
The Impact of Cooperative Learning Method in Teaching New Vocabulary for Fourth Preparatory Students

Key words: cooperative Learning , Teaching Vocabulary, Techniques for Teaching New Vocabulary

**Asst. Inst. Taghreed Abd –Al-Razak
Directorate General of Education / Diyala**

Taghreed43562@gmail.com

Abstract

This study sheds light on the investigation of the outcome of cooperative learning on English language development in teaching new English vocabulary of students in Iraqi public educational classrooms. The control and experimental design is used in this research. 88 Iraqi EFL learners at preparatory school participate in this study who were studying vocabulary development throughout their textbook course in 2019 academic year(English for Iraq). The first course concerned in this research. Several cooperative learning instructions were followed in reading and writing drills. Every student asks to do the pretest to show the homogeneity and the final exam as the post test for the sake of English vocabulary knowledge progress .The average was taken to show the effect of cooperative learning in the students' development of vocabulary English language. From the comparison of results, a pretest and post test indicate the existence of considerable distinction between the experimental group and control group of instructions .

Introduction

Communication is the central part in the possession of second language .So, an excellent means to engage to learn any language deceits students negations in that language. Grouping tasks and actions are critical support to contact because they provide many probability for learners to interact as a way of integrate, listening, talking, interpretation, and lettering (Jacobs, Crookall etal Thiyaragarajali 1997:33; Harmer 2001:87:34; Jacobs 1997:12). Oral skill is one of the crucial component in communication among EFL learners ,it is clear that vocabulary knowledge acting a major part in the educational lives of EFL learners. Additionally, EFL learners be short of a full-grown vocabulary. So, their other language skills undergo notably. Some educationalists prove, that lacking grammar, very little can be conveyed. While lacking vocabulary, nothing can be conveyed. For that reason, a variety of instructions employ to make up the vocabulary comprehension of EFL learners. As the Iraqi core curriculums for English Language, is built up around the principles of communicative language teaching (CLT). This indicates that the extensive exposure to a foreign language, the sufficient opportunities to use that language, the learning of the language will happen. The main difficulties concerning English teaching in Iraqi ,English classes at preparatory level can be solved by the application of cooperative learning method. The researcher as an English teacher observed that the governing environment of the classes is teacher-

centered. The teacher reads the new lesson, explains the new terms and expressions, and asks questions from the text to see if students understand the lesson or not. Students typically listen to the teacher and occasionally he answers questions by himself. Even though, there is the suggestion of applying pair and group work in the course book, the exercises are done individually. The high-achiever student is the one who answered all of the exercises or questions. It seems that there is no sense of cooperation, no communication or interaction and quite competition.

Aims

The study attempts to answer the following questions:

- 1- How does cooperative learning be helpful in improving Iraqi fourth preparatory students` academic achievement in learning new vocabulary?
- 2- Are there considerable difference between the scores of experimental group who have been utilizing in teaching new English vocabulary by implementing cooperative language learning and the scores of control group who have been teaching new English vocabulary by implementing traditional language learning in school?

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study lies in these points:

- 1- It is the first Iraqi effort to explore the cause of cooperative learning in the preparatory school of English vocabulary development.
- 2- The outcome of this research will optimistically shout approval for researchers to revise the special methods of EFL public schooling in Iraq .
- 3- The results of this research may paid some attention on the efficiency of this study and the opportunity to apply it in all female and male public schools in Iraq.

Limitation

The current study is limited to:

- 1-Iraqi EFL fourth preparatory students at Um AL-mumineyn Preparatory School For Girls, Diyala Governorate.
- 2-The first course of the academic year (2019).
- 3- Cooperative learning Method.

Literature Review

2.1Cooperative learning

This accommodating instruction of learning has confirmed to be a useful education strategy to both the instructor and student. It promotes learning to take place and assist contact abilities to progress amongst students (Jacobs & McCafferty, 2006:45). It offers a non-frightening learning setting and supports EFL students to go up over their difficulties in conversing and state their views in English language (Slavin, 1995:23). This supportive strategy

can be expressed as a shared procedure and acquiring knowledge throughout the flourishing contact along with the groups (Cohen, 1994:12). Slavin (1995, p. 2) defines cooperative learning as "a multiplicity of schooling methods in which students work in small groups to assist one another learn educational content." Learners are likely to lend a hand each other, to discuss, dispute, and appraise their existing information.

2.2 Doctrines of Cooperative Learning

Johnson and Johnson (1994:11) declared five critical fundamentals that are needed to build constructive, efficient cooperative class.

1-Affirmative Interdependence

Johnson and Johnson (1989:32) stated that the students should be associated to work on a general objective. Affirmative interdependence may be intended to ask group members to (1) agreement on a respond from the group (2) each member clarify the respond (3) complete allocate tasks.

2-Mutual Contact

This factor requires students to talk, contribute their thoughts, views and resources, and get reactions, support to keep one another extremely provoked to finish tasks they assign.

3-Individual responsibility

Members in each group work correctly on his/her duty. Consequently they learn collectively and perform superior as individually.

3-Team- working Skill

The success of any cooperative class rely on team-working skill for example guidance, administrative, , communiqué, and difference - organization. These skills should to be trained as educational skills. A lot of learners do not work helpfully in educational circumstances. Therefore, they need the wanted skills for burden the team-working fruitfully.

4-Group Processing

Teachers make sure that each member in cooperative learning groups know how well they achieve their goals and maintain efficient operational interactions (Johnson & Johnson, 1989:10).

2.3 Teacher& Student's task in Cooperative Learning

Cooperative Learning gives new roles, both for the teachers and for the students.

Teacher's job: He is a supporter, assistant who lead their learners to attain educational goals (Zhang, 2010:12). Teachers systematize the learners in diverse group, to offer them with appropriate supplies, and drawing suitable educational policy (Chen, 1999:23). Their speaking should be always fewer than learner speaking (Jacob, 2006). It is necessary for the teachers to give students a supportive model for more knowledge (Harel, 1992:31).

Student's Role: According to Zhang (2010) Learner is an active participator and self-directed learner. Jacob (2006:42) gives us five roles which student has to

carry out throughout a accommodating activity. These are: facilitator, recorder's duty, time keeper, and observer each role has a divers responsibility to keep the class cooperatively .

2.4The Merits of Cooperative Learning to EFL Learners

Researchers have revealed that learning cooperatively is a helpful means for students to expand their skills in contact. Learners can converse to one another and allow them more chances for communication (Brecke & Jensen, 2007:31; Zhang, 2010:27; Duxbury & Ling, 2010:43). students make use of language to perform tasks, they must work jointly to full a particular objective and make their ideas clear to others and extend themselves a bit to appreciate another's perspective on a problem (Strickland and Feeley, 2003:54). Cooperative learning is an excellent way to conduct communicative language teaching.

2.5The challenges faced the teacher in Cooperative Learning

In his study Wang(2007:21) retained , several shortcomings and difficulties of the teaching process in cooperative learning some of these are:

1. Teacher may note some of the students refuse to work cooperatively and they make noise inside the class. Consequently, classroom management is fall.
2. It is not an easy task for a teacher to manage the large class and pay more attention to different groups so control student's misbehavior and keep classroom management is seemed to be difficult task in such class.
- 3- Heavy work waiting the teacher to arrange teaching resources and to intend cooperative actions.
4. Some students are absent, which extremely affect the group deliberations, and cooperative environment.
- 5- Teacher may ignore silent students , or lower achievers for the period of group work activities .Those can't speak English aloud, and they stay silent. So ,cheering those students to talk English assertively in class is the most vital concern.

2.6Teaching Vocabulary

Since words are critical to be controlled by the students to appreciate any language and to articulate their ideas and be able to comprehend other people's talking. Alqahtani (2015:67) " defined the mastery of vocabulary as complete knowledge or complete skill in processing words of a language". Therefore, there are several techniques concerning the cooperative strategy, in teaching vocabulary have to be considered by English teachers if they want to present a new vocabulary or lexical items to their students. The followings are some techniques of teaching vocabulary as proposed by the following experts (Susanto & Fazlinda, 2016:36)., (Takač & Singleton 2008:87) :

1. Real Objects

Gairns & Redman (1986:58) assure that actual things is a suitable technique employing for beginners when presenting tangible words.

2. Practicing, Drilling and spelling

Drilling and practicing should be clear and natural so learners become more familiar and unforgettable the new word. (Thorbury, 2002:31) In the same time, spelling requires memorization of the words (Reed, 2012:54).

3. Pictures and drawings

Pictures and drawings connect students' previous knowledge and help them learn new words. Pictures include poster, flashcard, wall diagram, and textbooks pictures can be a supportive visual aids and assist learners to realize the meaning of vocabularies.

4. Facial expressions, gestures and mime

Facial expressions, and gestures can be useful means to explain adjectives. For instance, "sad", "happy" and so on. Many studies highlight the role of gestures in second language attainment (Alqahtani, 2015:11). Instructors bend over to signal a lot (Sime, 2001:32; Hauge, 1999:44), particularly when chatting with pupils. It is frequently granting that "teaching gestures" arrest concentration and make the lesson more lively. (Tellier, 2007:13).

5- Estimating from Context and situation

Presenting new words through context is a helpful technique to understand the meanings of abstract words quickly. Therefore, John Haycarf (1978: 48) states that "the only way to teach the meaning of many abstract words is by creating a context or situation from which the students can they ease the meaning." For instance when teacher wants to teach the word "friend" he can select two friends students from the class to present the meaning of this abstract word.

6- Sense relations

This is a valuable technique to considerate the relation among words, like synonymy, hyponymy, antonym and other relations in terms of their meaning. These relations will give consistency to the lesson and provide a useful construction for the student to recognize the connotation of new words. R. Gairns and S.Redman (1986:31).

7- Utilizing dictionaries .

It is a common situation when learners work out the meaning of new words thought starting up in a alphabetical list of dictionary. Since a word may have more than one meaning in a language, students should be trained how to decrease many alternatives by removal. Scanning the classification in the entry before make a decision which is the suitable one that fits a word is a good idea (Ebrahimi&Azhideh,2015:45).

Methodology

Sample of the study

Due to the results of a pre-test, eighty-eight Iraqi EFL preparatory students from public schools in Iraq contributed to the present study. They aged between 16 and 17 years old and regularly separated into two groups, i.e. a control group and experimental group, each group, (N=44). It was supposed that the students have similarly educational knowledge.

Instrumentations

Two tools were utilized in this study. The first one Cambridge Proficiency Test (CPT). Using the t-test formula for one and two samples, also to ensure the validity. It is revised by two language experts and their notes are utilized in the main version of the study. The first instrument was a Cambridge Proficiency Test of vocabulary as a pre-test. The aim was to make a decision if the participants were harmonized in their knowledge of English vocabularies. This pretest consisted of 50 multiple-choice test items for preparatory (upper intermediate level). The items of the test are also revised by two experts of the field to ensure the validity. The second instrument was a vocabulary test as the posttest. This test also consisted of 50 multiple-choice questions. The only difference between this test and the pretest was that the order of the items. It is worth to declare that split-half method reliability is used, correlation coefficients Pearson and Spearman Brown are computed and found to be (0.85), (0.79) respectively, which were fairly satisfactory (Murad & Selman, 2012:19).

Procedures

Later on, the selected sample of participants were separated into two groups, a pretest containing 50 questions was administered. Then, the English lexicons, include vocabularies, taught to the experimental groups utilizing pair and group work in reading and written tasks in eight weeks.

While English vocabularies taught to the control group by the traditional ways of teaching include clear explanation of rules, do drills and exercises from the textbook. Earlier to the posttest, the researcher as an instructor applied the suitable strategies of cooperative learning, during the treatment. Then, conduct the posttest, the outcomes of the performance of two groups calculate. In addition, the experimental groups' mean scores analyze to investigate the most significant strategy on English vocabulary development.

Data analysis & Discussion

To examine and confer the findings of this study. In table(1)t-test for one sample formula to compare the scores of both pre and post-tests in control group students is used.

Table(1)

T-test value for one sample, between pre-test and post-test in the control group .

Level of significance	d. f	M.		Computed t- value	S.D. D	M. D	S,D	Tabulated t- value	N	Test
No significance	43	23.55		0.795	3.60	0.43	5.86	2.00	44	Pre-test
-	-	23.98	-	-	-	-	5.99	-	-	post-test

Regarding data analysis, a comparison between the average of pre-test and the post- test in the control group students. The results are shown that the computed t-value(0.795) is less than t-tabulated value (2.00) under (43)the degree of freedom at (0.05)level of significance. This indicates that there is no a significance difference between the students' control group performances who work individually in both pre and post- tests. . Since the control group did not receive the treatment. The students did not practice working cooperatively. see table (1).

Table(2)

T-test value for one sample, between the pre-test and the post- test in the experimental group.

Level of significance	d. f	Tabulated t- value	Computed t- value	S.D. D	M. D	S,D	M.	N	Test
Significance at level 0.05	43	2.00	12.497	3.86	7.27	5.26	31.91	44	Pre-test
-	-	-	-	-	-	2.97	24.64	-	Post-test

From the comparison ,between the average of ,pre and the post- test . The results reveal that there are significance differences in the students' performances who work cooperatively between the average of , the pre and the pos-test. This is due to the fact ,that computed t-value(12.497)is higher than tabulated t-value(2.00)under the degree of freedom (43) at(0.05) the level of significance ,which means that students have better performance ,when work in

group rather, than individual . They share their ideas, experiences, through their discussions see table(2).

Table(3)

T- test formula for two samples, experimental and control groups between the average of the post-tests .

Level of significance	d.f	Tabulated t- value	Computed t- value	S,D	M.	N	Groups
Significance at level 0.05	86	1.99	7.50	5.26	31.91	44	Experimental group's post-test
-	-	-	-	5.86	23.55	-	Control group's post-test

The above table reveals that there is a difference in students' performance after they work in a group ,since the computed t-value (7.50) is higher than the tabulated t-value (1.99)which has statically significant under the degree of freedom(86) at 0.05 level of significance ,and this difference is in favor to experimental group's students performance who study cooperatively in the post-test. This result indicates that there is a significant effect in the development of students performance in cooperative-work tests see table (3).

Table(4)

T- test formula for two samples, experimental and control groups between the average of the pre-tests .

Level of significance	d.f	Tabulated t- value	Computed t- value	S,D	M.	N	Groups
No Significance at level 0.05	86	1.99	0.65	2.97	24.64	44	Experimental group's pre-test
-	-	-	-	5.99	23.98	-	Control group's pre-test

For the purpose of equal of variance t-test formula for two samples is used. It has shown that there is no significance differences in students' performance in

pre-tests for both experimental and control groups. This is due to the fact ,that computed t-value(0.65)is less than tabulated t-value(1.99)under the degree of freedom (86) at(0.05) the level of significance ,which means that the students in the two groups are nearly have the same performances , since the performance of students in experimental group may not affected in the first week of the experience. They did not receive enough treatment in the first time. Apparently, students in control group are taught traditionally, and they did not work cooperatively . see table(4).

From the analysis of the previous data it has been found that in a period of one academic school year (2019 ;first course) of two months, EFL fourth preparatory students facing minimal exposure to the English language teaching new vocabulary in cooperative strategy (45 minutes per week) have obtained reasonably better results than work individually.

Students who undergo this study have noticeably improved their ability and knowledge in English vocabulary . This reflected in their writing, reading and even in listening and speaking in eight-weeks period of instruction in a nominal contact situation of cooperative learning.

Previous Studies

Fekri ,N. (2016)

In this study the researcher examined the effect of cooperative and competitive learning strategies on the acquisition of English vocabulary development by Iranian EFL learners . The results revealed that both of these strategies were effective in English vocabulary development . Furthermore, the findings indicated that the performance of the experimental group via cooperative strategy was better than their counterpart in the experimental group whom was taught via competitive strategy. This is an evidence of what the present study approved.

Najmonnisa &Saad ,I. (2017)

Another approval on the current study's results has come from a resarch in the effects of cooperative learning method on students` academic performance in the subject of science and to identify the challenges if any while implementing cooperative learning in Pakistani classroom. The researchers adopted quantitative approach and quasi-experimental research design was employed. Experimental group received treatment and was taught with cooperative learning whereas control group left untreated and was taught with traditional lecture method. The findings suggested that the use of cooperative learning significantly affected students` test scores in the subject of science.

Conclusion

Several conclusions are strained from the study:

Cooperative learning is a useful, sufficient teaching method that locates communicative approach into accomplishment. It is a helpful instruction to get

better and generate a more sociable and sympathetic learning atmosphere .. In such contact among the students enlarge the quantity of student talk and student's involvement in the classroom.

Concerning the considerable difference between the average of marks of both groups . This distinction is in favor to investigational group who taught cooperatively. Cooperative learning, offers many benefits beyond enhanced second language acquisition. However, using cooperative learning may be difficult at first. It requires some early thought, some long-term vision , and some efficient management to succeed.

In this method attainment and incentive are strongly linked , because it is a controlling method that enhance the students' inspiration through a helpful setting of caring and sharing in the classroom that makes English learning more pleasurable, active, toward learning English as a foreign language.

Cooperative learning may undertake a mixture of needs and abilities in a diverse class. Scholars state that accommodating learning is the best collection for all students because it highlights active contact involving students of varied abilities and conditions.

أثر أسلوب التعلم التعاوني في تدريس مفردات جديدة لطلبة المرحلة الإعدادية الرابعة

الكلمات المفتاحية: التعلم التعاوني ، تعليم المفردات ، تقنيات تدريس المفردات الجديدة

م.م. تغريد عبد الرزاق

المديرة العامة للتربية والتعليم / ديالى

الملخص

تلقي هذه الدراسة الضوء للتحقق من نتائج التعلم التعاوني في تطوير تدريس مفردات إنجليزية جديدة للطلاب في المدارس التعليمية الحكومية العراقية. تم استخدام تصميم المجموعة الضابطة والتجريبية في هذا البحث. ٨٨ متعلماً عراقياً للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية اشتركوا في هذه الدراسة من مدرسة اعدادية تدرس الكتب المنهجية المدرسية (منهج اللغة الانكليزية في العراق) في العام الدراسي ٢٠١٩ ؛ المجموعة الأولى المعنية بهذا البحث. تم اتباع العديد من اساليب التعلم التعاوني في تدريبات القراءة والكتابة.تم طلب من كل طالب إجراء الاختبار التمهيدي لإظهار التجانس بين المجموعتين والامتحان النهائي باعتباره الاختبار البعدي من أجل معرفة التقدم في مفردات اللغة الإنجليزية ، وقد تم حساب المتوسط لإظهار تأثير التعلم التعاوني في تطوير مفردات اللغة الإنجليزية لدى

الطلاب. من مقارنة النتائج ، يشير الاختبار القبلي والاختبار البعدي إلى وجود فرق كبير بين المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة.

References

- Alqahtani (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, III(3), pp. 21 - 34.
- Brecke, R., & Jensen, J. (2007). Cooperative learning, responsibility, ambiguity, controversy and support in motivating students. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 2(1), 57-63.
- Chen, H. C. (1999). A comparison between cooperative learning and traditional, whole-class methods--teaching English in a Junior College. *Academic Journal of Kang-Ning*, 3, 60-90.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994) *Designing Group work. Strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroom* (2nd edition). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Daniels, K. M. (2005). Cooperative learning structures for English foreign language classroom. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 4, 143-149.
- Duxbury, J. G., & Ling, L. T. (2010). The effects of cooperative learning on foreign language anxiety: *A comparative study of Taiwanese and American universities. International Journal of Instruction*, 3(1), 3-18.
- Ebrahimi1 .Z,& Azhideh .P (2015).The Effects of Teaching Vocabulary Learning Strategies on Iranian EFL Learners ‘Vocabulary Development. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL) Volume 3, Issue 1, January 2015, PP 57-64 ISSN 2347-3126 (Print) & ISSN 2347-3134 (Online) www.arcjournals.org.*
- Fekri ,N.(2016)Investigating the Effect of Cooperative Learning and Competitive Learning Strategies on the English Vocabulary Development of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. Department of English language, Aliabad Katoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, Aliabad Katoul, Iran.: Department of English language, Aliabad Katoul Branch, Islamic Azad University, *Journal of English Language Teaching; Vol. 9, No. 11; 2016 ISSN 1916-4742 E-ISSN 1916-4750, Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.*
- Gairns, R. & Redman, S. (1986). *Working with words: A guide to teaching and learning vocabulary.* USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Harel, Y. (1992). Teacher talk in the cooperative learning classroom. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book* (pp.153-162). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Hauge, E. (1999). Some common emblems used by British English teachers in EFL classes. In Killick, David & Margaret Parry (Eds.), *Cross-cultural Capability - Promoting the Discipline: Marking Boundaries and Crossing Borders Proceedings of the conference at Leeds Metropolitan University Dec*, pp. 405-420.

Jacob, G. M. (2006). *Issues in implementing cooperative learning*. In S. G. Jacobs, G. M. & McCafferty, S. G. (2006) Connections between cooperative learning and second language learning and teaching, in: S. G. McCafferty, G. M. Jacobs & A. C. DaSilva Iddings (Eds) *Cooperative Learning and Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 18-29.

Jacobs, G. M. (1997). Cooperative learning or just grouping students: *The difference makes a difference*. In W. A. Renandya, & G. M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Learners and language learning* (pp. 172-193). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Jacobs, G.M., Crokall, D., & Thiyaragarajali, R. (1997). *The evolution of group activities in ELT coursebooks*. *Folio*, 4(2), 21-24.

Johnson D. W. (1989) *An Overview Cooperative Learning The Cooperative Learning*, Center University of Minnesota <http://www.co-operation.org>. New York. Minnesota.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1987). *Structuring cooperative learning: lesson plans for teachers*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, F. (1991). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1994). *Learning together and alone, cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning*. Needham Heights, MA: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Leading the cooperative school*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

Jolliffe, W. (2007). *Cooperative learning in the classroom: putting it into practice*. London: Paul Chapman.

Kagan, S. (1994). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publications

Lyman, F. (1981). *The responsive classroom discussion: The inclusion of all students*. In A.

Murad, A.S. & Selman, M.A.A. (2012). *The Testes and Measurements in the Mental and Educational Sciences , the steps and their numbers and characteristics* . Cario: Dar AL-Katab AL-Hadeeth Press.

Najmonnisa & Saad, I. (2017) *The Role of Cooperative Learning Method in Teaching of Science Subject at Elementary School Level: An Experimental Study: Bulletin of Education and Research August 2017, Vol. 39, No. 2 pp. 1-17*.

Reed, D. K. (2012). *Why teach spelling?* Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

Sime, D. (2001). *The use and perception of illustrators in the foreign language classroom*. In Cavé, Christian, Isabelle Guaitella, & Serge Santi (Eds.), *Oralité et gestualité*

- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research and practice*. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Strickland, D. S., & Feeley, J. T. (2003). Development in the elementary school years. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp.529-535). New York: Macmillan.
- Susanto, A. & Fazlinda, A, (2016). English Vocabulary Acquisition through Vocabulary Learning Strategy and Socio-Educational Factors: A Review. *Applied Science and Technology*, 1(1), 173, pp. 166-173.
- Takač, V. P., & Singleton, D. (2008). *Vocabulary learning strategies and foreign language acquisition*. Canada: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Tellier, M. (2007). How do teacher's gestures help young children in second language acquisition? *Proceedings of the meeting of International Society of Gesture Studies*, Allyn & Bacon.
- Thorbury, S. (2002). *How to teach vocabulary*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Wang, Tzu-Pu(2007), The Comparison of the Difficulties between Cooperative Learning and Traditional Teaching Methods in College English Teachers. Department of Applied English, Kun Shan University. *Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning* Vol. 3, Num. 2, December 2007 274 p27-28.
- Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 81-83.