

Original Paper

Methods Analysis: Comparing *Competitive Team-Based Learning* with other Instructional Methods and Approaches

Seyed Mohammad Hassan Hosseini^{1*}

¹ Independent Theoretician, Methodologist, Researcher, & The Founder of “Systematic Transforming & Liberating Education”, Iran

* Seyed Mohammad Hassan Hosseini, E-mail: mhhosseini73@proton.me

Received: June 18, 2023

Accepted: July 29, 2023

Online Published: August 14, 2023

doi:10.22158/wjer.v10n4p95

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjer.v10n4p95>

Abstract

Having introduced Competitive Team Based Learning (CTBL), my innovative approach to teaching, this paper presents a cogent and critical analysis and comparison of CTBL with other popular methods /approaches in the arena of Education in general and Language Teaching in particular, in terms of their distinguishing features and characteristics. Among such methods and approaches are Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Collaborative Learning (CoLL), Interactive Learning (IntL), and Cooperative Learning (CL) methods which are appreciated particularly in the U.S. and in the West. A synthesis of the distinguishing drawbacks of the comparison methods and approaches is part of the article. The chapter also explicates how CTBL, my educational innovation, that has been formulated based on my edu-political theories (Hosseini, 2023) is, in the last analysis, an approach to human security and prosperity and world peace. I hope this chapter would contribute to making a sound decision on implementing CTBL in the arena of (Language) Education for the ultimate goal of peace making and more compassionate civilizations building.

Keywords

The Oppressed Majority, Colonial Education, Sheeple, Theory and Method Engineering, Political Socio-Cognitive Language Learning Theory (PSCLL Theory), Multiple Input, Output, and Feedback Hypothesis (MIOF Hypothesis), Competitive Team-Based Learning, Catalyst for Transformation and Change, Agent of Change; People, Liberating Approach to Teaching, Civilised Societies, Compassionate Civilizations, Coherent World, World Peace. --See the INDEX at the end of the book for more terms

1. Introduction

Despite their commonalities in some aspects, the conventional didactic methods and approaches have their unique and distinguishing features and characteristics which encapsulate their designers' views on and interpretations of learning, teaching, and even the world. The present methods and approaches diverge due to a range of variables, from their views on affective aspects of learning and the role of learners in the learning process to the types of patterns of interaction they (intend to) pattern among classroom participants. As regards my innovative approach to teaching, in contrast to some methods that are strictly prescriptive, CTBL does not necessarily stipulate and follow specific steps. Therefore, in virtue of its flexibility, it has the potential to compensate the deficiencies of the conventional methods and approaches not merely in the sphere of Language Teaching but in the arena of Education as a whole also.

Before continuing our discussion, search for Dr Hosseini's Didactic Weapon in the virtual world and watch the introductory video about the application of his approach in a real classroom situation. Also, watch the videos to my initial thoughts that contributed to CTBL at <https://www.aparat.com/v/mfx1q> and at <https://www.aparat.com/v/aeOoI>, the video on the how abouts of the transforming power of his approach at <https://www.aparat.com/v/fAErU>, and his Ph.D. viva voce video at Mysore University in 2009 at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QBrb0ySuPH0>.

Competitive Team-Based Learning focuses upon deleting certain damaging problems of traditional methods to suit particularly the specific requirements of language classes in the present world context. CTBL has been offered to language classes in order to enrich and enhance the process of (language) learning. This is possible through a win-for-all dynamics ushered in by the role of the teacher as facilitator, creator, and orchestrator of opportunities for comprehensible input-output and feedback treatment for learners' comprehensive development and growth, which comes about with their total engagement and active participation and contribution in class activities. (Language) learning via CTBL has been viewed as an act of learning (the language) together and as an act of learning to share (language) learning skills and strategies by equipping students to learn it as a FL or as a L2 through some effective activities that cherish critical, analytical, and creative thinking. CTBL best benefits especially language classes as it, unlike the conventional methods and approaches and seat-work teacher dominated approaches, underscores the value of some pivotal factors of critical importance to (language) learning and language/new knowledge use. Among such factors are affective aspects of learning meaningful interaction, exposure of students to comprehensible input (in the target language) and (language) learning strategies, attention, purposeful communication, and multiple sources of input and output. Some other crucial tectonic context variables like motivation and active engagement of all learners in the process of (language) learning are also appreciated in CTBL semi/authentic, analytical, and suggestive feedback-rich relaxing environments. CTBL, thereby, is of high value for (language) classes in the sense that the mechanism underlying it is naturally highly favourable to language/new knowledge acquisition and the development of all aspects of communicative competence of students.

More importantly, it contributes effectively to the critical sensitivity of our citizens and the quality of their understanding and reasoning and thus to the accuracy of their long-term retention, which is a criterion for real learning. CTBL intends to make (language) learning (environments) a more vivid, interesting, motivating, goal oriented and effective exercise for more comprehensive development of our civilians. For more information about CTBL, the how bouts of its transforming power, researches done about its effectiveness, and particularly its edu-political/ theoretical foundations, see Hosseini, 2020 and 2023.

As you realized, CTBL is therefore a holistic contextualized approach to teaching and learning that reflects the real world holism. Contrary to the conventional methods and approaches, the procedure in classes run through CTBL *is not a loose anything goes* one. It is highly structured and systematic. CTBL's rich-opportunities-for-all situations naturally contribute to the engagement of all participants in giving and receiving information/feedback and elaboration of the material especially through the application of challenging tasks and specific activities and also through assigning rotating roles. As a state-of-the-art approach to (Language) Education, CTBL tries to produce a more realistic depiction of the real-world norms and settings in the classroom, as the microcosm, in order to more effectively connect learners to the real world, the macrocosm.

2.1 The Significance of Competitive Team-Based Learning vis-à-vis Other Methods and Approaches in the Field of (English) Language Teaching

Like Lexical Approach (LA), CTBL appreciates the importance of functional words for effective communication and focuses upon providing sufficient and appropriate input for empowering students with essential words. As in Natural Approach (NA), CTBL foregrounds the significance of comprehensible input and semi-authentic learning environments. CTBL is not negligent of Audio Lingual Method's (ALM) principles and techniques in the sense that it avails itself of various kinds of drills, whenever needed. As it is in Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT), CTBL realizes the critical importance of tasks and activities that incorporate real and naturalistic communication, and encourage students to negotiate meaning and discuss ideas. Tasks are designed to provide better contexts for the activation of not only input-output practice and the learning process but also students' critical sensitivities, which are conducive to more effective language learning. Like Whole Language Approach (WLA), with the presupposition that meaningfulness of the language to the learner supports the learning process, CTBL relishes teaching language as a whole and not in the form of isolated (sub) skills. The belief is that whole language, rather than its isolated parts, carries more meaning that should be negotiated and processed in my classes. I am also of the view that students can best learn and remember the kind of language that they fully understand; and that whole language is more meaningful, and meaningfulness of the language and learning situation is conducive to more effective understanding and remembering after a longer duration of time. Hence, the mechanisms underlying CTBL have been designed in such a way that they make language and the learning situations more meaningful and engaging through different strategies, stages, activities, techniques, etc.

Just as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) stresses the development of communication skills of students, so CTBL intends the development of such skills in well-designed relaxing as well as motivating dialogic social frameworks. It cherishes communication for real purposes, inspires risk taking, and accepts errors as signs of learning. As it is in the Silent Way (SW), CTBL encourages discovery learning and knowledge construction to make learners more independent and self-reliant. CTBL is also consistent with Multiple Intelligences (MI) as it values uniqueness of the learners and takes care of their differences. By shifting the roles of the students in their heterogeneous teams, CTBL aims at not just accommodating diversity in intelligences but also improving their multi intelligences simultaneously. CTBL is aligned with Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) as it lays the stress on teaching of learning strategies whenever possible, not just implicitly but explicitly also. As in Suggestopedia (SO), CTBL focuses upon desuggesting psychological barriers and making the learners feel totally relaxed and open and, consequently, more receptive to what is learned. It also prioritises the importance of peripheral learning. Like Counselling Learning (ConL), CTBL considers cognitive, affective, and edu-, socio-, and political aspects of learning. It attempts to make the learner feel comfortable as a member of a team. - Spontaneous exploratory discussion and confidence building within the privacy of small teams in a friendly ambiance cheered by the teacher as a fellow facilitator contribute to the development of such a feeling. And CTBL is similar to Neuro Psycholinguistics (NP) in the sense that it aims at equipping students with techniques and strategies for personal growth and change.

On the other hand, unlike the conventional methods and approaches, particularly seat-work teacher dominated methods and approaches such as the Traditional Lecture Method (TLM) or the Banking Method, CTBL underscores the value of some pivotal factors of critical importance to language learning and language use. Among such factors are meaningful interaction, exposure of students to comprehensible input in the target language, language learning strategies, attention, purposeful communication, and affective aspects of learning. Unlike SO, CTBL is not merely focused on vocabulary at the expense of other (sub) skills. In comparison to CoL, CTBL can be employed for large groups of learners. Considering Total Physical Response (TPR), CTBL can be applied to all levels of proficiency and for all skills. Unlike the SW, CTBL is not boring. In direct contradiction to Grammar Translation Method (GTM), CTBL focuses upon the process of learning in semi/authentic, analytical, and suggestive feedback-rich relaxing environments, rather than products of teaching in contrived environments. In sharp contrast to ALM as well as the Banking Method, CTBL respects and treats students as whole persons/human beings rather than animals, and gives prominent importance to their creativity and higher order thinking abilities. As opposed to Direct Method (DM) and the Banking Method, CTBL makes students accountable for their own learning and pays specific attention to the realities of classrooms by contrast. What adds to the significance of my seminal approach to emancipatory education refers to the fact that, contrary to all the above-mentioned methods and approaches and particularly CLT, it (i.e., CTBL):

1) Has strong theoretical foundations (see Hosseini, 2023);

- 2) Never forgets the idea that learners are human beings;
- 3) Is not restricted to the Present, Practice and Produce (PPP) model of presentation - CTBL values another P, which stands for Personalizing what has been learnt.
- 4) Systematically caters to learners with different ability ranges and learning styles;
- 5) Supplies pragmatic guidelines to effective and systematic implementation of groupwork, which is of paramount importance for the success of language classes;
- 6) Appreciates the significance of multiple sources of input, output, and feedback, and some other crucial context variables e.g., motivation and active as well as total engagement of all learners in the learning process for more effective language/knowledge learning/acquisition;
- 7) Facilitates simultaneous development of all aspects of communicative competence of students, including their thinking/reasoning and particularly socio-political competences which are overlooked by the present modern methods and approaches;
- 8) Generates highly democratic, motivating, and engaging leaning atmospheres;
- 9) Conveys crystal-clear views regarding the learning process and the mechanisms under which effective language learning occurs;
- 10) Is not limited to a particular view of language learning or a particular type of syllabi;
- 11) Is cognizant of the fact that successful living in the present real world settings and being able to face the realities of this dynamic and complicated competitive world demands something more than the appropriate use of the language in benign environments. This is the reason as to why it prioritises the significant role of some effective variables in the learning process such as socio-cultural and particularly socio-political expectations of the present world context;
- 12) Takes great care of moral and human values, and
- 13) Intends to prepare students for today competitive world environments in such a way that they would have the capacity to influence the world and contribute to more civilised social order/cohesion and world peace.

In sum, CTBL is of high value particularly for today world (language) classes in the sense that the mechanisms underlying it are naturally favourable not only to language acquisition/learning and to the development of all aspects of communicative competence of students. They are also highly conducive to critical sensitivity of our students, quality of their thinking, understandings and reasoning and accuracy of their long-term retention, which is a criterion for real learning. All of these are contributive to our citizens' personal growth/development, and disposition.

2.2 Differentiating CTBL from Interactive Approaches Like Collaborative Learning, Interactive Learning, and Cooperative Learning Methods

From a broad perspective, CTBL, Collaborative Learning (Coll), Interactive Learning (IntL), and Cooperative Learning (CL) seem to be the same. They bring an inclusive departure from the values and styles of traditional methods and approaches in four major ways:

- 1) They stress a shift from dependence on teacher towards greater reliance on self and peers;

- 2) They emphasise discovery-based learning, in situations that cherish problem-solving activities;
- 3) They prioritise the significance of interpersonal skills, and
- 4) They focus upon the significance of group work and require students to share, compare and judge their findings.

In general, teachers, in such approaches, are considered as fellow facilitators of learning and learning process managers rather than expert transmitters of knowledge, as it is in traditional methods and approaches. Students are likewise valued as active negotiators of meanings and ideas who are both giving as well as receiving rather than reticent bench-bound recipients. This kind of interactive models reflect the strand of communication with the difference that CoIL, as Oxford (1997) explained, brings in the shared context of thought in a community of learners that is less structured, whereas IntL is highly concerned about the interpersonal communication which lays notable emphasis on acculturation¹ of individuals in social relationships in learning communities. CL differs from these collaborative learning approaches in the sense that it emphasizes positive interdependence, which brings a sense of common fate among group members, and individual accountability or the feeling that each individual is responsible. It could also be claimed that CL stresses academic achievement and clearly defined curricular goals more than IntL and CoIL. Another significant feature of CL, according to Adprima (2010), an online educational magazine, refers to the fact that ‘in CL methods, students learn to be patient, “less critical” and more compassionate’. To remind the superiority of CL over other forms of group learning, Cuseo (1992) confirmed that CL is “the most researched and empirically well-documented form of collaborative learning in terms of its positive impact on multiple outcome measures” (p. 3).

On the other hand, as a special, in-depth approach to the use of small groups in teaching, CTBL entails the salient features of humanistic approaches. But contrary to IntL and CoIL environments, students, in CTBL settings, do not have the unstructured freedom that they might be given in an open classroom; nor does the system underlying my approach cater too much to their personal strengths and preferences as it might be in a class organized to individual learning styles.

Regarding the evaluation system, CTBL’s evaluation system is against undifferentiated group grading for teamwork as it is in Johnsons’ methods where all team members receive the same grade regardless of differences in contributions to the total-team/class effort. In CTBL environments, motivational incentives are used to sustain the individual efforts and immersion in the process of learning in team activities and furthering cooperation of team members in the course of learning.

Also, although in CTBL team members take final exams individually as it is in Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), Students Teams Achievement Division (STAD), and Teams Games Tournaments (TGT), they take midterm exams, tests, or quizzes cooperatively. The main philosophy beyond allowing students to take some exams, tests, or quizzes collaboratively is to subordinate testing to teaching. Apart from its contribution to positive interdependence, this strategy subjects students to more opportunities for transference of skills, strategies, thinking styles and approaches, attitudes, and so forth in a meta-cognitive way (e.g., through listening to their teammates who are in actual fact thinking aloud).

The below critical characteristics also discriminate CTBL from the abovementioned interactive innovations or any other type of humanistic approach that foregrounds the significance of groupwork:

- 1) CTBL advocates more direct training of students to function properly in groups;
- 2) CTBL focuses on transforming groups into teams and then engages those teams with challenging, complex and authentic learning tasks;
- 3) CTBL is directed towards technicality – psychological and socio-political oriented techniques and strategies are prioritised;
- 4) CTBL is highly detailed, organized, structured, and strategic;
- 5) CTBL teaches students to be critical;
- 6) CTBL pursues whole development of our civilians in semi/authentic environments which reflect the real world holism, and
- 7) CTBL's final aim is transforming our sheeple into People/Subjects, the ultimate change makers. See Hosseini, 2023.

Now, at this juncture, in lieu of the popularity of CL methods among educators and researchers, I would rather proceed his discussion about the noteworthy features of CTBL with reference to CL methods in the following sections.

2.3 The Significance of CTBL in Comparison with Other Methods in the CL Sphere

This section presents a comparison of CTBL and some popular methods of CL with reference to the following areas:

- 1) The concept of teacher-/learner-centeredness;
- 2) The stress they put on positive interdependence;
- 3) The emphasis they lay on individual accountability;
- 4) The pattern of interaction they bring among class participants;
- 5) The evaluation systems they employ;
- 6) The kind of tasks they focus upon, and
- 7) The feasibility of their application in real classroom situations.

For other distinguishing features of CTBL with reference to its design, objectives, syllabus, activities, materials, etc. see Hosseini, 2022, 2023.

2.3.1 Competitive Team-Based Learning Versus CL Methods with Reference to the Concept of Teacher-/Learner-Centeredness

In different CL methods, learners are appreciated differently. In this regard, Group Investigation (GI) and STAD can be considered as two extremes. Whereas in the former, as the byword of learner-centred methods of CL, students are given considerable freedom in, for instance, determining how to organize their teams, assigning their roles, doing their assignments, and presenting their products to the class; in the latter, as one of the most teacher-centred methods of CL, students do not have such choices and opportunities. It is the instructor who often determines the members of individual teams, their roles, the nature of the learning materials, and so on. CTBL offers a balance between these two extremes -- the

middle path of learning-centeredness to teaching. In CTBL's settings, it is learning that counts. I does whatever possible to improve learning and the quality of learning. That is why he strives to subordinate testing and even teaching to learning.

2.3.2 Competitive Team-Based Learning vs. CL Methods with Reference to Techniques Applied for Bringing Positive Interdependence

Another factor that distinguishes CL methods is the kind of strategies they employ for bringing, enhancing, and maintaining positive interdependence among students in order to create appropriate motivating learning environments. Methods like GI, Learning Through Discussion (LTD), and Constructive Controversy (CC), for instance, put emphasis on asking one joint product or report or giving extra grades to groups. This strategy usually leads to the weak mode of positive interdependence, to borrow a term from Kagan (1992). Weak mode of positive interdependence exists when an individual in a group can succeed even if some of his group members fail to secure their marks. It can also exist when a group can succeed even when some other groups in the class fail. In spite of its positive aspects, this kind of positive interdependence seems to have brought with it a major deficiency in the CL methods that prioritise it: In classes which focus on this kind of interdependence high achievers will not be motivated enough to teach others due to the simple reason that they do not feel that it is necessary. Consequently, weak students will also be disappointed and reluctant to continue to learn because of being ignored by high achievers, who want to secure and improve their own marks.

Methods like Jigsaw I and Jigsaw II make themselves avail of strategies like division of tasks and thus creation of gaps in participants' information for bringing and maintaining positive interdependence. In such situations to complete their own knowledge of the topic, students are motivated to ask for further information and listen attentively to one another. Comparing Jigsaw I and Jigsaw II, Slavin (1990) believed that Jigsaw I patterns positive interdependence better because it provides everyone with the information others lack and therefore make them all to be more carefully listened to, valued, and respected by others. These kinds of strategies, however, contribute to strong form of positive interdependence' among class participants. That is, they bring about an environment where the success of each group member is totally dependent on the success of other members, and the recognition of a group totally depends on the success of other groups in class. Although such methods may best satisfy low performers, they would dissatisfy bright students in view of the fact that the evaluation system of these methods are, in their perception, unfair and illogical.

Competitive Team-Based Learning, on the other hand, appreciates moderate positive interdependence. It comes to mediate between the above two mentioned kinds of interdependence: In CTBL classes an individual's success or a teams' recognition is not highly related to the success of other members or teams. Individual members' or individual teams' diligence will also play a significant role in shaping their kismets. Considering the weak mode of positive interdependence, the distinguishing point, in CTBL, is that individuals are highly motivated to coordinate their efforts to the success of their teams through different strategies. By virtue of the different techniques, strategies, and activities CTBL implements, all

students have the same opportunities to develop their repertoire of knowledge both through listening to others as well as through elaborating their own understandings to them. Among such techniques, strategies, and activities are prioritising the importance of incentives, appreciating an accurate procedure for evaluation of teams and individual team members, assigning rotating rolls in teams, valuing the significance of well-designed criterion-based heterogeneous teams, and encouraging teams to take quizzes collaboratively. As a result, the problem of the domination of group discussions by the best minority has been tackled by this approach. High achievers do not have opportunities to dominate the discussions in their teams, which, if so, it hampers positive interdependence. This quandary exists in most methods of CL such as STAD and TGT.

Another main feature of CTBL refers to the fact that it tries to subordinate testing to teaching in the sense that it encourages team members to take some exams, tests, or quizzes cooperatively, although they take final exams individually as it is in CIRC, STAD, and TGT. Apart from its contribution to positive interdependence, this strategy subjects students to more opportunities for transference of skills, strategies, thinking styles and approaches, attitudes, and so forth in a meta-cognitive way. The other main difference between CTBL and CL methods, with reference to positive interdependence, is that whereas most of CL methods appreciate both intra- and inter-group positive interdependence, CTBL emphasizes only intra-group positive interdependence, leaving the space for accommodation of competition at inter-team level.

2.3.3 Competitive Team-Based Learning Versus CL Methods with Reference to Individual Accountability

Likewise, the level of the prominence CL methods give to individual accountability, and the strategies they apply to bring, develop, and maintain it distinguishes them from one another. Too much emphasis on positive interdependence and negligence of individual responsibility is among the most critical problems with most of CL methods. Such disregard brings its own pitfalls in cooperative learning settings. It, for instance, can develop some individuals as social loafers and free riders, who are abdicating their accountabilities. This problem naturally arises in methods like CGBL, GI, and Jigsaw I, which mostly focus on bringing positive interdependence.

To bring individual responsibilities of group members, TGT stresses tournaments; STAD, LTD, and CC focus on individual quizzes, and TMT, TAI, Jigsaw II, and GI emphasis individual assignments. A shared presentation is another strategy used in LTD, GI, and CC to cheer this element among learners. But CTBL may be considered as a typical approach that pays especial attention to the significance of individual accountability of team members in order to avoid problems like free riding and social loafing, which are detrimental to the success of humanistic approaches and methods like CL methods. Particularly through test tournaments, its special evaluation system and activities, CTBL escalates the sense of accountability among all team members, and thus intensifies peer tutoring in a noticeable way, and highly engages learners in learning process.

2.3.4 Competitive Team-Based Learning versus CL Methods with Reference to Pattern of Interaction among Classroom Participants

As regards the pattern of interaction that CL methods prioritise, STAD is quite neutral because it appreciates neither within group nor inter-group relationships. That is to say, it structures no actual relationships among different teams, neither cooperation nor competition. This is because, as it is in CGBL, all groups can achieve the established criteria for reward or recognition regardless of the existence of such interdependences. STAD, however, appreciates intra-group cooperation and encourages a kind of competition of the individual with himself, as it is in TLM. In contrast to STAD, methods like TGT and GI try to depersonalise competition.

On the other hand, whereas most methods of CL (e.g., Learning Together or CGBL) highlight merely cooperation, some methods like TGT and specially CTBL apprehend and appreciate the role of competition. Tournaments in TGT and special grading system in CTBL foster and enhance competition among students. In spite of their similarities, there exists a major difference between TGT and CTBL at the class level: While TGT appreciates only within group comparisons, CTBL patterns a strong competition not merely among groups' members -- by within group comparisons in its evaluation system, but among groups also. This is not to conclude that the important role of cooperation is underestimated or devalued in CTBL. This approach prioritizes the significance of the both (cooperation and competition) in the sense that it spurs team members to help one another on cooperative tasks in order to compete with their same-level opponents in other teams and also win the competition against other teams. CTBL in point of fact emphasizes a combination of cooperative tasks, team competition, and team rewards in order to improve individual performances.

Also from a broader perspective, CL methods differ in their outlooks and in the outcomes they are looking for. The evaluation systems in methods like STAD, whereby students' performances are recognized by, for example, a comparison with their own past, do not value the realities of the real world and thus bring no considerable motivation with them. As noted earlier, classes should mirror the real world holism, and in the real world no achievement can be better appreciated without a comparison with the achievements of others. CTBL comes to cover these gaps. CTBL brings in situations wherein students have to compare their potentials, capacities and achievements with a number of others. More importantly, individuals, in CTBL situations, will learn to accept what they are and that they could potentially be the best. Such situations spur and facilitate students to do their best, with the scaffold of their team members, which contributes to their academic success. Their success, in their turn, escalates their intrinsic motivation, which is of a very high importance.

2.3.5 Competitive Team-Based Learning versus CL Methods with Reference to Evaluation Systems

Concerning evaluation systems, there are hot arguments among advocates of cooperative learning methods on exactly what is necessary for CL to be successful. Arguing against encouraging cooperation through using extrinsic rewards as motivators, Van Lier (1996) notes the argument by several researchers that extrinsic rewards "bribe students to work together" (p. 116) and undermine creativity and intrinsic

motivation. Even scholars like Kagan (1995) are stronger in their condemnation. However, I have always strongly dismissed such ideas taking the stand that such assertion is unproved, at least for many parts of the world. Further, if we look into the matter through the perspective of researchers Van Lier has referred to, then we could also say that the world or the life is bribing us to work together! No one can deny the tectonic contribution of rewards to human prosperity. So why should we reject the undeniable contribution of extrinsic motivation to academic success, which is conducive to motivation of our students in our classes. The point is that grading students and their teams supplies an extrinsic reward as a motivator for group members to work collaboratively (rewards could also be non-grade in nature). And collaboration, due to many reasons leads to academic success which increases learners' intrinsic motivation.

Now the question, in the assessment of collaborative work, is whether any joint product produced by a collaborative group should be assessed as a joint product, with the same grade being given to each member of the group. Some methods like CGBL and GI mostly stress on group recognition and evaluate individuals based on their group performance. In contrast, some other methods like Jigsaw II and STAD recognize groups based on the sum of their members' performances. As it was already stated, the fact is that the former methods are ignoring the importance of making individuals responsible for their own learning, and the latter are neglecting the significance of positive interdependence both of which, in their turn, deter the attainment of group goals. However, some other methods like TGT, CIRC, TMT, and especially CTBL try to take care of the both. Besides considering collective contribution of group members to the attainment of their group goals, the evaluation system of CTBL also foregrounds the importance of individual members' own efforts for their own progression. The assumption is that students are more likely to work harder under such evaluation system. For the evaluation system of CTBL, see Hosseini, 2018 and 2020.

The evaluation system of CTBL, hence, is against undifferentiated group grading for teamwork as it is in Johnsons' methods where all team members receive the same grade regardless of differences in contributions to the total-team/class effort. In CTBL motivational incentives are emboldened to sustain the individual efforts and immersion in the process of learning in team activities and furthering cooperation of team members in the course of learning. This, as noted, contributes to individuals' success that is conducive to intrinsic motivation.

2.3.6 Competitive Team-Based Learning versus CL Methods with Reference to Tasks

The type of tasks and especially the ways they are applied to cooperative learning situations discriminates CL methods from one another. As noticed, in contrast to methods like GI which encourage the application of very broad and demanding tasks such as group projects, CTBL focuses on more specific and to-the-point tasks. On the other hand, whereas in some methods like GI, RTR, and CGBL students work together on a single task, in others like Jigsaw I, LTD, and CC group members work independently on one part of a task and then share their findings and understandings with others. Accordingly, the types of interaction tasks pattern in a GI class, to cite an example, totally differ from

that of in a Jigsaw I class. Tasks in Jigsaw I instigate dyadic tutoring while in GI motivate students for inquisition, exchange of ideas, and problem solving. Yet, in CTBL the implementation of both of these tasks are possible, depending on the need of the situations and instructional objectives. What matters in CTBL classes is that tasks should be interesting and motivating, varied, conceptual, appropriately authentic, communicative, goal oriented, and discursive and challenging in nature. Most important of all, they should be beyond the developmental level of some, if not all, of the teams' members to encourage more effective cooperation in the course of teamwork. More importantly, they make more effective transitions to real world setting – even at the global level.

2.3.7 Competitive Team-Based Learning versus CL Methods with Reference to Feasibility of Application

Cooperative Learning methods like STAD, CGBL, and GI look easier in terms of the feasibility of their application to classrooms, and so they can be more reasonable choices for teachers who want to practice CL for the first time. Most methods of CL, however, demand more work on the part of the teacher. In Jigsaw II, for instance, the teacher must work more to prepare separate meaningful sections of a unit, which should be self-contained. The teacher should think of tasks that have several distinct aspects or components. Likewise, in CTBL, the teacher should be equipped with necessary work sheets, quizzes, answer keys and team recognition forms and be ready to calculate individuals as well as their teams' marks through CTBL multidimensional evaluation system. The solution, however, as noted, is to lessen the number of main exams in a semester/academic year or put more emphasis on self- or peer-assessment of individuals at least on quizzes, which would also contribute to deepening their learning.

In conclusion, CTBL differs from the conventional methods and approaches particularly in the arena of CL in view of the fact that the mechanism underlying it:

1. Helps the best students or high achievers feel satisfied and puts an end to their objection and unwillingness to contribute their efforts into the success of their team members;
- 2) Spurs weak students to have more active participation in class activities;
- 3) Enforces individual accountability of all team members, and thus limits the scope for social loafers and free riders;
- 4) Brings for students not merely a zest for true and active shared learning but further opportunities to be more clearly aware of their capacities and capabilities in a broader sense also;
- 5) Equips students for current globalized environment which requires workforce and citizens who are competent in skills like teamwork, conflict management, and successful collective decision making amidst competitive environments;
- 6) Contributes to learning humanitarian democratic principles, norms, and values, and
- 7) Enables our citizenry to confront any sources of hegemonic ideas, corruption, and oppression, and gives them the drive to take the course of action for the ultimate goal of eliminating apartheid, fascism and dictatorship...

2.4 Distinguishing Features of CTBL in Comparison with the TLM/the Banking Method, Conventional CL Methods and Approaches, and CLT

Lastly, I have tried to illustrate the distinguishing features of CTBL in comparison with the TLM/the Banking Method, conventional CL methods and approaches, and CLT in a table: See the below table.

Table 11.1 Comparison of CTBL with the TLM/the Banking Method, conventional CL methods and approaches, and CLT

The TLM/ The Banking Method

CL Methods/

Approaches

CLT

CTBL

Orientation

Text-based product-oriented

Context-focused (mostly) product-oriented

Context-focused process-oriented

Socio-political & Problem-focused future-oriented (it entails process also)

Type of centeredness

Teacher-centred

Learner-centred

Learner-centred

Learning-centred, with a special focus on learners as whole persons

Teacher's roles

Autocratic; Predominant mode of dispensing knowledge;

Cheater;

Depositor, &

Mini dictator, in action

Fellow facilitator of learning process, & Scaffold provider

Communication model, & Facilitator of the communication tasks for language learning

Innovation model; Problem poser, Attitude recalibrator & Agent of critical awareness & social change & development; & Midwife who gives birth to knowledge & challenging ideas in citizens' minds

Teacher's main concerns

Issuing communiqués;

Making deposits; Infusing (false) knowledge into receptacles, & Cheating

Hammering effective variables in learning

Arrangement of class; Cultivating & improving the learners' communication ability, & the syllabus

Problimitising the context & creating cognitive disequilibrium; Decolonising students' minds, and spreading the truths, Transforming sheeple into People - for bringing a change in the patterns of

interaction in society

Learner's roles

Numb depositories and acknowledgers

Active participants & accumulators of knowledge

Enthusiastic interlocutors

Proactive discussants, truths explorers and disseminators, knowledge seekers, analysers, & evaluators

Learner's main concern

What to memorize in order to pass the course, enter universities, & become a boss

Gaining grades, rewards, awards, & recognition

Fluent communication

How to find out; Deep understanding for further investigation; Spotlighting false information, their sources & the philosophy beyond them

Interaction type

If any, it is teacher-to-one-student interaction at a time

Intra- & inter-group cooperative interaction

Person-to-person or intra- group cooperative interaction

Intra- group collaboration but inter-group competition

Grouping

No groupwork

Mostly buzz groups

Random grouping, mostly homogenous groups

Grouping in such a way that systematically caters to learners with different ability ranges & learning styles

Favourable to

Dominant minority – often extrovert but narrow-minded people

Free riders & social loafers

Extroverts & sometimes clever students

All, particularly weak students/the Other

Main activities

Passively listening, repetition, memorization, recitation, translation, & reproduction

Negotiation,

clarification, comparison, synthesis, elaboration, & application of concepts during problem solving activities

Negotiation,

clarification, comparison, elaboration, & application of concepts during problem solving activities

Discussion about challenging ideas which solicit higher order of incisive & analytical thinking skills such as critical evaluation of causes & effects, analysis, synthesis, creative generalization, & elaboration

Communicative competence

grammatical

Some aspects of communicative competence

Some aspects of communicative competence

All aspects of communicative competence in parallel that include thinking and socio-political competencies also

At the end of a (reading) course, students will be able to

Read the lines

Read between the lines

Read between the lines

Read beyond the lines

Students are treated as

Objects/Animals

Whole persons, & sometimes Subjects

Whole persons/participants

Subjects, & prospective Agents of change

Students' outlooks/

minds are hammered to be

(If any) narrow/shallow

Flexible & wide

So-so

Wide, holistic, realistic & flexible, but unshakable at times

Students are engineered to

Live as sheep in their country

Lead a successful life in their country

Communicate fluently, & sometimes accurately

Survive in more complicated environments, and change their destinies

Students will ultimately contribute to

Dictatorship/

Apartheid, & finally Anarchism – a dog-eat-dog world

Successful humane living

in 'cooperative oriented societies'

Tourism &

economic development, mostly at the 'societal' level

Sustainable futures & World Peace

(see Hosseini, 2006, 2007, 2023)

Conclusion

Empowering students for successful confrontation with the realities of the present world context, which is highly multicultural, incredibly complicated, and of course developmentally and fiercely competitive, is the necessary proviso for creating more civilized nations, compassionate civilisations, and so world peace and sustainable futures. The truth is that the conventional methods and approaches cannot help us meet such a goal. It seems that it was destined such a wide divergence between what our conventional education regimes intend to make out of our citizenry and what their dream worlds, in today world context, exact them to be could not go side by side any longer. Therefore, the deficiencies inherent in the present traditional didactic methods and approaches call for urgent and pragmatic overhauling of our teaching systems, and syllabi and textbooks revision, in the current scenario of globalisation, which is characterised by ever-growing revolutions also.

Academia has no option but taking account of real life situations and moving side by side with the constant flux and paradigm shifts that are emerging based on peoples' needs. Learning-/learner- centred rather than teaching-centred activities and strategies should be focused upon as the need of the hour. CTBL has been offered in such circumstances as a panacea to all (language) learning environments. Since our classes are, in essence, microcosms of the macrocosm – a fraction of the real world, CTBL takes heed of the realities of our dynamic and complicated world, chief among which are local, economic, historical, socio-educational/cultural, and political factors.. CTBL has been offered to Education in general and to the Language Teaching repertoire in particular in order to assist our citizens and particularly the Other in order to gain agency over the conditions of their lives and destinies in the present world context. CTBL is thus an excellent and of course seminal approach for today world context, that is characterised by ever-growing injustice, corruption, racism, tyranny, terror and bloodshed, and destruction, as it offers a real hope of salvation of humanity the world over. It does not hurt to repeat here the statement, unfortunately still rejected by even some renowned scholars in spite of its obviousness, that CTBL is a very useful, effective, and practical edu-, 'socio-political' approach to the pedagogy of particularly the oppressed majority. It is indeed a concrete plan of action for empowering and liberating the Other. CTBL is thereby an ensured pathway towards peace making, security, development, and prosperity. This is because contrary to the present immaterial methods and approaches, CTBL's focal area of concern is moral, spiritual, and intellectual revolution towards a big change in the present suffering peasant societies, who are contributing to an unhealthy and uncivilized world, for the ultimate goal of peace making and compassionate civilizations building. See Hosseini, 2023.

References

- Adprima: Toward the best. (2010). *Instructional Methods Information*. Accessed January 3, 2010.
Also published by *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, (2022), 11(3), 68-86.

Hosseini, S. M. H. (2023). My Transformative Edu-political Theories and Liberating Approach to Teaching. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 11(2), 31-60.

Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for Teachers.

Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative Learning, Collaborative Learning, and Interaction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 443-452.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London: Longman.

***My instructional innovation, CTBL is an approach to the empowerment and liberation of the Other who have been victimized. To put it another way, CTBL is in the last analysis an approach to the elimination of apartheid and dictatorship who is in the habit of hegemonic articulation/presentation or