer, H. (1990). *Unterrichts-Methoden. Ii: Praxisband*. Frankfurt: A. M. Cornelsen Scriptor.

Nunan, D. Designing and adapting materials to encourage learner autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 192-203).

Pemberton, Richard et al. (Eds). (1996). *Taking control. Autonomy in language learning*. Hone Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Schwerdtfeger, Inge Christine, 1977, *Gruppenarbeit Im Fremdsprachenunterricht*. Heidelberg, Germany: Quelle & Meyer.