

The Impact of 'Cooperative Learning' on Learning English as a Foreign Language on the Students' Achievement of the College of Education

Dr. Alaadin K. Abdullah

Ghanim M. Hussein

University of Kirkuk /
College of Education for Humanities

تاريخ نشر البحث: ٢٥ / ٦ / ٢٠١٥

تاريخ استلام البحث: ٢٩ / ٣ / ٢٠١٥

Abstract

The current study tries to shed light on the impact of cooperative learning on developing, expanding, and growing the students' information in learning English as a foreign language. This study aims to investigate the effect of the cooperative method and compare it with traditional methods of teaching English language. The study also tries to reveal the benefits of 'cooperative learning' in many aspects.

A sample of 84 students in the first year, Department of Psychological and Educational Sciences, College of Education, University of Kirkuk, has been chosen.

They are divided into two equal groups: 42 students for the control group and 42 students for the experimental group. It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference between the means of the control group and that of the experimental group. After instruction for 6 weeks, a test has been constructed, its validity and reliability have been measured, and then applied on the students. The data have been analyzed, results obtained and finally a number of conclusions and recommendations are given.

Section One: Introduction

1.1 Problem of the Study

More than 80% of the instruction in schools consists of lectures, seat work, or competition in which students are isolated from one another and forbidden to interact. Most classroom time is spent in “teacher talk”, with only 1% of the students classroom time is used for reasoning about or expressing an opinion (Johnson et al, 1984)and (Goodlad, 1984).

According to the teachers who use a traditional method, the fundamental purpose of learning a foreign language is to be able to read literature written in the target language and provide students with a good mental exercise which helps to develop their minds. Teachers as controllers apply the following: tell student things, organize drills (i.e. Teacher-centered).

The main demerit of the traditional method is that it does virtually nothing to enhance a student's communicative ability in the language. It neglects students' needs, interests and abilities (Al-Rifai and Mizhir, 2012:11). The students who were taught by cooperative strategies learned more than the students who were taught by traditional method. (ibid)

Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson and scone (1981)conducted a meta-analysis of 122 studies related to cooperative learning and concluded that there was evidence for the superiority of cooperative learning in promoting achievement over competitive and individualist strategies. Cooperative learning as an instructional methodology is an option for teachers. It is currently the least frequently used in university level or stage.

1.2 Aim of the Study

This study tries to investigate the impact of cooperative learning method on student's achievement in learning English as a foreign language.

1.3 Hypothesis of the Study

There is no significant difference between the mean scores of the control group (taught by the traditional method), and the mean scores of the experimental group (taught by the cooperative method).

1.4 Limits of the Study

The study is limited to the students of first year in the Department of Psychological and Educational Sciences, College of Education, University of Kirkuk. Who are studying EFL in the academic year 2013- 2014

1.5 Value of the Study

The study has a theoretical value because of shedding light on a new method of teaching English to students of other subjects such as those who study psychology and education. It has also a practical value for students who study English as a foreign language, teachers and textbook writers. So this study could change the situation in our classrooms.

Chang, et al (1999) noted that every cooperative-learning strategy, when used appropriately enable students to move beyond the text, memorize basic facts, and learn lower level skills. Bilgin et al (2006) state that cooperative group, apart from academic benefits, has been found to promote self-esteem, interpersonal relationship and improve attitudes towards school and peers (cited in JayaPraba, 2013).

In the cooperative learning strategy; students have the opportunity to discuss their answers with a fellow student. The students could jot-down their answers to a question, turn to their neighbour and talk about their answers and share the same with the entire class. It forces students to discuss their thinking, analyze their position, and explain their points of view to their classmates. By their sharing information with the entire class, students will be able to evaluate themselves by gathering information from other classmates².

Learners learn to express themselves with a greater confidence when working in small teams(ibid).

If decide to assign each student in a team a role (such as reporter, recorder, time keeper, and materials manager), might want to rotate roles each week or each activity. By rotations, students develop the skills they most need to practice. (ibid)

Cooperative learning is particularly beneficial for any student learning language as a second or foreign language. Cooperative learning activities promote students interaction, which helps the development of language and the learning of concepts and content. Cooperative learning method is important to assign learners to different teams so that they can benefit from English language role models.

Several studies have examined the effects of cooperative learning on student learning. Joysvold, Marine, and Johnson (1977) found that cooperative learning strategies promoted positive attitudes toward both didactic and inquiry methods of teaching science, and students taught by cooperative strategies believed that they had learned more from the lessons presented throughout competitive strategies., Woodarski et al. (1980) found significant gains between the pretest and post test scores. They concluded that cooperative learning was an effective method of teaching nutrition.

Humphreys, Johnson, and Johnson (1982) compared cooperative, competitive, and individualistic strategies in science classes. They found that students who were taught by cooperative method learned and retained significantly more information than students taught by the other methods. Perrault (1983) found that cooperative learning resulted insignificantly higher achievement in individual arts students at the knowledge and comprehension levels of cognitive domain according to Bloom's taxonomy, but not of the application level, when compared to students taught by competitive methods.

Allen and Vansickle (1984) used student Teams-Achievement divisions (STAD) as the experimental treatment in a study involving low-achievement students. They found that the

cooperative learning group scored significantly higher on a world geography test. Sherman and Thomas (1986) in a high school general mathematics classes taught by cooperative and individualistic methods found similar results. Slavin (1991) reviewed 67 studies concerning cooperative learning and found that overall, 61% of the cooperative learning classes achieved significantly higher test scores than the traditional classes.

Much research has been conducted over the years to show the benefits of the cooperative learning. Cooperative learning activities are those that require students to work in small to complete a joint project. Students work together as a team to not only learn the material but also help each other to succeed (Kelly, 1991: 50).

Students who work together as a team share a common goal. Sharing a common goal allows students to learn to trust each other as they achieve more than would be possible on their own. All members in the group need to practise communicating in a positive manner. Skills should be directly modeled by the teacher and reinforced throughout the activity.

Students working in a group will have their own responsibilities. This will require them to make many decisions that could affect their entire team, as the teacher and facilitator attempts to get all individuals of the team talking together and model effective “conflict resolution” for them. This study introduces a good experiment for teachers in English department and other departments that teach English to improve their academic performance among students and teachers. The teacher would have the opportunity to evaluate the student's understanding based on the content of discussions. This study is also valuable for those persons who are interested in teaching process and for educational centers or institute that teach English as a foreign language. This study tries to show effects of cooperative language learning method on language learning, compared with traditional method of language teaching.

1.6 Definitions of Basic Terms

Language

It is the “kind of tool used for communication among people”. (Akmajan, 1995: 56). It is " a means of communication" (Yule, 1996: 49)

Language Learning

It is “the process by which human beings acquire their speech of foreign language” (Horman,1979:125). It is “the process of inter analyzing (internalizing) a language either a mother tongue or a foreign language” Crystal (2003:257).

Foreign Language

Foreign language is “a language which is not a native language in a country”. Richards et al (1992:142). it is “learning a language that is not generally spoken in the surrounding community” Yule (2006:1) While the term “foreign language” is also defined as" a language which is not normally used for communication in a particular society" (word reference forum, 2009).

Cooperative Learning

It is “an approach to organize classroom activities into academic and social learning experiences”.(Slavin, 1990: 55). cooperative learning is learning in small groups where interaction is structured according to carefully worked-out principles. (stenler, 2003: 66).

Section Two: Theoretical Background

2.1 Traditional Language Teaching Method

It refers to the teacher-centered method in which many principles of the grammar translation method and audio lingual method are used in the process of language teaching and learning. Teaching has traditionally concentrated on making the students aware of certain aspects of the code without providing adequate practice. Language learning is viewed as memorizing rules and facts in order to understand and manipulate the lexical and syntactical aspects of the foreign language(Larsen- Freeman, 2000).

2.2 Cooperative Learning Method

Allport et al. (1971) began establishing cooperative learning theory after finding that group was more effective and efficient in quantity, quality, and overall productivity when compared to working alone (Cited in Gillies and Adrian, 2003).

Johnson and Johnson (1975) have been actively contributing to the cooperative learning theory. They identified that cooperative learning promoted mutual liking, better communication, high acceptance and support as well as demonstrated an increase in a variety of thinking strategies among individuals in the group.

Cooperative learning can be used at all age levels, from kindergarten to university. Cooperative learning has not been specially developed for foreign language teaching, but can be used with advantage in all subjects. The reason why the methods are relevant for us as foreign language teachers is that- apart from everything else it can do. It is an excellent way of contacting communicative language teaching.

Oslen and Kagan(1992:8) state that “cooperative learning is group learning activity organized, so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others”.

2.3.Characteristics of Cooperative Learning (CL)

Table (1) lists some of the main differences between (CL) and the traditional method based on the research of Johnson and Johnson, (1991), (Nunan, 1989).

Table (1) Comparison Between (CLL) and the Traditional Method

	CLL	Traditional language teaching
Teacher role	Organizer and counselor of group work, facilitator of the communication tasks, intervener to teach collaborative skills.	The centre of the classroom, controller of teaching pace and direction, judge of students right or wrong, feedback, reinforcement and support.
Learner role	Active participator, autonomous	Passive receiver and performer
Materials	arranged according to purpose of lesson. Usually one group of students shares a complete set of materials.	Complete set of materials for each student.
Types of activities	Group work to engage learners in communication, involving processes like information sharing, interaction	Knowledge recall and review, listening, patterned practice exercises
Room arrangement	Collaborative small groups	Separate desks or students placed in rows of desks
Student expectations	All members contribute to success of their group	-Take a major part in evaluating own progress and the quality of own effort towards learning. - Be a winner or loser
Teacher and student relationship	Cooperating and equal	Superior-inferior relationship

2.4.Cooperative Learning Tasks

There are some popular strategies that can be used with all students to learn content such as: language arts and foreign languages. Most of these tasks are specially effective in terms of four: round robin, round table, team jigsaw, tea party, numbered heads together, cooperative projects.

Coelho (1992:132) describes three major kinds of cooperative learning tasks and their learning focus, each of which has many variations.

A. Team practice from common input skills development and mastery of facts

- All students work on the same material.
- The task is to make sure that everyone in the group knows the answer to question and can explain how the answer was obtained or understand the material.

Because students want their team to do well, they coach and tutor each other to make sure that any member of the group could answer all of them and explain their team's answer.

- When the teacher takes up the question or assignment, anyone in a group may be called on to answer for the team.
- This technique is good for review and for practice tests; the group takes the practice test together, but each student will eventually do an assignment or take a test individually.
- This technique is effective in situations where the composition of the groups is unstable. Students can form new groups every day.

B. Jigsaw: differentiated but predetermined input-evaluation and synthesis of facts and opinions.

- Each group member receives a different piece of information.

- Students regroup in topic groups (expert groups) composed of people with the same piece to master the material and prepare to teach it.
- Students return to home groups (jigsaw groups) to share their information with each other.
- Students synthesize the information through discussion.

Each student produces an assignment of part of a group project, or takes a test, to demonstrate synthesis of all information presented by all the group members. This method of organization may require team-building activities for both home groups and topic groups, long term group involvement, and rehearsal of presentation methods. This method is very useful in the multi-level class, allowing for homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping in terms of English proficiency. Information gap activities in language teaching are jigsaw activities in the form of pair work, partners have data (in the form of text, tables, charts, etc.) with missing information to be supplied during interaction with another partner (ibid).

C. Cooperative Projects

- Topics may be different for each group.
- Students identify subtopics for each group member.
- Steering committee may coordinate the work of the class as a whole.
- Students research the information using resources such as library reference, interviews, visual media.
- Students synthesize their information for a group presentation: oral or written. Each group member plays part in the presentation.
- Each group presents to the whole class.

This method places greater emphasis on individualization and students' interests. Each student's assignment is unique. Students

need plenty of previous experience with more structured group work for this to be effective.

Olsen and Kagan (1992:88) describe the following examples of (CLL)cooperative language learning activities:

A. Three Step Interview

1. Students are in pairs; one is interviewer and the other is interviewee.
2. Students reverse roles.
3. Each shares with the team member what was learned during the two interviews.

B. Round Table

There is one piece of paper and one pen for each team:

1. One student makes a contribution.
2. Passes the paper and pen to the student of his/her left.
3. Each student makes contributions in turn. If done orally, the structure is called round robin.

C. Think Pair Share

1. teacher poses a question
2. students think of a response.
3. students discuss their responses with a partner.
4. students share their partner's response with the class.

D. Solve Pair Share

1. Teacher poses a problem
2. Students work out solutions individually
3. Students explain how they solved the problem in interview or round robin structures.

E. Numbered Heads

1. Students number off in teams.
2. Teacher asks a question
3. Heads together - students literally put their heads together and make sure everyone knows and can explain the answer.
4. Teacher calls a number and students with that number raise their hands to be called on, as in a traditional classroom.

(ibid)

2.5 Cooperative Learning in Foreign Language Teaching

Stenlev (2003) states that in our context, it is particularly interesting how cooperative can contribute to attaining better learning results in foreign language teaching. Let us look at some concrete examples of cooperative learning structures used in foreign language teaching.

A. Three-step interview

Step 1: pair work student A interviews student B

Step 2: partners switch roles

Step 3: team work round robin the students explain in turn what their partner said. "Three-step interview" is categorized as an information-sharing structure. It can be used to process material in numerous ways.

B. Travelling Heads Together

Step1: the team is given a task, they discuss until they arrive at an answer and make sure they all agree about it and can defend it.

Step2: a student from each team (e.g. With the aid of a student selector) goes to the next group, where he/ she explains the team's answer. Travelling heads together is a variation of the structure numbered heads together, what is categorized as a mastery structure (ibid).

C. Inside-Outside Circle

Step1: the students work in teams on certain material.

Step2: the students form two big circles on the floor, one inside the other. If, for example, there are six teams of 4 students, three teams form the inner circle and the other three the outer circle.

The inner circles look outwards, the outer circle inwards. Each person in the inner circle has a partner in the outer circle. The students now change material or discuss with their partner.

Step3: the students in the outer circle (or inner) circle move 4 persons to the right (or left), so that everyone is now facing a new partner. Material is exchanged with the new partner. Inside outside circle is one of the most versatile for structures. It appears under the categories class building, 'mastery and information sharing'. One of the things inside-outside-circle especially suitable for is to train students to present material in a clear, well-structured way. (ibid)

Section three: Previous Studies

3.1 Abu and Flowers (1997)

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the cooperative learning approach of 'student teams achievement divisions' (STAD) on the achievement of content knowledge, retention, and attitudes towards the teaching methods.

Cooperative learning was compared to non-cooperative (competitive) learning classroom structure using quasi experimental design. An achievement test, consisting of items from the state competency test-item bank for the course, and an attitude questionnaire were administered immediately following instruction on the use of special nutritional needs. Results indicate that cooperative learning wasn't found to be more effective than non-cooperative learning with respect to home economics students' achievement and retention in this study.

3.2 Doston (2001)

The study compares achievement scores of 6th grade social studies students who participated in classes using cooperative learning with students who did not. The primary goal of this study was to measure student achievement for those using cooperative learning as compared to the achievement of those using the traditional method. The sample of the study consists of 25 students for the first group and 25 students for the second group. Results indicate the same achievement for both methods.

3.3 Rasheed (2003)

The study aims at investigating the impact of using two strategies of cooperative learning on the achievement of 5th primary school pupils in English. The sample of the study includes 3 groups. The first group includes 25 pupils which were taught by (TGT) strategy. The second group includes 25 pupils which were taught by (LT) strategy. The third group includes 25 people which were

taught by non-cooperative learning method. The tool of the study was achievement test.

The results indicate a statistically significant difference between cooperative learning method and non-cooperative learning method.

3.4 Iqbal (2004)

The study was conducted to examine the effect of cooperative learning on the academic achievement of secondary school students in mathematics. The study aims to determine whether the cooperative learning is more effective than traditional methods of teaching with respect to academic achievement of students in mathematics. The study was conducted in government high school DAV college road, Rawalpindi. The sample of the study includes the students of two classes. Section A served as the control group while section B served as the experimental group. The control group was kept under control conditions by providing traditional situations in the class, while the experimental group was provided with cooperative learning method. The experiment lasted for a period of 10 weeks. Tests were used as measuring tools in the study. Results indicate a statistical difference between cooperative learning and traditional method.

3.5 Herriman (2013)

The study reports the results of a quasi-experimental real life intervention with cooperative learning in an undergraduate course. In class participation and student approaches to learning were measured before and after the intervention to assess the impact on 140 students' engagement levels. In addition, open-ended comments were analyzed, revealing what faculty adopting cooperative learning principles in higher education should be especially aware of.

3.6 Discussion of the Previous Studies

Abu and Flowers study (1997) investigates the effect of the cooperative learning approach of student teams achievement divisions (STAD) on the achievement of content and attitudes toward the teaching method as compared with non-cooperative learning method. Doston Study (2001) measures students' achievement using cooperative learning as compared with a traditional method. Rasheed study (2003) investigates the impact of using two strategies of cooperative learning on the achievement of primary pupils in English.

Mohammed study (2004) investigates the effect of cooperative learning on the academic achievement of secondary school students in mathematics. Hermann study (2013) reports the result of a quasi-experimental, quasi-experimental real-life intervention with cooperative learning in an undergraduate course. While the present study investigates the effect of cooperative learning method on students achievement comparing it with traditional method.

The aims of previous studies are concentrated on measuring Students' achievement according to those using cooperative learning method; likewise, the present study aims to show the impact of cooperative learning method. The instruments of the previous studies and present study are achievement test. The samples of the studies differ from each

Section Four: Procedures

4.1 Population and Sample

The population for this study includes 135 students of first academic year (2013-2014) in the Department of psychological and Educational sciences , College of Education, University of Kirkuk. The sample of the study consists of two groups which have been chosen randomly and divided into an experimental group which includes 42 students. Control group which includes 42 students.

4.2 Students' Instruction

The control group was kept under control condition by providing traditional classroom situations . The experimental group was taught according to the cooperative learning method. The same material was taught and the time allotted for a lecture was 60 minutes were conducted 2 times a week. This experiment lasted for a period of 6 weeks from 1st March 2014 to 15th April 2014. After the provision of instruction, practice, and teaching 3 units as follows:

Unit One: The Biological and Social Bases of behavior.

Unit Two: Low Intelligence Quotient students.

Unit Three: About Modern School.

4.3 The Instruments of the Study

The academic achievement for both groups (the control group and the experimental group) were examined through achievement test. The students were tested on the material they had studied.

The instrument used in this study was planned by the researcher (teacher).

The test was a paper-pencil test consisting of 5 questions and each question included many items. The test was designed to measure students achievement. (see appendix (1))

Content and face validity of the items of the test was assessed and verified by exposing them to experts specialized in Educational and psychological field and specialist teachers. The instrument is

performed as pilot tested to establish reliability. The coefficient correlation for the instrument was 0.87. The test was administrated to both groups at the end of the course. Students' scores were recorded. The mean scores for the experimental groups were adjusted by the covariate measures to statistically control for preexisting differences.

The adjusted mean score for the experimental group (the cooperative learning group) was 85.47 while the adjusted mean score for the control group (the non-cooperative group or traditional method) was 76.92 students' scores were recorded.

4.4 Lecture Planning

The teacher will give each group a different part of a passage.

- Group's job is to read the part of a passage and to discuss the meaning of any new words.
- Use dictionaries or ask teacher when you cannot figure out the meaning of a word.
- In 10 minutes you will form new groups.
- 3 students move to another group, 3 students stay, and others join to the group.
- In each group you will tell your part of the passage.
- You will teach a new group the meanings of any vocabulary words that the group members don't know.
- Change groups again and do the same thing.
- The third time tell the passage from beginning to end.
- Work together to learn the new vocabulary.
- One group sits in a circle.
- One group puts chairs around two desks.
- One group sits at a table.
- The teacher distributes handouts with a different part of the passage to each group.

- The teacher moves from group to group spending 2-3 minutes with each one.
- The students appear to be busy working in their groups; there is much talking.
- After 10 minutes, the teacher tells the students to stop and for 3 students to leave their group and to join another group.
- After 10 minutes, the teacher tells the students to stop and for 3 students to leave their group to join another group.
- After 10 minutes they do this again.
- Then students return to their original groups and work on putting the parts of the passage together and teaching each other the new vocabulary.
- Individual vocabulary test.
- After the test, the students correct their own work.
- Groups compare and combine scores.
- The teacher suggests that one of the students to be the taskmaster to keep the group focused on the task of completing the statements.
- One be the recorder to write the group's answers.
- One be the timekeeper to keep track of the time.
- One be the checker to see that all of the work is done.
- One be the reporter who will give the group report later.
- The teacher tells them they have 10 minutes for the discussion.
- The teacher circulates among the groups, but does not say anything.
- After 10 minutes the teacher asks each group's reporter to share their group's responses.
- The teacher consults the notes that he has made during his observation and he offers his comments.

4.5 The Statistical Methods

The following statistical methods have been used:

1. Pearson correlation coefficient is used to compute reliability.

$$R = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

2. Chi-square has been used to measure validity.

$$\text{Chi}^2 = \frac{\sum(O - E)^2}{E}$$

(chi)² = chi-square value

O= observant frequency

E= expectant frequency

∑= summation

3. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to measure the difference between two groups (control and experimental groups)
4. T-retest has been used in this study.

Section Five: Analysis of Data, Discussion of Results

5.1 Analysis of Data and Discussion of Results

The purpose of the study is to determine the effect of cooperative learning method in developing the ability of the students in learning English as a foreign language. Students' mean scores on the test were recorded and mean was calculated for both control and experimental group as shown in table (2)

Table (2)

Group	N	Mean Scores	SD	Computed Value	Tabulate value
Experimental	42	85.47	12.060	2.102	0.0409
Control	42	76.92	17.739		

It is clear from table (2) that the computed value is (2.102) which is higher than the tabulated value which is (0.0409) at (0.05) level of significance and 83 degree of freedom. The present study shows, that the cooperative learning method provides students with opportunities to analyze and practise ideas cooperatively. This group interaction helps students to learn from each other's skills and experiences. Most students feel that group work help them to better understand the material and stimulate their thinking.

This result agrees with the results of Rasheed (2003), and Hermann study (2013).

5.2 Conclusions

1. There is statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups in students achievement and on the behalf of the experimental group.
2. Results show that the mean scores of the experimental group which is taught according to the cooperative learning method is higher than the mean scores of control group which is taught according to traditional method . After conducting a statistical analysis on test scores, it was found that students who participated in cooperative learning have performed significantly better than students who studied individually or using traditional method.

5.3 Recommendations

In the light of the conclusions, the following recommendations have been drawn:

1. The instructor's or teacher's role is not to transmit information, but to serve as a facilitator for learning. This involves creating and managing meaningful learning experiences and stimulating students' thinking.
2. The teacher involved in teaching English as a foreign language should be an experienced one and interested in cooperative learning method.

Bibliography

Abu, R. & J. Flowers, J. (1997). The Effects of Cooperative Learning Methods on Achievement, Retention, and Attitudes of Home Economics Students in North Carolina. Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 13(2).

Akmajian, Adrian, Demers, Richard A. , Farmer, Ann K. and Harnish, Robert M. 1995. Linguistics - An Introduction to Language and Communication. London , England. Library of Congress.

Allen, W.H. & Van Sickle, R.L. (1984). Learning teams and low achievers. *Social Education*, 48, 60-64.

Al-Rifai, FatinKh. And Mizhir, Dhea (2012) Curriculum and Methods of Teaching English. 2nd ed., Registration number in Iraqi National Library 2279

Bruner, J. (1985). Vygotsky: An historical and conceptual perspective. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspective* (pp. 21–34). London: Cambridge University Press.

Coelho, E. (1992). *Cooperative learning: Foundation for a communicative curriculum*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Colorin Colorado (2007). Cooperative learning strategies. Retrieved from ; Colorin Colorado! website: <http://www.colorincolorado.org/educators/content/cooperative/>

- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dotson, Jeanie M.(2001)" *Culminating Project*", Kagan Online Magazine.
- Gilles, R.M., & Adrian, F. (2003). *Cooperative Learning: The social and intellectual Outcomes of Learning in Groups*. London: Farmer Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hermann, K. J. (2013) "The impact of cooperative learning on student engagement: results from an intervention," Active Learning in Higher Education, 14(3), 175–187.
- Horman, H.(1979). *Psycholinguistics: An Introduction to Research and theory*.2nd ed. New York: springer Verlag
- Iqbal, Muhammad. (2004) *Effect of Cooperative Learning on Academic Achievement of Secondary School Students In Mathematics*. University of Avid Agriculture, institute of education and research.
- Jayapraba, G., (2013). "Metacognitive instruction and cooperative learning strategies for promoting insightful learning in science". International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications. Vol. 4, issue: 1, Article 15, pp 1309-
- Johnson, D.W., and Johnson, R.T. (1975). *Learning Together and Alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
-; Maruyama, G.; Johnson, R.T.; Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, (47-62).
- kannan , R . (2009) *Word Reference Forum*.
- Kelly, Melissa (1991). [Benefits of Cooperative Learning. Cooperative Learning and Student Achievementwebsite:http://712educators.about.com/od/cooplearning/tp/Benefits-Of-Cooperative-Learning.htm](http://712educators.about.com/od/cooplearning/tp/Benefits-Of-Cooperative-Learning-and-Student-Achievementwebsite:http://712educators.about.com/od/cooplearning/tp/Benefits-Of-Cooperative-Learning.htm)
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
-(1989) . *Understanding Language Classroom: A Guide for Teacher Initiated Action*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Olsen, R. & Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Perreault, R.J. (1983). An experimental comparison of cooperative learning to non cooperative learning and their effects on cognitive achievement in junior high industrial arts laboratories. (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), University of Maryland, 1982.
- Rasheed, W. A. (2003) The Impact of Using Two Strategies of Cooperative Learning on the Achievement of Fifth Primary School Pupils in English.. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis), University of Mosul
- Richards , J . C . platt , J , and platt , H . (1992) “ Longman Dictionary of Language teaching & applied linguistics” second Ed, Essex , England :Longman Group U K limited .
- Slavin, R. E.(1990). Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall
- (1991). Student team learning: A practical guide to cooperative learning: Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Stenlev, J. (2003). Cooperative Learning in Foreign Language Teaching. Sprogforum.
- Stenlev, J. (2003). Lecturer, MA (English and Russian)The Copenhagen Day and Evening College of Teacher Training
- Tjosvold, D., Marine, P., & Johnson, D.W. (1977). The effects of cooperation and competition on student reactions to inquiry and didactic science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11(4), 281-288.
- Wodarski LA, Adelson CL, Todd MT, Wodarski JS (1980).Teaching nutrition by teams-games-tournaments. Journal of Nutrition Education, 12(2): 61-65.
- Yan Zhang. (2010). Cooperative Language Learning and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching. journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol 1, No 1 pp. 81-83, January.
- Yule, George. (1996) The study of language. Cambridge, 3rd edition, Cambridge university press.
- (2006) The study of language. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Appendix (1)
Specification of the Objective of the Achievement Test

Q No.		Scores
Q1	Assess students' comprehension, thinking and intelligence	25
Q2	Assess the students' ability to recognize true or false statement	15
Q3	Assess students' ability to recall, remember, and know	20
Q4	Assess students' ability in thinking and recognition	15
Q5	Assess students' ability in application	25
Total		100

Appendix (2)
Achievement Test

Q1\ Answer the following questions according to the passages you have studied (Choose only 5) (25 Marks).

- 1. Why do children misbehave at school?**
- 2. What are the two main forces that determine man's behaviour?**
- 3. Why cannot a child learn at school ?**
- 4. Do IQ students have low or high ambitions?**
- 5. What kind of exercises do low IQ students prefer?**
- 6. What can be noticed inside the classroom ?**
- 7. What properties can be noticed in low IQ students' language?**

Q2\ state whether the following statement is True or False (Choose 5) (15 Marks).

- 1. Organic and environmental influences are interrelated .**
- 2. Low IQ students frequently misbehave.**
- 3. Low IQ students feel interested with industrial arts.**
- 4. Lower animals can perform the act children can perform.**
- 5. Low IQ students make friends without difficulty.**
- 6. Low IQ students feel unhappy with exercises that require creativity .**

7. Elementary and high school pupils also read and write, in all grades .

Q3\ Fill in the blanks with the suitable word or phrase (20 Marks)

1. Low IQ students may be interested in -----.
2. Low IQ students may lead into ----- to learn
3. Low IQ students may be----- from their peers.
4. Now the school that does not face fact is ----- the times.
5. Opportunities for Identifying and developing ----- should be provided by schools.
6. We can learn much about ----- in nursery schools.
7. There should be a ----- for every activity we do at schools.
8. Any form of behaviour is the product of -----.
9. ----- results in physical weakness.
10. ----- children differ from city children.

Q4\ Choose the most suitable answers to complete the following statements: (Choose only 3) (15 Marks).

1. Man can learn languages because of ----- .
 - A. Organic structure
 - B. Environment
 - C. Body growth
2. Body changes in function and structure with dependence on -----
 - A. Protoplasm changes
 - B. Environmental changes
 - C. Physical and chemical changes
3. Environmental stimulation is essential for -----.
 - A. Human development .
 - B. Motivation.
 - C. Performance of many acts .
4. Human behaviour largely depends on -----.
 - A. Glandular conditions
 - B. Vitamin deficiency
 - C. Physical health.

Q5\ Write a composition on one of the following topics (Choose one) (25 Marks).

1. Modern psychological and educational principle of teaching children.
2. Differences between today school and old one in Iraq.

اثر التعلم التعاوني لتعلم الانكليزية كلغة أجنبية على تحصيل الطلبة لطلبة كلية التربية

الملخص

تحاول الدراسة تسليط الضوء على اثر التعلم التعاوني تطوير، توسيع ، ونمو معلومات الطلبة في تعلم اللغة الانكليزية كلغة أجنبية. تهدف الدراسة لبحث اثر التعلم التعاوني مقارنة بالطريقة التقليدية في تدريس اللغة الانكليزية وإظهار فائدة التعلم التعاوني في عدة مجالات. أعدت مجموعة تجريبية، حيث ان عينة البحث تتكون من ٨٤ طالبا وطالبة في المرحلة الاولى قسم العلوم التربوية والنفسية، كلية التربية ، جامعة كركوك وقسمت العدد الى مجموعتين. مجموعة ضابطة وعدد الطلبة (٤٢) ومجموعة تجريبية تتكون من (٤٢) طالبا. اعد الباحثان أداة البحث وهي الاختبار التحصيلي وتم استخراج الصدق الظاهري والثبات. تم تطبيق الأداة على العينة. قام الباحثان بتحليل النتائج والحصول على الاستنتاجات والتوصيات