THE EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING TECHNIQUES AND SELF-CONFIDENCE ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING COMPETENCY

Dewa Ayu Rai Wiryadi Joni

Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Jl. Kamboja Denpasar
e-mail: ari.rudo@gmail.com

Abstract: The Effect of Cooperative Learning Techniques and Self-Confidence on Students' Speaking Competency. This study investigated the effect of cooperative learning techniques (Jigsaw II and STAD) on speaking competency viewed from students' self-confidence (high and low). 'Posttest only control group' design with 2x2 factorial arrangement using Two-Way ANOVA and Tukey Test was employed. The second semester students majoring in English Education in Mahasaraswati University were sampled and involved in the experiment. The findings indicated that there was a significant effect of cooperative learning techniques (Jigsaw II and STAD) on students' speaking competency. The students with high-self-confidence speak better after they were treated using Jigsaw II than using STAD. However, no difference was found when the low self-confidence were treated using the two techniques. This study provided an empirical evidence of the importance for taking self-confidence into consideration when a teacher decided to implement a new teaching technique in his/her class.

Keywords: speaking competency, cooperative learning, Jigsaw II, STAD, self-confidence

Abstrak:Pengaruh Penggunaan Teknik Pembelajaran Kooperatif dan Kepercayaan Diri terhadap Keterampilan Berbicara Mahasiswa. Penelitian ini bertujuan mengkaji perbedaan pengaruh penggunaan teknik pembelajaran kooperatif (Jigsaw II dan STAD) dan kepercayaan diri terhadap keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan rancangan *posttest-only control group design* dengan faktorial 2x2 menggunakan teknik analisis Anova dua jalur dan tes Tukey. Subjek penelitian adalah mahasiswa semester dua Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar. Temuan yang dihasilkan adalah bahwa terdapat pengaruh penggunaan teknik pembelajaran kooperatif (Jigsaw II dan STAD) dan kepercayaan diri terhadap keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa. Mahasiswa yang memiliki rasa percaya diri tinggi yang diajar dengan teknik Jigsaw II meraih keterampilan berbicara yang lebih baik daripada mahasiswa yang diajar dengan teknik STAD. Tidak ada perbedaan kemampuan berbicara pada mahasiswa dengan rasa percaya diri rendah yang diajar dengan kedua teknik tersebut. Penelitian membuktikan tentang perlunya seorang guru mempertimbangkan rasa percaya diri siswa dalam implementasi suatu pembelajaran yang baru.

Kata-kata Kunci:keterampilan berbicara, pembelajaran kooperatif, Jigsaw II, STAD, kepercayaan diri

According to Cummins in Herrell & Jordan (2004), there are two types of language that students must obtain. The first, "basic interpersonal communication skill (BICS)" or "social language" is gained more quickly and easily than the second, "cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)" or "academic language". These types are necessary for the students to participate successfully in classroom learning opportunities. English is needed to be in use in both types of language.

Many potential reasons affect a student in learning to speak in years of schooling (Brown[a], 2000). Some of them are students' intrinsic factors, one of which is students' self-confidence. Other intrinsic factors are more likely related

to outside influences, such as the teaching technique and classroom atmosphere.

As observed in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (hereafter, FKIP) Mahasaraswati University Denpasar, students majoring in English Education mostly struggled to actively manipulate English to meet the need of communication. This was due to their lack competency in the spoken language. Informal interview with the students confirmed students' actual problems, such as difficulty to listen to other people while at the same time prepare for appropriate response spontaneously; reluctance about appropriate words or expressions to be used; and fear of making mistakes in pronunciation and grammar. Meanwhile, the curriculum required them to demonstrate active and productive skills in the form of interactive dialogues or discussions. Students' limited English and lack of opportunity to speak spontaneously make them prefer to be quiet. This condition might cause the perception that speaking is difficult.

Speaking activities in the classroom should promote communicative competence rather than focus strictly on content (Riggenbach & Lazaraton in Celce-Murcia, 1991). The content-based learning in nature usually requires the implementation of rote learning strategies, such as memorization, repetition, and uncontextualized drills. These strategies hardly improve students' communicative competence. As a matter of fact, these strategies for learning are not likely to result in ability to communicate, whereas this communicative competence is the major goal of every language learning (Canale in Celce-Murcia, 1991).

To promote communicative competence in the classroom settings, a careful selection of teaching technique is required. The technique should be able to foster language skills as well as to lead students to be confident English speakers through working cooperatively. As far as effective teaching is concerned, Wang (2009) found that the cooperative strategies such as Jigsaw II, STAD, and Think Pair Share, positively affect learners' learning motivation to listen and to speak in the target language. This motivation leads them to achieve the language learning instructional objectives.

In addition to instructional strategy choice, (an external factor as viewed from the side of the learners), an internal factor like self-confidence has also been found to play an important role in students' success to learn a foreign language.

Clemet in Molberg (2010), defined self-confidence in term of self-perception of second or foreign language competence and low level of anxiety. With respect to the essential of speaking compe-tency for Englishas Foreign Language (here-after, EFL) learners, the levels of self-confidence that they attach with and the problems faced in communicating English as foreign language, the researcher has accomplished a research about the effect of different techniques of cooperative learning and self-confidence upon students' speaking competency.

Speaking competency is more than just being able to speak fluently with correct pronunciation, appropriate stress and intonation. Based on Harmer (2007), speakers of English must be able to speak in various ranges of topics as well as in different genres and situations. When speaking to someone, a speaker should employ conversational strategies and assure the occurrence of typical functional exchanges between them. However, one point to remember is that each speaker undergoes different speaking processes as they build their own knowledge and have different prior knowledge.

The product of speaking processes is the communication of thoughts and emotions by the speaker towards the interlocutors. The success of communication is depended upon how competent a speaker consigns a message. When a speaker understands the intention of particular oral language then the meaning of sounds is met. It results from the speaker's production of meaning through blending his prior knowledge with the communicative competence. When these speaking acts have lasted, the comprehension is represented in the knowledge then gathered from the speaking experience and reflected it in society (Dorn & Soffos in Al-Hebaish, 2012). This is due to one of the important components of communicative competence, which is an awareness of the differences between formal and informal language used in real life contexts and situations.

The EFL learners are considered to be competent if they are able to utilize their prior knowledge and oral skills into account in daily life. As a matter of fact, speaking ability is a priority to any second or foreign language learners. Therefore, every learner tried to do their best to cope with the complexity of the spoken language (i.e. speaking). Research has thrown considerable light on the complexity of spoken inte-racttion in either a first or second language.

Luoma (2004), for example, points out a number of spoken features as follows:

- Composed of idea units (conjoined short phrases and clauses).
- Planned (e.g., a lecture) or unplanned (e.g., a conversation) speech.
- Employs fixed phrases, fillers, and hesitation markers.
- Contains slips and errors reflecting online processing.
- Involves reciprocity (i.e., interactions are jointly constructed).
- Shows variation (e.g., between formal and casual speech), reflecting speaker roles, speaking purpose, and the context.

Those features mentioned above emphasize on the requirement for becoming competent English speakers. Richards and Rodgers (2001), point out that competency consists of 'essential skills, knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors' required for effective performance of a real-world task or activity. In other words, competency is not only about capability of doing something but also about the knowledge of considered terms, the way learners act in particular, the way learners think or behave, etc, which is considered to be acceptable in the society or real life. Thus, competency can direct learners to be an educated or competent part of society.

Docking (in Marcellino 2005) strengthens the abovementioned theory. Docking mentions that a unit of competency can be achieved through a task, a role, a function, or a learning module. These will vary from context to context. Therefore, competency may consist of specific knowledge, thinking processes, attitudes, and both perceptual and physical skills. All of these may be linked to any sphere of life in the field of work and social survival in a new environment. Competent speakers in a language should master the components of speaking competency. Based on Luoma (2004), speaking is defined as a strategic process involving speakers in using language for the purpose of achieving a certain goal in a particular speaking task. Speaking is heavily dependent on intelligibility of pronunciation, an understanding of grammar, fluency, vocabulary and appropriate content.

Teaching speaking in EFL context can be considered challenging because of the complexity of speaking competency as mentioned earlier. Teaching strategy choice becomes very important on the part of the teacher. The strategy should provide opportunities for the learners to interact with others using the target language. Learners should be put in groups and cooperatively accomplish the language learning objecttives. Hiçyilmaz (2005) maintains that cooperative learning approach capitalizes on one another's resources and skills (asking one another for information, evaluating one another's ideas, monitoring one another's work, etc.)

There were two teaching techniques of cooperative learning employed in this study: Jigsaw II and STAD. Jigsaw II is the mutation of common Jigsaw technique, which is mostly used for teaching reading (Slavin, 2009). The students work in four-or five-member teams. After being grouped, all students read a general text, such as a book chapter, a short story, an article in newspaper, or a biography. However, each student receives part of a topic on which to become an expert. Each student meets and discusses assigned part in expert group discussion. After mastering the sub part, each expert gathers to their home groups to report what they have learnt to their teammates. Then, each student takes individual assessment which results in team scores. If the group excels, the group recognition is given.

Meanwhile, STAD (Student Teams-Achievement Divisions) is described as an effective cooperative learning technique, which comprises common set of teaching, cooperative study in mixed-ability teams, and quizzes, with recognition provided to teams whose members excel (Slavin, 2009). STAD includes a regular cycle of instructional activities: explaining, groupings, and taking individual quizzes or other assessment (such as essays or performances), and finally publishing the team scores (which is the sum up of individual score in the team).

Both of these techniques mainly emphasize mutual or positive interdependency in learning. The primary role of the teacher is to arise students' willingness to speak. The teacher organizes the whole speaking class for the entire class and gives the students guided practice, direct modeling, and unequivocal instruction, and then transferred the leading role to the students, acting as a guide and assistant giving the students opportunity to participate in the speaking processes. The students construct meaning through interacting in groups interactively. Meaning construction from the teacher is strongly omitted.

Beside the teaching techniques used, the students' self-confidence had significantly influenced the students' under study achievement. Self-confidence, which is one of learners' affecttive considerations, involves judgments and evaluation about one's own value and worth. Self-confidence can negatively influence learners when they think of one's self as deficient and limited in the target language. On the other hand, high self-confidence can be positively correlated to oral performance (Heyde in Park & Lee, 2006).

It is very crucial to know and comprehend learners' self-confidence. Teachers can help and judge students through the understanding of learners' self-confidence, like how to treat learners with low self-confidence, how to develop them, or else. One of the ways to represent self-confidence is the "I can do it!" principle, or the self-confidence principle. At the soul of all learning is one's belief in his or her ability to accomplish a task. Simply put, based on Brown[b] (2000), self-confidence is the learners' belief that they are fully capable of achieving the assigned tasks. This capability is the indicating factor of their success in accomplishing the task.

This research aims at investigating: (1) whether there is an effect of cooperative learning techniques (Jigsaw II and STAD) on students' speaking competency, (2) whether there is an interactional effect of teaching techniques and self-confidence on students' speaking competency, (3) whether there is a significant difference in speaking competency between the students with high self-confidence who are taught with Jigsaw II and those who are taught with STAD, and (4) whether there is a significant difference in speaking competency between the students with low self-confidence who are taught using Jigsaw II and those who are taught using STAD.

METHODS

The research was conducted in The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (hereafter, FKIP) Mahasaraswati University Denpasar. 68 students were sampled from the second semester students in the academic year 2012/2013 and were classified into high and low self-confidence groups. The former were taught by using Jigsaw II while the latter by using STAD.

The research employed a *Posttest Only Control-Group Design* using a 2x2 factorial arrangement. Data were collected through speaking competency test (to gain data on speaking competency) and self-confidence questionnaire (to classify samples into high and low self-confidence groups). The speaking performance test used five criterions, which were adapted from Council of Europe and National Board of Education (in Luoma, 2004), with three major topics, namely health, education, and environment into analytical scoring rubric. The questionnaire was adapted and developed based on six dimensions by Aida (in Park & Lee, 2006) into five point-Likert scale. These dimensions comprise positive perception of own capability as an English Learner, acceptance in groups, feeling in speaking task of certain knowledge in classroom, applicability of speaking English in real life, positive progress of English speaking competency and feeling of speaking English in classroom. Meanwhile, for the treatment instruments, lesson plans and teaching handouts were used. The collected data were analyzed using Two-Way Anova assisted by SPSS 16.0 and Tukey test. Before analyzing the data using descriptive statistical analysis and inferential statistical analysis, such as Two Way Anova and Tukey Test, two major assumptions must be revealed, namely normality testing (by means of Kolmogorov-Smirnov formula) and homogeneity testing (by means of Levene's test of Equality of Error variance).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

The normal distribution of the data as well as the homogeneity of subjects was first of all tested. The finding confirmed that the research could proceed to the next step, descriptive statistical analysis. The median, mean, and mode as well as the spread of dispersion (standard deviation, variance, range, minimum, and maximum) of the eight cohorts were presented in Table 1 below.

The data could be grouped into eight cohorts, such as: (1) group of students who were taught using Jigsaw II (A1), (2) group of students who were taught using STAD (A2), (3) group of students with high self-confidence (B1), (4) group of students with low self-confidence (B2), (5) group of students who were taught using Jigsaw II with high self-confidence (A1B1), (6) group of students who were taught using STAD

with high self-confidence (A2B1), (7) group of students who were taught using Jigsaw II with low self-confidence (A1B2), and (8) group of students who were taught using STAD with low self-confidence (A2B2). The table reveals that A1B1 shows the highest speaking competency.

This indicates that students who have high self confidence are more in favor with Jigsaw Type II in learning to speak in EFL. The low achievement of B2 demonstrates that the role of self-confidence is important as far as learning to speak in EFL is concerned.

Table 1. Summary of The Descriptive Statistical Data

Statistics	A1	A2	B1	B2	A1B1	A2B1	A1B2	A2B2
N	68	68	68	68	34	34	34	34
Mean	81.18	72.94	81.18	66.76	89.18	71.29	73.18	74.59
Median	82.00	72.00	80.00	70.00	88.00	72.00	76.00	76.00
Mode	88	72	80	70	88	72	76	76
Std. Deviation	9.21	2.96	3.70	5.20	3.67	2.54	5.05	2.42
Variance	84.87	8.784	13.72	27.09	13.52	6.47	25.52	5.88
Range	32	12	10	20	12	8	16	8
Minimum	64	68	75	55	84	68	64	72
Maximum	96	80	85	75	96	76	80	80

The next step was the employment of Two-Way ANOVA to examine the main effect of the two cooperative teaching strategies on students' speaking competency. It was found that there was an interactional effect of teaching techniques and self-confidence on students' speaking competency. The summary of the findings can be summarized in the Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Findings from Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of Two-way Anova Analysis

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3421.176[a]	3	1140.392	88.726	.000
Intercept	403788.235	1	403788.235	3.142E4	.000
selfconfidence	686.118	1	686.118	53.382	.000
technique	1152.941	1	1152.941	89.703	.000
selfconfidence * technique	1582.118	1	1582.118	123.094	.000
Error	822.588	64	12.853		
Total	408032.000	68			
Corrected Total	4243.765	67			

a. R Squared = .806 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.797)

Discussions

The table shows that students treated with Jigsaw II achieved better that those treated with STAD. The Jigsaw II Group with high self-confidence achieved higher than the STAD Groups with the same category of self-confidence. On the contrary, the low self-confidence students achieved similarly when treated with either Jigsaw II or STAD (see details below). These findings answer or confirm the hypotheses testing that there is significant effect of cooperative learning techniques (Jigsaw II and STAD)

on speaking competency between the students taught by using Jigsaw II and those taught by using STAD. This supports Bancroft (2010) who found that cooperative learning had over-whelmingly effect on students' achievement levels, social relation and attitudes. Furthermore, it was found that Jigsaw II had significantly higher effect on students' speaking competency than STAD. These findings indicated that the participants in the Jigsaw II Group experienced a more meaningful learning as indicated by their better speaking competency. The five teaching syntax used in Jigsaw II led the students to do

independent reading and become active listeners during the speaking activities. They were trained and encouraged to speak up ideas, thoughts and opinions. As in the expert group discussion, the students were required to encourage themselves as important members of a cooperative study group for they had a responsibility to transfer the information to their home respective groups. As been known that when students learned with groups, they would experience a greater level of understanding of concepts and ideas than in individualized classes (Wilis in Zhou, 2011). Furthermore, in this research, the individual contribution of each member is accounted as known from the cooperative learning essential, which was the success of one's group depended on group member individual contribution. This was in line with one of the cooperative learning elements, which was individual accountability. This teaching technique forcefully entailed the students to develop and stimulate their own thinking skills which then influenced their responsibility to teach other study group members as the groups were formed in mixed-ability grouping between the high self-confidence students and low self-confidence students. Similarly, Chan (2004) found that the students' performances had improved sig-nificantly after being taught by Jigsaw II.

In addition, Wang (2009) also found that Jigsaw II did not only promote the achievement of integrated skills (i.e reading, listening and speaking) but also encouraged the affective domain of the students because the procedure of Jigsaw II obliged students to get actively involved. Subsequently, in investigating the interactional effect between the implementation of teaching techniques and self-confidence toward the students' speaking competency, the second hypothesis testing was accepted, that there is a significant interactional effect between teaching techniques and self-confidence on the students' speaking competency. It could be concluded that not only did teaching tecniques influence the students' speaking competency, but also the self-confidence.

Similarly, a study conducted by Tong (2004) that resulted on the solid relations between a positive self-confidence and students' performance on learning task. The more positive the students saw themselves in learning, the better performances they had. It could be assumed after the result of the second hypothesis testing that teaching techniques and the level of self-confidence could affect students' speaking competency. This finding was also strengthened by the result of study done by Al-Hebaish (2012), which revealed that the rising of self-confidence influenced the increasing of students' oral academic achievement. Therefore, the teaching techniques of cooperative learning must be used to enhance students' self-confidence (Johnson & Johnson, 2009).

Tukey test which was employed to find more detailed differences, found that there was a significant difference between the high self-confidence students who were taught with Jigsaw II and those who were taught with STAD. This finding confirms LoPiccolo (2012) who found that there was an advantage to employ Jigsaw II into courses to improve students' learning achievement and students' interaction

The lower impact of STAD on speaking competency may be due to the learning experience the students have gone through. This strategy allowed the students to develop their speaking competency by interacting using English with their teams. It was observable that the high self-confidence students were more risk-taking and more easy-going in interacting with others (Al-Hebaish, 2012). On the other hand, the low self-confidence students seemed to be more receptive. It is probable that they would learn from the high self-confidence receptively. Therefore, the high self-confidence students were inclined to dominate the discussion and so that they did not seem to be able to face argumentative situations in pairs discussion. On the other side, because the high self-confidence students felt confident to face challenges ahead, when being taught using Jigsaw II, they delivered the materials to the other members of the group confidently and accurately. They were more likely to be aware about their capability whether they were proficient or less proficient. They saw learning as an effort that they must encounter. Therefore, Jigsaw II which promoted and respected the attempt of each member was suitable to teach high self-confidence students. This is in conformity with Prom-D (2012) who proved that the Jigsaw II brings positive impact on achievement; and Sahin (2010), who claims that Jigsaw II increases both self confidence and achievement of the students.

However, the reversed phenomenon happened to the low self-confidence students. These students demonstrated the similar level of speaking competency as a result of the imple-

mentation of Jigsaw II and STAD. It was proven by the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference in students' speaking competency between those who were taught using Jigsaw II and those who were taught using STAD. As known that Jigsaw II and STAD belonged to cooperative learning model. In STAD, the low self-confidence students were encouraged to tag along into discussion with their pairs. They were benefited from the pairs as pairs must help the other members of group to achieve optimally in the performance test. If one member failed then all members did not get the group recognition. Likewise, in Jigsaw II, the low self-confidence students were challenged to take responsibility of the success of the group. It seemed that the concept of 'sink and swim' together occured in these both teaching techniques groups. It can be concluded that for the low self-confidence students, to be taught using Jigsaw II and STAD does not make any difference.

A study by Felder and Brent (2007) confirmed the effectiveness of various cooperative learning techniques in different classroom settings. They also stated that there were several reasons why cooperative learning was able to give positive effect towards the students' achievement. The teaching techniques of cooperative learning are suggested to be implemented to the low-achieving students, who eventually got stuck when studying alone. Through cooperative learning strategies they are forced to keep going by working cooperatively with high-achieving students. The high-achieving students are believed to bring motivating impact to their low achieving counterpart in which they take the charge of explaining and clarifying the materials

to the them so that they could learn together in effectively.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings and discussion above, it can be concluded that: *first*, there is a significant effect of cooperative learning techniques (Jigsaw II and STAD) on students' speaking competency. The students of Jigsaw II group achieved higher speaking competency than those of STAD group. *Second*, there is an interactional effect of teaching techniques and self-confidence on students' speaking competency. *Third*, there is a significant difference in speaking competency between the students with high self-confidence who are taught by using Jigsaw II and those by using STAD. The students with high self-confidence who gain higher speaking competency are best treated by using Jigsaw II. Finally, there is no significant difference in speaking competency between the students with low self-confidence who are taught by using Jigsaw II and those by using STAD. The students with low self-confidence are best treated using either Jigsaw II or STAD.

This study confirms that the effect of Jigsaw II and STAD as well as the levels of self-confidence on students' speaking competency is certainly significant. Therefore, the choice of teaching techniques should consider students' levels of self-confidence. Since this study is limited in the number of sample involved and duration of experiment time, further research considering larger size of samples and longer time of experiment so that the findings could improve the practice of EFL pedagogy.
.

REFERENCES

Al-Hebaish, S.,M. 2012. The Correlation between General Self-Confidence and Academc Achievement in the Oral Presentation Course, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(1): 60-65.

Bancroft, B. 2010. *Enhancing Student Achievement through Cooperative Learning at the Elementary Level.* Unpublised thesis. Michigan: Northern Michigan University.

Brown, D. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Longman.

Brown, D. 2000. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy(2nd Ed)*. New York: Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M. 1991. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (2nd Ed)*. New York: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.

Chan, K., W. 2004. Using Jigsaw II in Teacher Education Programmers, *Hongkong Teachers' Centre Journal*, 3: 91.

Felder, R., & Brent, R. 2007. *Cooperative Learning.* ACS Symposium Active Learning: Models from the Analytical Sciences. Washington, DC. 2nd of August 2007.

Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of Language Teaching (4th Ed).* New York: Longman.

Herrell, A. & Jordan, M. 2004. *Fifty Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners(2nd Ed).* New Jersey: Pearson.

Hiçyilmaz, A. 2005. "A Review of Cooperative Learning". *Turkish School of Linguistics*.

Johnson, R. T. & Johnson, D. W. 2009. An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning, *American Educational Research Association*, 38(5): 365-379.

LoPiccolo, O. 2012. *Testing Jigsaw Learning In a Freshman Laboratory Course.* ASEE Middle Atlantic Section Spring 2012 Conference University of Delaware. New York: April 20-21.

Luoma, S. 2004. *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcellino, M. 2005. Competency-Based Language Instruction in Speaking Classes: Its Theory and Implementation in Indonesian Contexts, *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1): 33-44.

Molberg, H., K., K. 2010. *The Consequence of Motivation and Linguistic Self-Confidence in Relation to Pupils' Oral Interaction*. Unpublished thesis. Tromso: Universitetet i Tromso.

Park, H. & Lee, A. 2006. L2 Learners' Anxiety, Self-Confidence and Oral Performance, *Modern Language Journal*, 1(82): 197.

Prom-D, D. 2012. *The Effect of Jigsaw II Technique on Reading Comprehension of MattayomSuksa 1 Students*. Unpublished thesis. Bangkok: Srinakharinwirot University.

Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sahin, A. 2010. Effects of Jigsaw II Technique on Academic Achievement and Attitudes to Written Expression Course, *Educational Research and Review*, 5(12): 777-787.

Slavin, R. 2009. *Educational Psychology Theory and Practice*. New Jersey: Pearson.

Tong, J. 2004. Little Voice: Students' Confidence and Their Responses in English Lessons. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. 1(1): 197.

Wang, T., P. 2009. Applying Slavin's Cooperative Learning Techniques to a College EFL Conversation Class, *The Journal of Human Resources and Adult Learning*, 5(1): 112-120.

Zhou, X. 2011. *Applying Cooperative Learning to english Teaching for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Students*. A Seminar Paper Presented to the Graduate Faculty University of Wisconsin-Platteville, Wisconsin: 13th of April.