Iranian Evolutionary and Educational Psychology Journal
December 2019: 286-294
© University of Hormozgan Publication 2019
DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5
http://ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir

# The Relationship between Cooperative Learning and Skilled Learning with the Satisfaction of Students Studying Foreign Languages (Russian, English, and Arabic)

**Abbas Sadeghi[1*], Seyyedeh Masoumeh Davoudy[2]**

**Abstract**: This study was performed to examine the relationship between cooperative learning and skilled learning with the satisfaction of students studying Russian, English, and Arabic languages. The research method was a correlational one. The study statistical population included the students of fields Russian, English and Arabic languages at the University of Guilan in 2016 who were selected by the cluster sampling method accounting for 120 subjects. A researcher-made questionnaire was used to collect data. The data were analyzed using SPSS-18 software, Pearson correlation test, and the linear regression. According to the Pearson correlation coefficient results, the variable of educational satisfaction was positively correlated with cooperative learning (r = 0.338) and skilled learning (r = 0.449). The results of regression analysis also showed that the skilled learning variable and then, the cooperative learning together explain 0.22 of the satisfaction variance. The results revealed that cooperative learning and skilled learning have a significant effect on students' satisfaction. Given the importance of this issue, we should say strengthening the teaching skills can help increase the student's satisfaction rate and quality of education..

**Keywords**: Cooperative Learning, Skilled Learning, Satisfaction, Students.

## Introduction

The advancement of science and the spread of various sciences make the need to obtain further and more durable information in a shorter time inevitable. Therefore, one of the tasks of education professionals is to identify appropriate practices for students' faster and better learning and the optimal use of the limited time of education by learners. Besides learning formally taught contents and knowledge, the learners also learn in the school environment how to communicate with others and perceive their views (Golmohammad Nejad Bahrami, 2018). It would be highly useful for learners to use the learning environment for learning and experiencing ways to communicate with others as well as creating a positive view, in addition, to acquire skills and information formally presented to them (Solberg, Hopkins, Ommundsen, & Halvari, 2012). Striving to provide appropriate and useful methods for optimal use of educational opportunities and facilities to learn better, deeper and more broadly, meanwhile opposing the earlier definitions of teaching considered to be just the transfer of information, the education professionals define and see teaching as helping the learner understand and perceive the contents (Packard, 2019). The students' involvement and cooperation in the learning process are so important that some education professionals have proposed the participation rate of students in learning

1. Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Guilan, Iran
*Corresponding author email: asadeghi1394@gmail.com
2. MA in English Teaching, Iran Language Institute Teacher, Rasht, Iran

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

activities as a criterion for teachers' evaluation (Gao et al., 2019). To introduce and describe a good teacher or class with one phrase, one should say that a good teacher is one who motivates and leads the students toward curiosity and asking more questions (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005).

After extensive research and studies in this field, researchers have also come to the conclusion that the participation rate of students in the classroom is the clearest indicator of educational effectiveness (Ing, Webb, Franke, Turrou, Wong, Shin, et al., 2015). New and advanced theories on collaborative (cooperative) research in group learning suggest that learning is effective when the learner plays the central role. The teacher should play the role of an advisor and a guide and tries to involve and participate students in classroom activities as much as possible (Gaunt, & Westerlund, 2016). Teachers who teach using indirect methods are more effective than teachers who do not use such methods. This is due to the fact that students are more involved in the indirect teaching method and the teacher strives to get students thinking and engaging them with learning opportunities, whereas in the direct teaching method, the teacher merely presents the contents to the students (Wong, Ruble, Yu, & McGrew, 2017).

In a study entitled "Cooperative learning as a tool for improving social skills among middle school students", Hill (2011) concluded that cooperative learning enhances students' social skills. In a study, Nichols (2002) examined the effects of one form of participatory (cooperative) group learning on the students' motivation and academic achievement in a high school geometry class. The results indicated that the students in the participatory learning group were more efficient than the students in the control group, had goal-oriented learning, further valued the geography course and showed more academic achievement. Gillies (2004) evaluated the impact of cooperative learning on group solidarity and social responsibility. The results showed that cooperative learning has a greater impact on group solidarity and the social responsibility of students compared to the traditional method.

In a research entitled "The impact of cooperative learning classes in comparison with traditional learning classes on students' self-esteem, Holtferter & Holtferter (2005) concluded that cooperative learning enhances the students' self-esteem. In a study entitled "The impact of cooperative learning on the concept of self-education and academic achievement in high school students chemistry course", Zisk (2009) concluded that cooperative learning has a positive effect on the concept of self-education and academic achievement in high school students.

The students' participation in the learning process is not just about asking them questions; rather, the teacher must actively engage students in all stages of teaching, including starting with the lesson, presenting and summarizing it. The teacher also has to consult with the students in different ways on how to manage the class, how to teach, and even the evaluation method and pay attention to their comments and suggestions since giving students the opportunity to submit comments satisfies the student's need for self-reflection and prevents many behavioral abnormalities (Kilic, 2010).

As some of the research related to this topic mentioned above, there are many studies showing the impact of cooperative and skill-based teaching methods on academic achievement, social relationships, and self-esteem. However, no study was found in reviewing the literature that has simultaneously examined the cooperative and skilled teaching on the students' satisfaction rate in foreign language fields. Accordingly, the present study aimed to investigate the relationship between cooperative learning and skilled learning with the satisfaction of students studying Russian, English, and Arabic languages.

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

## Material and Method

This research was a correlational study. This study was performed on the statistical population of students in the fields of Russian, English, and Arabic languages of Guilan University in 2016. To conduct the research, 120 of them (40 from each group) were selected by a multistage cluster random sampling method. The sample size was calculated based on the questionnaire baseline information and considering the error level of 0.05 using G.Power software. The software estimated the minimum sample size as 90 subjects. However, 120 individuals were selected for more assurance. To conduct the research, the researcher referred to the classrooms of these students, and after obtaining permission from the instructor and informed consent based on the class list, selected the students randomly to complete the questionnaire. The research inclusion criteria were informed consent, being a student of these three disciplines, and being interested in participating in the research.

The research questionnaires were provided to the students and they were asked to complete the questionnaire within 15 minutes in the classroom and return it. A 30-question researcher-made questionnaire was used to evaluate cooperative and skilled learning and the academic satisfaction of students (cooperative learning: 10 questions, skilled learning: 10 questions, and academic satisfaction: 10 questions), which were answered based on a five-option Likert scale (strongly agree = 5, agree = 4, moderate = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1). The content validity method and CVI were used to evaluate the questionnaire validity and the views of five university professors were asked to determine the CVI rate. The internal consistency coefficient was used to evaluate the reliability using Cronbach's alpha method. The alpha coefficient was calculated for academic satisfaction, cooperative learning, and skilled learning as 0.79, 0.78, and 0.73, respectively. The data were analyzed using SPSS-18 software and statistical Pearson correlation and regression tests.

## Results

The study involved 120 students of disciplines of foreign languages, including Arabic, Russian, and English. The mean age of students was 24.90 years with a standard deviation of 8.59. The participants included 80 female and 40 male students. The distribution indices of the variables are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** The distribution indices of the research variables

| Variable | Mean | SD | Cronbach's alpha |
|---|---|---|---|
| Academic satisfaction | 29.65 | 3.18 | 0.79 |
| Cooperative learning | 36.43 | 3.12 | 0.78 |
| Skilled learning | 27.57 | 3.59 | 0.73 |

The results showed that the variables of academic satisfaction with a mean of 29.65 and a standard deviation of 3.18, cooperative learning with a mean of 36.43 and a standard deviation of 3.12, and learning variable with a mean of 27.57 and a standard deviation of 3.59 have appeared in the students. In the following, the Pearson correlation coefficients of the variables are discussed.

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

**Table 2.** The correlation coefficients of variables

| Variables | Cooperative learning | Skilled learning |
|---|---|---|
| Academic satisfaction | 0.338** | 0.449** |
| | 0.0001 | 0.0001 |

The results of Table 2 showed that the Pearson's correlation coefficients between educational satisfaction and cooperative learning and skilled learning are 0.338 and 0.449, respectively. In other words, a positive and significant relationship was found between educational satisfaction and cooperative and skilled learning styles. The linear regression test was used to investigate the contribution of these variables to the variance of educational satisfaction.

The normality of data distribution must be verified before using parametric tests (e.g., linear regression); otherwise, their nonparametric equivalents should be used. The single-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to examine the normality of the data distribution. The results showed that academic satisfaction (sig = 0.088) was not significant. Accordingly, they have a normal distribution. Also, if the Durbin-Watson statistic value is between 1.5 and 2.5, the independence of the errors has been realized, which has been calculated in the present regression model as 1.89. This indicates that the errors are independent. The regression results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Step-by-step regression to predict academic satisfaction based on the cooperative and skilled learning variable

| Model | R | $R^2$ | F | Non-standard coefficients | | Standard coefficients | T value | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant value | 0.447 | 0.228 | 17.23 | 29.527 | 13.299 | - | 2.220 | 0.028 |
| Cooperative learning | | | | 0.649 | 0.189 | 0.338 | 3.424 | 0.001 |
| Skilled learning | | | | 0.463 | 0.234 | .0195 | 1.978 | 0.043 |

The results of the regression analysis indicated that the variables of skilled learning, and then, the cooperative learning together explain significantly 0.22 of the satisfaction variance and both of predictors predict the criterion variable (academic satisfaction) significantly.

## Discussion

This study was conducted to investigate the relationship between cooperative learning and skilled learning with the satisfaction of students studying in the fields of Russian, English, and Arabic languages. The results showed that the variable of educational satisfaction was positively correlated with cooperative learning and skilled learning. Also, the results of the regression analysis indicated that the skilled learning variable, and then, the cooperative learning together explain 0.22 of the satisfaction variance.

Cooperative learning (CL) is more than "working together" – it has been described as "structuring positive interdependence" (Santaria, Junaid, & Ruspa, 2019), in pursuit of a specific shared goal or output. This is

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

likely to involve the specification of goals, tasks, resources, roles, and rewards by the teacher, who facilitates or more firmly guides the interactive process. Typically operated in small groups of about six heterogeneous learners, CL often requires previous training to ensure equal participation and simultaneous interaction, synergy, and added value (Buchs, Butera, Mugny, & Darnon, 2004). Higher effect sizes tend to be associated with approaches which combine group goals and individual accountability. At its worst CL can result in "the blind leading the blind" or "pooling ignorance", or one person doing all the work hence the need for structure (Driouech, Sisto, Lorusso, & Raeli, 2015). However, many schools might think they are implementing peer tutoring or cooperative learning, when all they are really doing is putting children together and hoping for the best (Falchikov, 2001).

Abrami, Poulsen, and Chambers (2004) found that expectation of success was the most significant factor distinguishing users and non-users of CL, suggesting a need for implementation support that impacts upon both teacher organization skills and self-efficacy. It is important that several colleagues are engaged in a peer learning program, and that embedding the program across the learning organization and succession planning is carefully considered well in advance.

Much research into peer learning has been conducted in schools, where it has come to be used with increasingly improbable learner groups. For example, peer tutoring has been found effective on a large scale with tutors as young as kindergarten or first grade (Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes, & Simmons, 1997). Peer learning is increasingly found in colleges and universities. All of these are relatively controlled contexts which are somewhat amenable to systematic measurement.

However, peer learning has increasingly been used in other contexts, some more challenging because of longer-standing learning failure in those to be helped (as in peer learning with adults of restricted literacy in domestic or community contexts; e.g., Scoble, Topping, & Wigglesworth, 1988), some because of greater transience and fluidity (voluntary organizations, after-school clubs, libraries, churches), some because learning is not the primary goal of the organization (as in workplace learning), and some because the population involved as helpers and helped have their own considerable intrapersonal challenges (as in peer tutoring in prisons).

Much peer learning in schools originally targeted core skills areas, such as reading (Topping, 2005). Where peer tutoring was deployed specifically for practice and consolidation purposes, this sometimes resulted in narrow "drill and skill" approaches (especially in the United States). However, teachers became more confident and trusting in children, and slowly moved to use peer learning in a less mechanistic way and in more challenging subject areas. Peer learning extended to spelling and writing (Topping, Nixon, Sutherland, & Yarrow, 2000), and then moved onwards to science. More recently, peer learning has extended to thinking skills. Most recently, peer learning in thinking skills has shown compelling effects on cognitive modifiability. As peer learning began to take hold in college and university education, PL was increasingly applied to a very wide range of subjects (Topping, Peter, Stephen, & Whale, 2004).

Additionally, both CL and PT can simultaneously yield gains in transferable social and communication skills and in affective functioning (improvements in self-esteem, liking for partner or subject area; regarding CL (Sykes, 2015). Although these are more elusive to measure and are not found as reliably as academic gains, they represent considerable added value for no more input.

When students are required to compete with each other for grades, they work against each other to achieve a goal that only one or a few students can attain. There is a negative interdependence among goal achievements;

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

students perceive that they can obtain their goals if and only if the other students in the class fail to obtain their goals. When students are required to work individualistically on their own, they work by themselves to accomplish learning goals unrelated to those of the other students. Students' goal achievements are independent; students perceive that the achievement of their learning goals is unrelated to what other students do. In cooperative learning situations there is a positive interdependence among students' goal attainments; students perceive that they can reach their learning goals if and only if the other students in the learning group also reach their goals (Indiyani, & Listiara, 2006).

Learning together to complete assignments can have profound effects on students and faculty. A great deal of research has been conducted comparing the relative effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic efforts on instructional outcomes (Johnson, 1991).

Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning. The effectiveness of cooperative efforts depends on how well positive interdependence, face-to-face promoted interaction, individual accountability, interpersonal and small group skills, and group processing is structured within the learning situation. These five essential elements may be structured within the learning situation, within the classroom, within the school, and within the school district. In a cooperative school students work primarily in cooperative learning groups, teachers and building staff work in cooperative teams, as do the district administrators. The heart of the cooperative school is cooperative learning. Cooperative learning groups may be used to teach specific content (formal cooperative learning groups), to ensure active cognitive processing of information during a lecture (informal cooperative learning groups), and to provide long-term support and assistance for academic progress (cooperative base groups). In the classroom, teachers may use two general approaches to creating cooperative learning procedures, conceptual and direct. Long-term changes in teaching practices depend on teachers understanding conceptually what cooperation is as well as being able to conduct cooperative learning lessons. In the school, staff members work in collegial support groups especially to increase teacher's instructional expertise and success, task forces to plan and implement solutions to school wide problems, and ad hoc decision-making groups to involve all staff members in important school decisions (Kouzes, & Posner, 2006).

In explaining the achieved results, it must be said that students who use better regulation skills are more careful in learning and studying than those who use less of them. Also research results approved that successful students use studying and learning strategies better and more such as note taking, highlighting, selecting important points, pre-reading of materials, rehearsing, repetition and review, review important points, supervising and selecting appropriate regulation strategies. On the other hand, it must be said that prompting the quality of learning environment or developing a positive attitude towards the issues can be expected from an active, healthy and dynamic community. Meanwhile, dealing with students and paying attention to their interests as deserving and respectful people is also very important. If the learners are treated as creatures like a robot and a crap that is supposed to be game of their teachers, it is feared that all their emotions and interests and attitudes toward education, university or any kind of learning environment are negated and this will bring about the conditions for their decline and mental retardation and ultimately for society, and learning does not really take place.

In explaining the obtained results, it can be said that some people are different in terms of mental abilities, learning methods, style and learning speed, preparation, interest and motivation toward gaining knowledge and performing educational activities. Thus, considering individual differences of people in education and

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

proper treatment with their specific characteristics is one of the important tasks of the educational system. The results of research in this regard have confirmed the fact that paying attention to individual differences of learners from teachers have a great influence on improving the quality of learning and increasing their educational achievement level.

On the other hand, it should be said that control of learning beliefs involves information about various actions that need to be done and involves information about various action that need to be done and involves information about various actions that need to be done and involves information about various actions that need to be done and determines how to do it, in the other words having control over learning means students' method that might be study method or problem solving method, that is knowing how to read carefully or carelessly, how and during what steps solve the problem, how to summarize the content or how to predict and infer the unlisted information. Explaining the mastery of reading is a broad range of actions related to each other in a task. This kind of knowledge is a worthwhile behavior source for a person who tries to achieve goals. Therefore, mastery of learning determines the importance of an attitude and or why an approach for solving problem is better or more important. In a research by (Sharan, 1990) as the ‘’relation of self-regulatory learning strategies with students educational achievements showed that there is a positive relationship between self-regulatory strategies and educational achievements and all factors of self-regulatory learning have ability to predict educational achievements. Generally, it should be said that students who plan to learn and organize the studied materials, can easily have control on what they learn.

In explaining the obtained results, it must be said that students are more successful that use self-regulatory process as a regular and controllable trend and are responsible for their educational outcomes. This causes flexibility in learner behavior and helps them to change their method and learning style whenever is needed.

One of the limitations of this study was the non-cooperation of all students in completing the questionnaires. Thus, the researcher was made to complete the questionnaires over two periods. Another limitation of this study was the lack of a standardized tool for measuring the research variables. Hence, the researcher had to design a research tool. Based on the present study results, it is recommended to develop a valid instrument in future studies to measure learning approaches and methods. In practice, it is also suggested that cooperative and skilled learning approaches will be taught to teachers and included in the in-service training courses.

**Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**Funding**

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

**References**

Abrami, P. C., Poulsen, C., & Chambers, B. (2004). Teacher Motivation to Implement an Educational Innovation: Factors differentiating users and non-users of cooperative learning. Educational Psychology, 24(2), 201–216.

Buchs, C., Butera, F., Mugny, G., & Darnon, C. (2004). Conflict elaboration and cognitive outcomes. Theory into practice, 43(1), 23-30.

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]

[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]

[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2005). A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve (Vol. 6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Driouech, N., Sisto, L., Lorusso, O., & Raeli, M. (2015). Alumni network and peer learning: experience of Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Bari. Agriculture & Forestry/Poljoprivreda i Sumarstvo, 61(1).

Falchikov, N. (2001). Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education. Psychology Press.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Simmons, D. C. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. American Educational Research Journal, 34(1), 174-206.

Gao, J., Zhao, B., Xiong, Y., & Gan, J. (2019). Optimization design of the online learning environment for ethnic college students: the perspective of the emotional participation. Interactive Learning Environments 9(12), 1-13.

Gaunt, H., & Westerlund, H. (Eds.). (2016). Collaborative learning in higher music education. Routledge.

Gillis, R. M. (2004). The Effect of cooperative learning on Junior High school student during small Group. Journal of learning and Instruction, 14,197-213.

Golmohammad Nejad Bahrami, G. (2018). The Comparison the Effectiveness of Cooperative and Traditional Learning on the Student Communication Skills and Self-Efficacy. Journal of Instruction and Evaluation, 11(41), 35-54.

Hill, K. A. (2011). Cooperative learning as a mean of improving social skill among middle grade student. Retrieved from http://www.Usoe. K12.ut.US/oals 2000/Kathy–hill–cooperative Learning.htm

Holtfreter, R. E. & Holtfreter K. L. (2005). Traditional Lcture Vrsus a Coperative Larning Cassroom: An Empirical Study to Determine the Differences in Self Esteem of Student. Htm://www.teach-nology.com.

Indiyani, N. E., & Listiara, A. (2006). Efektivitas metode pembelajaran gotong royong (cooperative learning) untuk menurunkan kecemasan siswa dalam menghadapi pelajaran matematika (suatu studi eksperimental pada siswa di SMP 26 Semarang). Jurnal Psikologi, 3(1), 10-28.

Ing, M., Webb, N. M., Franke, M. L., Turrou, A. C., Wong, J., Shin, N., & Fernandez, C. H. (2015). Student participation in elementary mathematics classrooms: the missing link between teacher practices and student achievement?. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 90(3), 341-356.

Johnson, D. W. (1991). Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4, 1991. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.

Kilic, A. (2010). Learner-centered micro teaching in teacher education. International Journal of Instruction, 3(1), 18-25.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). The leadership challenge (Vol. 3). John Wiley & Sons.

Nichols, J. D. (2002). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Students' achievement and Motivation in High School Geometry Class. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service N0 ED 387341).

Packard, M. A. (2019). Early Childhood Teachers Improving Together: The Impact on Teacher Noticing of Participation in Video-Mediated Professional Learning Communities within a Teacher Preparation Course (Doctoral dissertation).

Santaria, R., Junaid, R., & Ruspa, A. R. (2019). Promoting Students Interest in Learning through Cooperative Learning Tudassipulung Technique. ICONSS Proceeding Series, 526-530.

Scoble, J., Topping, K., & Wigglesworth, C. (1988). Training family and friends as adult literacy tutors. Journal of Reading, 31(5), 410-417.

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]
[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]
[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]

Sharan, S. (Ed.). (1990). Cooperative learning: Theory and research (pp. 969-977). New York: Praeger.

Solberg, P. A., Hopkins, W. G., Ommundsen, Y., & Halvari, H. (2012). Effects of three training types on vitality among older adults: A self-determination theory perspective. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13(4), 407-417.

Sykes, P. (2015). Experimenting with Cooperative learning to enhance non-academic outcomes in Interior Design education.

Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. Educational psychology, 25(6), 631-645.

Topping, K. J., Peter, C., Stephen, P., & Whale, M. (2004). Cross-age peer tutoring of science in the primary school: Influence on scientific language and thinking. Educational Psychology, 24(1), 57-75.

Topping, K., Nixon, J., Sutherland, J., & Yarrow, F. (2000). Paired writing: A framework for effective collaboration. Reading, 34(2), 79-89.

Wong, V. W., Ruble, L. A., Yu, Y., & McGrew, J. H. (2017). Too stressed to teach? Teaching quality, student engagement, and IEP outcomes. Exceptional children, 83(4), 412-427.

Zisk, K. M. (2009) Weapons, Culture, and Self-Interest: Soviet Defense Managers in the New Russia. N. Y.: Columbia University Press.

[ Downloaded from ieepj.hormozgan.ac.ir on 2025-04-21 ]

[ DOR: 20.1001.1.25884395.2019.1.4.1.6 ]

[ DOI: 10.29252/ieepj.1.4.5 ]