

The Effect of Cooperative Learning on EFL Learners' Success of Reading Comprehension: An Experimental Study Implementing Slavin's STAD Method

Ümmü ASLAN BERZENER

M.A., Teacher of English

springaurora@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9837-9204

Selma DENEME

Trakya University, Faculty of Education, ELT Department

selmadeneme@trakya.edu.tr

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7408-1163

ABSTRACT

Various teaching methods and techniques have been used for years to improve teaching English as a foreign language in Turkey. In order to increase student success, new methods and techniques are taking the place of teacher-centered traditional methods day by day. The cooperative learning method, which allows students to collaborate to achieve common learning goals rather than individual learning, has also become popular in English language classes. The purpose of this experimental study was to explore the effects of cooperative learning on EFL high school learners' reading comprehension. A pretest-posttest group research design was used. There was a total of 169 students involved in the study. The experimental groups ($n=85$) were treated with the techniques of the Student- Teams- Achievement Divisions (STAD) of the cooperative learning method for 4 weeks whereas the control groups ($n= 84$) were taught by the traditional method of direct instruction. An achievement posttest within the content taught was given to the groups at the end of the instruction. The mean scores of both groups on the test were compared through an independent samples t-test. The statistical results revealed the experimental groups progressed better than the control groups, indicating that the cooperative learning method was more effective on Turkish EFL learners' success of reading comprehension than the traditional method.

Keywords: Cooperative learning, Student Teams Achievement Divisions, STAD cooperative learning, teaching English, Turkish EFL learners

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of Humanism in the 1960s, traditional teaching left its place to student-centered learning methods such as the cooperative learning method which is a trending topic in the field of education. It is defined as one type of "instructional methods in which teachers organize students into small groups, which then work together to help one another learn academic content" (Slavin, 2011, p.344). Students involved in this method work together to maximize learning for themselves and for each other. Cooperative learning is an approach to learning a subject through working together, allowing students to create a common goal to solve a problem or fulfill a task (Christison, 1990). The communicative methods, constructivist ideas, and ordinary group work are fundamental to the approaches to cooperative learning. However, cooperative learning is more determined than conservative group work. This learning method has a clearer system, and it challenges students in various ways (Stenlev, 2003). During cooperative learning, students work in teams on structured learning tasks under conditions that meet five criteria; 1) Positive interdependence, team members must rely on one another to accomplish goal. 2) Individual accountability, members held accountable for doing their share of the work and mastering all material. 3) Face-to-face interaction, some or all work done by members working together. 4) Appropriate use of interpersonal skills. 5) Team members practice and receive instruction in leadership, decision-making, communication, and conflict management (Felder & Brent, 2004).

As the success of the individual depends on the success of the group, group members continuously contribute to the success of their friends. Group members help out either by teaching each other or by doing some of the work for each member. In other words, everyone in the group is responsible for each other's learning. In classroom practices, there is a competition between groups instead of competition between students. Thus, these practices improve trust among students. While the cooperative learning model gives each student the chance to help and receive assistance, it also enables students to interact face-to-face (Artzt, 1990; Ellis, 1990; Slavin, 1990).

Traditional teaching approaches usually require individual work and tend to be very demanding. Cooperative learning, on the other hand, requires active and effective working with others, which is a requirement of human

nature (Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Kagan 2014). In most of the studies which were tested in so many ways, it has been demonstrated that cooperative learning has positive and beneficial results like good morale, effective relations, student presence, confidence, and motivation (Johnson & Johnson, 2005; Johnson, 2009; Tran & Lewis, 2012). Studies on the cooperative learning model also reveal that this model is more effective than traditional teaching and positively affects the academic achievement of students (Johnson & Johnson, 1974; Sachs, Candlin, Rose & Shum, 2003; Peterson & Coltrane, 2003). According to studies, the outcome of cooperative learning (hereafter CL) which contributes to constructive relationships between students and their enthusiasm towards learning is more successful than individual working (Du, Yu, & Olinzock, 2011; Sachs et al., 2003; Slavin, 1988). In the same way, considerable research also demonstrates that CL produces higher achievement, more positive relationships among students, and healthier psychological adjustment than do competitive or individualistic experiences (Bonaparte, 1990; Cooper & Mueck, 1990; Doymuş, 2004; Johnson et al., 1991; Shemshadsara, 2012; Treisman, 1985). In addition, CL lessons can affect analytical thinking (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). Thus, it offers a solution to complications of training and teaching effectively which is insoluble using any other method (Slavin, 1991).

This solution also covers up language learning. After the popularity of the CL method in education, researchers, educators, and teachers started to implement this method into foreign language classes too. While exploring the effect of CL in language classes, some researchers have focused on students' attitudes and behaviors towards English classes after implementing CL and some others have dealt with learning differences between students who are part of CL and students who are not.

All teachers would admit that the most important aspect of language learning is that students need to practice the language. This belief has justified grounds. Brumfit (1984) claims that engaging communication and cooperation in language learning is obligatory because it is necessary for the learners to have the capability to progress in the specific language and also be capable of expressing themselves like they wish to do. In language learning, there are many advantages for CL. To begin with, CL teaching activities can enhance the academic development and problem-solving skills of second language learners besides their motivation. Additionally, second language learners have the opportunity to perform and use their logical thinking abilities better in collaborative contexts (Wentzel & Wakins, 2002). Another point is that students might not receive efficient results by interacting with only their teacher instead of communicating and learning new words and patterns with peers. Despite the fact that teachers are qualified to satisfy the requirements of students, they cannot think the same way as the pupils because of the difference between their cognitive levels. In line with this, Ghaith (2003) suggests that collaborating while learning a foreign language contributes to constructive attitudes and a sense of fulfillment among students helps to accomplish goals easier, and boosts students' confidence. It also helps them to wield the language according to their needs (Liao & Yang, 2012). Language skills improve when language learners are engaged in CL activities (Baquero, 2011; Ngubane, 2013) and there is a progress in students' learning level and positive attitude towards learning English (Chen, 2005). Research also shows that the use of CL aided significantly to boost language learners' grammar competence even though their tutors neglected this language component in teaching (Kezoui, 2015). In addition, it has been determined that CL has a positive effect on the enthusiasm of English learners and the intrinsic motivation of the learners (Ning & Hornby; 2014; Oksal, 2014). CL was also found to have a positive impact on improving English vocabulary skills (Bilen, 2015). In their research, Kartal and Özbek (2016) found that students learning English with CL developed a positive attitude towards learning English, CL, working in group and academic success.

Although the number of research studies conducted with the CL method in Turkey is not very high, the current researches have been comparing the traditional learning methods with the CL method. The common point of research conducted in different levels of education and subject areas at home and abroad is that the CL method is more successful and effective than the traditional methods in terms of attitudes towards school and schoolmates. The number of studies conducted in the field of teaching English and CL is quite low (Açıkgöz, 1991, 1994; Aslandağ-Soylu, 2008; Gömleksiz & Onur, 2005; Pala, 1995;). Since there is not much research on the application of the CL method in the teaching of English in the primary school dimension in our country, such research is needed (Baş, 2009).

Research shows that there are several purposes for the use of CL in foreign language teaching. It is an excellent way not only to let students use the language and master the grammar and terminology of the language but also to provide emotional help and encourage social activities between pupils. By providing this kind of environment, competition between students will diminish, thus it will facilitate more effective learning. Since the number of research investigating the effect and importance of CL in learning English as a foreign language is quite limited,

more studies are needed in this area. Therefore, this study aims to contribute to the literature by examining the role of CL on the overall success of Turkish EFL learners.

METHOD OF THE STUDY

The research method of this study is quantitative, a strategy of inquiry moving from the underlying assumptions and flowing to research design and data collection (Cohen, Manion, & Marrison, 2000). A pretest-posttest group research design was used under the quantitative experimental research method to explore whether the use of CL can improve the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language. Two types of data sources have been used: A placement test (Cambridge Empower Placement Test, 2018) to group the students equally, and an “Achievement Test” was circulated as the pretest and the posttest of the study. The test was prepared by experts adapting questions on the unit "legendary figures" from the question pool of the National Ministry of Education of Turkey.

The school where the research was conducted is a state school in İstanbul. One of the researchers of this study is an EFL teacher at the school where direct instruction, one of the traditional teaching methods, was used. The school was convenient for the research in terms of data collection and easy access during school hours. Furthermore, the researcher conducted the research in her classroom, which afforded her an opportunity to investigate teaching practices and possible solutions to the challenges in the teaching context. So, convenient sampling strategy was used to select the participant of this study. High school students were identified for the experiment. One hundred and sixty-nine 10th grade students participated in the study. 67% of the students were females ($n= 114$), and 33% were males ($n= 55$). Their English level was assumed as A2 and both groups were taught by the researcher.

The study which hypothesizes that the students in CL classes would be more successful than the ones treated by the direct instruction was guided by the following research question: Is there a significant difference between the CL methods and the direct instruction approach on the success of reading comprehension of the EFL learners? In order to test the differences in success between the groups, an independent T-test was conducted. The experimental design of the study is illustrated in the following table.

Table 1. Experiment design for the study groups

Groups	Instructional Methods	Pretest	Treatments	Posttest
Experimental group	STAD method of the CL	Q1	X1	Q3
Control group	Traditional method of direct instruction	Q2	X2	Q4

Q1: How do the experiment group learners perform in the achievement test before they are trained through STAD model?

Q2: How do the control group learners perform in the achievement test before they are trained through the traditional direct method?

Q3: How do the experiment group learners perform in the achievement test after they have been trained through STAD model?

Q4: How do the control group learners perform in the achievement test after they have been trained through the traditional direct method?

X1: The experimental group received “CL instruction” via STAD method.

X2: The control group received traditional method of direct instruction.

O1, O2: Pretest included a Ministry of National Education (MoNe) Achievement Test (a test designed by experts on the covered language content by selecting questions from the MoNe question pool).

O3, O4: Another version of MoNe Achievement Test on the same language content was the reading comprehension posttest.

Implementing the STAD Method of Cooperative Learning

There are different forms of cooperative learning (illustrated in table 2), such as Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), Jigsaw, Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), Learning Together (LT), Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Team Assisted Individualization (TAI), Academic Controversy (AC), Group Investigation (GI), etc. (Kagan, 1992). The idea which lies beneath all cooperative learning methods is that learners work together to achieve a task and they are responsible not only for their own learning but also for one another’s (Slavin 1990). The experimental groups in the research were designed and treated by implementing Slavin’s (1995) Students Team-Achievement Divisions (STAD) method of the CL. According to Slavin (1994) “the main idea behind STAD is to motivate students to encourage and help one another master skills presented by the teacher” (p. 23). In this method, students with different skills and gender are grouped and assigned to cooperate

to solve issues and help each other understand the lesson presented earlier by the teacher. It encourages team members to do well in both collaborative and individual works. Slavin describes five major components of STAD: a) class presentation: The teacher introduces the lesson to the students before they start cooperating. b) Teams: Students work in groups on the given task to reach the shared goal. c) Quizzes: Students take individual quizzes, they are not allowed to help each other during the test. d) Individual improvement: Individual improvement scores are valued to see whether students have improved according to their past performance and how much they have improved. e) Team recognition: Groups may win certificates or other kinds of rewards if their averages of improvement scores exceed a certain level.

Table 2. Modern Methods of CL (from Johnson, Johnson, & Stanne, 2000)

Reseracher-Developer	Method	Developed
Johnson & Johnson, 1999	Learning Together	Mid-1960s
DeVries & Edwards, 1973	Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT)	Early 1970s
Sharan & Sharan, 1976, 1992	Group Investigation	Mid 1970s
Johnson & Johnson, 1979, 1995	Constructive Controversy	Mid 1970s
Aronson et al., 1978	Jigsaw Procedure	Late 1970s
Slavin, 1978	Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD)	Late 1970s
Cohen, 1994	Complex Instruction	Early 1980s
Slavin et al., 1982	Team-Assisted Instruction (TAI)	Early 1980s
Kagan, 1985	Cooperative Structures	Mid-1980s
Stevens, et al., 1987	Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC)	Late 1980s

SOURCE: Adapted from Johnson & Johnson (2002).

Forming the research groups

The research was conducted with four classes of students- two were experimental and two were control groups. The levels of the groups were equalized by the placement test consisting of forty questions testing reading comprehension, vocabulary, and grammar knowledge of the EFL learners. The test was used for homogenizing the linguistic levels of the participants. By doing so, the study bias that could occur between the control group and experimental group is reduced. In the control groups, the direct instruction method was used without informing the students about the research. Experimental groups, on the other hand, were informed about the research and the STAD method in advance. The participation process of the research was also explained to them. Experimental groups were divided into six subgroups by the first researcher to ensure equality in the groups. Groups were in a heterogeneous structure consisting of students with different abilities and personality traits. After grouping, the students' desks were rearranged in U shape so that the students could have comfortable eye contact with the teachers and to enable group work and discussion. Each group was then asked to choose a name for their groups. They chose their group names from colors. In order to provide a competitive environment based on the method, the students were asked to select a group representative in a democratic way. The distribution of participants by gender and groups is as follows:

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the groups

Group		Gender	n	percentage
Control group	Group A	Female	32	19
		Male	11	6.5
	Group B	Female	22	13
		Male	19	11
Experimental group	Group A	Female	28	16.5
		Male	15	9
	Group B	Female	32	19
		Male	10	6

Teaching materials

This study was designed as part of the class time. Thus, the study material had to be part of the coursebook provided by the Ministry of National Education of Turkey, in our case, it was the coursebook “Count Me In”, for the 10th graders. The third unit of the textbook “Legendary Figures” was selected as the main content of the study. The main reason for selecting this topic was because of the time period. In other words, the schedule of the study was

arranged in a way that the experiment had to be implemented in October as the Ministry of Education assigned teachers to teach this unit this month.

Lesson preparations

The research was conducted during four-course sessions. As part of the research, eight lesson plans (see appendix for a sample lesson plan) were designed by the researcher to teach both control and experimental groups. Each of the lessons took 40 minutes and each lesson plan was designed to cover 80 minutes (two lesson hours in the Turkish school system). The unit to be covered in the first lesson was titled “Legendary Figures” from the 10th grade English textbook “Count Me In”.

Background of the lessons: Before proceeding to the new topic in the class of the 10th grade English textbook “Count Me In”, all students were asked to come to class prepared. Students were responsible for reading the text and vocabulary of the new unit. Each student ensured to be ready for the lesson.

Lesson implementation

Eight lesson plans based on the literature and CL content were designed to teach the groups. The lesson plans for the control groups were simply based on the “Count Me In” coursebook which was already being taught in the public schools in Turkey. The experimental group received the treatment while the control group did not. According to the research hypothesis, we expect the STAD method to have an efficient impact on the experimental group. The control groups were taught by the traditional method of direct instruction whereas the lessons conducted in the experimental group classes used some special teaching techniques and procedures. In order to fit the research requirements, Slavin’s (1995) STAD (Student Team- Achievement Division) method was applied during reading lessons in experimental groups adapting the five components of the method. The overall lesson process in experimental classes is as follows:

1) Firstly, the teacher briefly introduced the reading task then he asked the groups to read the text (class presentation). 2) After choosing the responsible group, the text was divided into sections and each individual in the group was allowed to read their sections with their group members. Meanwhile, the successful students and the other students were encouraged. Errors made during the reading activities were corrected by the teacher. The blackboard was used when necessary for the activities. After each CL task, learners were provided with an opportunity to discuss their experiences within their groups and then as a class. They studied the material as a group, and each group member checked their understanding by discussing the task. They also talked about what should be changed or improved for the next lesson. Different roles were assigned to the learners in each CL group, ensuring that each group had at least two high achievers, two average and two slow learners and that all groups were gender-balanced as far as possible. Contrary to the traditional classroom, the role of the teacher in cooperative classes was to facilitate the learning program by assigning the task to the learners, was to motivate, encourage, assist them when needed, promote discovery learning, and awarding the groups a score (teams). 3) After studying the text and its vocabulary, a quiz (the text-related questions) was answered by the students. During the quiz, they were not allowed to help each other (quizzes). 4) All activities processed throughout the course were rated based on individual ratings and grades of the students. The total score of the members in the group also created the group’s rating (individual improvement). 5) At the end of the week, the group with the highest score was declared as the winners of that week (team recognition).

During the four-week training (eight treatment in total), students in both groups improved their reading skills, vocabulary and grammar competencies. Students were observed to be more involved in the course with the STAD method. A positive competition between the students was observed by the researcher. Besides, the CL-class students tended to ask questions more comfortably in their groups. So, they were observed to develop self-esteem and were eager to help their group mates in CL classes. Thus, affective barriers to learning were decreased in CL classes. The lessons were processed for two months as described above. After two months, the students were then tested. A posttest was implemented to investigate the progress of the students.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Normality test was conducted to analyze the distribution of data. We found the data was normally distributed ($p > 0.05$) and therefore an independent t-test (see table 4) was conducted to compare students’ scores in the placement test, pretest, and posttest. The analysis was designated by the hypothesis of the research. The t-test was used to investigate whether there was a significant difference between the mean score of the groups on the achievement tests. The level of significance was 0.05.

Table 4. A Comparison of Reading Comprehension Achievement Test Scores of the Groups

	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig</i>
Placement Test	Control	83	25.398	6.2741	.6887	-.215	164	.830
	Experimental	83	25.181	6.6957	0.7350			
Pretest	Control	86	74.6512	10.45412	1.12730	2.117	167	.076
	Experimental	83	78,0542	10,43534	1,14543			
Posttest	Control	86	76.5349	15.13737	1.63230	5.897	168	,000
	Experimental	84	84.9464	9.35351	1.02055			

There was no significant difference for placement test results between experimental group ($M=25,181$, $SD=6,6957$) and control group ($M=25,398$, $SD=6,2741$) results; $t(164) = -0,215$, $p= 0,830 > 0,05$. There was also no significant difference for pretest results between experimental group ($M=74,6512$, $SD=10,45412$) and control group ($M=78,054$, $SD=10,43$) results; $t(167) = 2,117$, $p = 0,076 > 0,05$. On the other hand, there was a significant difference for posttest results between experimental group ($M=84,9464$, $SD=9,35351$) and control group ($M=76,5349$, $SD=15,13737$) results; $t(168) = 5,897$, $p=0,000 < 0,05$. These results suggest that there is a group difference for posttest but not for placement test or pretest.

When the pretest and posttest of the control group and the experimental group students compared, it was found that the students of the experimental group increased their mean scores from 78,0542 to 84,9464 by 6,8 where the students of the control group increased their mean scores from 74,6512 to 76,5349 by 1,8. This result shows that there was a significant improvement in the performance of the experimental group over the control group in the posttest. Thus, the hypothesis of the study; “Students who are taught by the CL method will be more successful than the students who are taught by traditional method” is accepted.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Analyzing the differences between the progress of the CL classes and direct instruction classes was the aim of this study. Thus, an independent t-test was conducted to compare students’ scores in the placement test, pretest, and posttest for both class types. As seen in the statistics, there was no significant difference for the placement test and pretest results between the experimental group and the control group. However, there was a significant difference between the groups for their progress. These results suggest that there is a group difference for the posttest but not for the placement test or pretest. These results, therefore, prove the hypothesis that students who are taught by the CL method will be more successful than those who are taught by the direct instruction. The result of our study is similar to the results found by Bilen (2015) and Karabay (2005) who also found that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group for the posttests (Bilen, 2015). Bilen’s study was conducted with elementary school students and the current study was conducted with high school students. A further study may investigate whether there is a different effect of CL for different grade levels.

The finding of our study also coincides with the findings of some other studies (Gömlüksiz, 2007; Kezoui, 2015; Pesen & Bakır, 2016) those showed significant differences in improving vocabulary knowledge and grammar competency in English. Similarly, in another study, Özkılıç (1996) investigated the effects of CL on students’ progress and retention for English. The study found similar results that university students in the CL group had more progress than the students in the control group (Özkılıç, 1996). In addition to that, in their study on language teaching, Gümüş and Buluç (2007) found that students enjoy lessons with a collaborative learning method and understand the lesson better, become more active in the lesson, increase their self-esteem and learn more easily. On the other hand, there are studies whose results do not coincide with this study. For instance, CL was found to have a minor role in language teaching, as teachers are not familiar with this way of structuring group work (Árnadóttir, 2014).

The effect of the CL method on English learning was studied in another study showing similar results. Yaşar (1993) conducted research on students who took text reading and analysis lessons in the Department of Foreign Language Education in order to test the effect of the teaching method with small groups in comparison to traditional teaching methods in developing foreign language reading skills. In the research, the effectiveness of teaching with small groups and traditional teaching methods on student achievement has been tested in terms of developing reading skills in the foreign language and developing the comprehension power of reading in a foreign language. As a result of the data collected, it was concluded that the teaching method with small groups based on collaboration was more effective in developing listening and speaking skills in a foreign language (Yaşar, 1993).

The study conducted by Baş (2009) had similar results. In his study, Baş investigated the effects of CL on learning English. Thus, he designed a study with 40 middle school students in Konya, Turkey. Based on the analysis, the researcher found that collaborative learning method (Unification-II) activities provided more positive effects on learners' access levels at the end of the lesson "The Present Simple Tense" compared to traditional learning-teaching methods activities. In another study conducted on the fifth-grade students of primary education, it was concluded that CL activities were more effective than cluster study on students' attitudes towards social studies lessons (Oral, 2000).

In the research conducted by Açıkgöz (1992), the effects of collaborative learning techniques and the effects of traditional education on the academic success, retention levels and affective characteristics of university students were examined. The research was carried out on 48 students attending learning psychology lesson under experimental conditions. As a result of the findings obtained from the research, it was revealed that the CL method was more effective than the traditional teaching method on the affective characteristics of the students (1992). Even though our study was applied for a short period of time, there was significant progress of the students in the CL classes. This result supports the statement that the CL method increases the speed of the student in the learning process, motivates her for learning, and keeps her active in the process by improving her knowledge and skills (Liang, 2002). In short, there is overwhelming evidence that CL as a pedagogical practice has had a profound effect on student achievement and socialization (Slavin, 2014). When it comes to the effects of STAD on success, the studies found that STAD increased the academic success of students, that it gave a positive attitude to the study program and was effective in the teaching process (Hanafi & Basuki, 2018; Ünlü & Aydın, 2011; Van Wayk, 2007; Van Wayk; 2015). The CL method is found to be more effective on students' comprehension of what they read than traditional teaching (Adams 1995; Bölükbaş & et al. 2011; Güngör & Açıkgöz, 2005). In the same vein, our research result has also witnessed the positive effect of STAD on student progress in reading comprehension, vocabulary knowledge and grammar competency in English lessons.

In conclusion, the results of this study showed that experimental group students progressed more and that STAD is an effective learning method in teaching English as a foreign language. The findings of the study expose that CL is more effective for English learning than traditional teaching methods. Even though the traditional method which is applied in most of the schools also helps the students improve their English, CL contributes to student success more by promoting language skills. While many different cooperative learning methods are being advocated and used in education, educators have very little guidance as to which specific cooperative learning methods will be most effective in their situation and how to implement them in the classroom. From this aspect, this study aims to provide a contribution to the foreign language teaching methods and proposes a guideline for EFL teachers who wish to implement the STAD method to enhance their students' progress.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This research was limited to four weeks and eight treatments in total due to the limitations caused by the curriculum and the course materials of the school. In addition, the number of the participants was limited to 169 students. Future research can increase the number of participants and make applications that extend over a longer period of time.

REFERENCES

- Acıkgöz, K.Ü. (1991). Cooperative, Competitive and Traditional Activities in Foreign Language Achievement and Retention. *TESOL 25th Annual Convention and Exposition*, March 24-28, New York.
- Acıkgöz, K.Ü. (1992). *İşbirlikli öğrenme: Kuram, araştırma, uygulama*. Malatya: Uğurel Press.
- Adams, E. T. (1995). The effects of cooperative learning on the achievement and self-esteem levels of students in the inclusive classroom, Unpublished PhD thesis, Wayne State University.
- Árnadóttir, K.H. (2014). A Study of the Use of Group Work in Language Studies in Icelandic Secondary Schools, Cooperative Learning in Foreign Language Teaching. *Háskóli Íslands Ritgerð til MA-prófs í enskukennslu*.
- Artzt, A.F. and C.M. Newman. (sept. 1994). "Cooperative Learning". *Journal of Mathematics Teacher*. (pp. 448 - 452).
- Aslan Berzener, Ü. (2020). *The Role of Cooperative Learning on Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Edirne.
- Aslandağ-Soylu, B. (2008). *İngilizce Öğretiminde İşbirlikli Öğrenme Yönteminin İlköğretim 6. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Akademik Başarılarına Etkisi*. Niğde Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Niğde.
- Baş, G. (2009). İngilizce dersinde işbirlikli öğrenme yönteminin öğrencilerin erişiş, derse karşı tutumlarına ve öğrenilenlerin kalıcılığına etkisi. *Millî Eğitim*, 184 (Güz), 240-257.

- Baş, G. (2009). Sınıf yönetiminde çoklu zekâ. *Eğitim Dergisi*. Mart, Sayı:23.
- Bilen, D. (2015). *The effects of cooperative learning strategies on vocabulary skills of 4th grade students*. Ufuk University Graduate School of Social Sciences Department of English Language Teaching, Master Thesis. Ankara.
- Baquero, M. R. (2011). *Cooperative Learning: A Meaningful Way to Learn English* Universidad De La Salle Facultad De Ciencias De La Educación Licenciatura En Lengua Castellana, Inglés Y Francés Bogota.
- Bonaparte, E. P.C. (1990). The effect of cooperative classroom organization for mastery learning on the mathematical achievement and self-esteem of urban second-grade pupils. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50(7), 1944.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The Role of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bölükbaş, F., Keskin, F., & Polat, M. (2011). The effectiveness of cooperative learning in the reading comprehension skills in Turkish as a foreign language. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 10(4), 330-335.
- Bölükbaş, F. (2014). Jigsaw-ıv Tekniğinin Yabancı Öğrencilerin Türkçedeki Temel Zamanları Öğrenmeleri Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 3(3),96-209.
- Chen, S. (2005). Cooperative learning, multiple intelligences and proficiency: Application in college English language teaching and learning. Thesis in Education. Australia Catholic University. Victoria. Australia
- Chen, H.Y. & Goswami, J.S. (2011). Structuring Cooperative Learning in Teaching English Pronunciation. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 26-32.
- Christison, M. A." Cooperative Learning in the EFL Classroom". *English Teaching Forum*. Oct. 1990, (pp 6-9).
- Cooper, J., & Mueck, R., (1990). Student involvement in learning: Cooperative learning and college instruction. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 1, 68- 76.
- Doymus, S. B. (2004). Effects of cooperative learning method on academic achievement and attitude in science class. *Turkish Journal of Science Education*, 1(2), 103-115.
- Ellis, Susan S. "Introducing Cooperative Learning" *Educational Leadership*. January 1990. (pp. 34-37).
- Du, J., Yu, C. & Olinzock, A. A. (2011). Enhancing collaborative learning: impact of question prompts design for online discussion. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 53(1), 28-41.
- Felder, R. M., & Brent. (2004). *Cooperative learning*. National Effective Teaching Institute.
- Gömlüksiz, M. N. & Onur, E. (2005). İngilizce Öğreniminde İşbirlikli Öğrenme Yönteminin Öğrenci Başarısı Üzerindeki Etkisi (Elazığ Vali Tevfik Gür İlköğretim Okulu Örneği). *Milli Eğitim*. Bahar. 166.
- Gömlüksiz, M. N. (2007). Effectiveness of cooperative learning (jigsaw II) method in teaching English as a foreign language to engineering students (Case of Firat University, Turkey). *Journal European Journal of Engineering Education*, 32(5), 613-625.
- Ghaith, G. (2003). Effects of the learning together model of cooperative learning on English as a foreign language reading achievement, academic self-esteem, and feelings of school alienation. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education*, 27(3), 451-474.
- Gümüş, O. & Buluç, B. (2007). İşbirliğine Dayalı Öğrenme Yaklaşımının Türkçe Dersinde Akademik Başarıya Etkisi ve Öğrencilerin Derse İlgisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, (49), 7-30.
- Güngör, A. ve Açıkgöz, K. (2005). İşbirlikçi öğrenme ve geleneksel öğretimin okuduğunu anlama üzerinde etkileri ve cinsiyet ile ilişkileri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 43, 354-378.
- Hanafî, A., & Basuki, I. (2018). Student Team Achievement Divisions: Its effect on electrical motor installation knowledge competence. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 336, 012025. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/336/1/012025>.
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1974). Instructional goal structures: cooperative, competitive, or individualistic. *Review of Educational Research*, 44, 213-240.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. & Smith, K. A. (1991). Cooperative learning: Increasing college faculty instructional productivity. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, No.4.
- Johnson, R.T. & Johnson, D.W. (1994). An overview of cooperative learning. Originally published in: J. Thousand, A. Villa & A. Nevin (Eds), *Creativity and Collaborative Learning*; Brookes Press, Baltimore.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2005). New Developments in Social Interdependence Theory. *Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs*, 131(4), 285-358. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/MONO.131.4.285-358>.
- Johnson DW and Johnson RT. (2009) An educational psychology success story: social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *EducRes*. 38(5): 365–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X09339057>.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). *Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

- Kagan S., (2014). *Brain-Friendly Teaching: Tools, Tips, and Structures*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.
- Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning*. Paseo Espada: Resources for Teachers, Inc.
- Karabay, A. (2005). *Kubaşık öğrenme etkinliklerinin ilköğretim beşinci sınıd Türkçe dersinde öğrencilerin dinlenme ve konuşma becerileri üzerindeki etkileri*. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans tezi. Adana.
- Kartal, Ş. & Özbek, R., (2016). İşbirlikli öğrenme tekniklerinden ötb tekniğiyle işlenen ingilizce dersine ilişkin öğrenci görüşleri. *The Journal of International Lingual, Social and Educational Sciences*, 2(2), 85-106.
- Kezoui, N. (2015). *Cooperative learning groups in EFL grammar classes: A learners' boost outcomes the case of second year EFL students at Tlemcen University*. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.
- Liang, T. (2002). *Implementing cooperative learning in EFL teaching: process and effects*. (Doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan Normal University). [Online] Available: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Thesis_Liang_Tsailing.pdf (February 1, 2021).
- Liao, H.C & Yang, C.C (2012). "Teaching practice and cultural difference of an English as foreign language classroom in Taiwan". *English Language Teaching* 5(11), 151-160.
- Ngubane, N.I., (2013). *The effectiveness of cooperative learning in an English first additional language classroom*. Dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of the Master of Education in the School of Education University of Kwazulu-Natal.
- Ning, H. & Hornby, G. (2014). The impact of cooperative learning on tertiary EFL learners' motivation. *Educational Review*, 66(1), 108-124
- Oksal, B. (2014). *The effects of cooperative learning and technology on English language learners' speaking anxiety and motivation level: a case study at a Turkish private university*. Graduate School of Educational Sciences of Bahçeşehir University. Master Thesis, Istanbul 147p.
- Oral, B., (2000). Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde İşbirlikli Öğrenme ile Küme Çalışması Yöntemlerinin Öğrencilerin Erişileri Derse Yönelik Tutumları ve Öğrenilenlerin Kalıcılığı Üzerindeki Etkileri. *Çukurova Üniversitesi EF Dergisi*, 2 (19), 43-49.
- Özkılıç, R., (1996). Farklı İşbirlikli Öğrenme Yöntemlerinin Hizmet Öncesi Ortaöğretim Öğretmenlerinin Başarısı ve Hatırda Tutması Üzerindeki Etkileri. 4. *Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Bildirileri 1, Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No.1076, EF Yayınları No.51*, 253-274.
- Pala, A. (1995). *İşbirlikli Öğrenmenin Yabancı Dil Öğretimindeki Etkililiği*. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İzmir.
- Pesen, A. Bakır B. (2016). İşbirliğine Dayalı Öğrenme Yaklaşımının Başarıya Etkisi. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 6(11), 71-84.
- Peterson, E. & Coltrane, B. (2003). Culture in second language teaching. *ERIC Digest*, December.
- Sachs, G.T., Candlin, C.N., Rose, K.R. & Shum, S. (2003). Developing cooperative learning in the EFL/ESL secondary classroom. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 34(3), 338-369.
- Shemshadsara, Z.G. (2012). Developing cultural awareness in foreign language teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 95-99.
- Stenlev, J. (2003). Cooperative learning in foreign language teaching. *Sprogforum*, 25, 3342.
- Slavin, R. E. (1988). Cooperative learning and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 46(2), 31-33.
- Slavin RE 1990. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice*. Massachusetts: Allen and Bacon.
- Slavin, R.E. (1991). Synthesis of research on cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership*, 48(5), 71-82.
- Slavin, R.E. (2011). Instruction Based on Cooperative Learning. In R. E. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction* (pp. 344-360). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Slavin, R. (2014). Cooperative learning and academic achievement: Why does groupwork work? *Anales De Psicologia*, 30, 785-791
- Tarım, K., & Akdeniz, F. (2008). The effects of cooperative learning on Turkish elementary students' mathematics achievement and attitude towards mathematics using TAI and STAD methods. *Edu. Stud. Math.*, 67, 91
- Tran VD & Lewis R. (2012) Effects of cooperative learning on students at an Giang University in Vietnam. *Int Educ Stud*.5 (1), 86–99.
- Treisman, U. (1985). A study of mathematics performance of black students at University of California, Berkley., *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47(1), 1641.
- Yaşar, S., (1993). *Yabancı Dilde Okuma Becerilerinin Geliştirilmesinde Küçük Gruplarla Öğretim Yönteminin Etkililiği*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları No.693, EF Yayınları No.34, 1-145.
- Van Wyk MM (2007). The use of cooperative learning in the Further Education and Training phase in the Free State province. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Bloemfontein: University of the Free State. [38] Walstad WB, R

- Van Wyk, M. M. (2015). Measuring the effectiveness of Student Teams Achievement Divisions as a teaching strategy on Grade 10 Learners' Economic Knowledge. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(2), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2015.11917664>.
- Varank, Ş. & Kuzucuoglu, G. (2007). The effect of learning together technique of cooperative learning method on students' mathematics achievement and cooperative study skills. *Elementary Education Online*, 6(3): 323-332.
- Ünlü, M. & Aydıntan, S. (2011). İlköğretim 8. Sınıf Öğrencilerin Matematik Öğretiminde Öğrenci Takımları Başarı Bölümleri Tekniği Hakkındaki Görüşleri. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1), 101-117.
- Wentzel, K. R., & Watkins, D. E. (2002). Peer relationships and collaborative learning as contexts for academic enablers. *School Psychology Review*, 31 (3), 366- 377.

APPENDIX A: Lesson Plan for Lesson 1 (Experimental Group)

The objectives:

- Talking about legendary figures such as Atatürk and Fatih Sultan Mehmet
- Describing characters and settings in an event in the past

Resources and Materials

1. Paper and pencil
2. Board marker

Class period: 40+40minutes (two class periods)

Language Skill: Reading Comprehension

Activities and procedures

1. Warm-up: the students will be asked to close their eyes for one minute and think about the legendary figure mentioned in the text
2. Group selection: The students are divided into six groups based on students' prior knowledge
3. After determining the group responsible for reading the text, the text is divided into sections and each individual in the group is assigned to read a section from the text. The students who are successful at reading are given scores and the other students are encouraged.
4. The teacher asks the students to read the whole text. The board is used when necessary for their activities.
5. Teacher participation: Errors are corrected by the teacher.
6. "If you were" activity: After reading the assigned text, the students will be asked what they would do if they were the legendary figure mentioned in the text.
7. The group members will discuss their ideas. They will be able to use the board allocated for them.

Evaluation: The best group who brings the best solution will be elected by the rest of the class. The voting will be done filling in anonymous survey.

APPENDIX B: Lesson Plan for Lesson 1 (Control Group)

The objectives:

- Talking about legendary figures such as Atatürk and Fatih Sultan Mehmet
- Describing characters and settings in an event in the past

Resources and Materials

1. Paper and pencil
2. Textbook

Class period: 40+40minutes (two class periods)

Language Skill: Reading Comprehension

Activities and procedures

1. The students work individually. The students are asked to match the words on the left column with their definitions on the right column
2. The students are asked to read "The Conquest of Constantinople" topic from the textbook.
3. Students respond to the reading questions about the topic listed in the textbook.
4. The students read rest of the text
5. The students fill in the blanks
6. There is no group work
7. Teacher participation: Errors made during the reading activity are corrected by the teacher.

Evaluation: The students do not get any grades for their class performance. They are assessed via their class exams.