

---

## The Effectiveness Of Using Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) In Teaching Reading Of Narrative At Second Grade Of MA Mambaus Sholihin

Zumrotul Faricha<sup>1</sup>, Khoirul Huda<sup>2</sup>

*Students of Institut Keislaman Abdullah Faqih Gresik<sup>1</sup>*

*English Language Department, Faculty of Tarbiyah, Institut Keislaman Abdullah Faqih Gresik<sup>2</sup>*

[zumrotulfaricha@gmail.com](mailto:zumrotulfaricha@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [khoirulhuda.inkafa@gmail.com](mailto:khoirulhuda.inkafa@gmail.com)<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

*The objective of the research was to see the effectiveness Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) technique in teaching reading of the narrative text at the second Grade students of MA Mambaus Solihin and also to help the English teachers create interactive activities for students while learning reading of a narrative text. The method applied in this research was pre-experimental research. There was class, this research was conducted through the following procedures: giving the pre-test, and giving a post-test. The result of the research proved that the Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) technique is effective to be used in learning reading of a narrative text. The finding showed that both groups had a significant difference. It could be said that the pre-test and post-test value is increased. it was proven from the materials, scores and activities which were used in the C class that support students' interesting to learn more about reading topic.*

**Keywords:** Cooperative learning, Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) Technique, Reading, Narrative Text

### I. INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the main language skills. Reading skill also has a big role for the students to get some information from English text in order to increase their knowledge. (Harmer, 1991) Explains that reading is receptive skill work, then, should

involve learners in reading or listening where they are able to process the language sufficiently at least to extract the meaning, through Reading, students can increase their competence which is related to the target language. Students also can improve their fluency in other skills like speaking. Hence,

reading is taught in the second grade of senior high school with some goals that have been created by the government. Students of second-grade senior high school should understand the social function, text structure, and the elements of the narrative text in table based on the context function (Hakim, 2017).

However, teaching reading text at second-grade senior high school is not easy. Based on the observed teacher of MA Mambaus Sholihin Gresik, some students get difficulties to achieve the goal in learning reading materials, in the learning process, they like to read the text loudly but they do not understand the messages or information of the text. Furthermore, it is caused by a lack of vocabulary they had. Here, the problem which is faced by the students in MA Mambaus Solihin Gresik, Especially at second-grade students, becomes a central point of this research. Therefore, the researcher uses the *Teams Games Tournaments* (TGT) method and then measures its effectiveness. This research focuses on the effectiveness of TGT method in teaching reading which is expected can help the students to get the effective, good and gratify teaching and fulfill what they need in this learning

Based on the explanation above, this research is focused on finding an alternative technique in teaching reading of a narrative text, it is expected can make students enjoy learning and make them confident to show their English ability. And then, the alternative technique is also expected can encourage students' motivation in the teaching and learning process (Aziz & Dewi, 2019).

Moreover, the students feel fun in the classroom while teaching and learning process. As a professional worker, the teacher is expected to be able to motivate the students in specific ways. By using *Teams Games Tournaments* (TGT), the teacher probably can motivate the students to understand narrative text (Kim, Almond, & Shute, 2016). Because by *Teams Games Tournaments* (TGT), the students can work together with their friends and they have variation in their learning style in the classroom. So, the teacher hopes that students will enjoy their learning activities. Roy Killen concludes that TGT is suited to the same types of subject matter and learning outcomes as STAD. It requires a little more than STAD, but can be very motivating for learners (Killen, 2006).

There are some methods of teaching in teaching and learning English, one of them is Cooperative learning. Cooperative

learning requires pupils work together in small groups to support each other to improve their own learning and that of others (Jolliffe, 2015). It means in cooperative learning students study together and solve problems together, students have a sense of responsibility to themselves and also to their friends in teaching and learning process to accomplish the goals (Gibson, 2018; Mitra, 2019). In cooperative learning, individuals look for the outcomes that are beneficial to themselves and beneficial to all group members. Cooperative Learning has many benefits which are related to students (Karim, 2018; Slavin, 2015; Slavin Robert, 1995). Cooperative Learning classes are often more relaxed and enjoyable than traditional classes. This creates a positive learning environment, with more students attentive to assigned tasks. As a result, academic achievement increases for all students (Oliveira et al., 2015).

Cooperative Learning has some general or variation methods (Jenkins, Fuchs, Van den Broek, Espin, & Deno, 2003; Jong, Lai, Hsia, Lin, & Lu, 2013; Son & Metcalfe, 2000), Some variations on the theme of Cooperative Learning: Students Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Teams Games Tournaments (TGT), Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI), Jigsaw, and Cooperative Integrated Reading and

Composition (CIRC) (Cruickshank, 1990). Furthermore, Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) technique originally was developed by David Den Vries and Keith Edward. According to Robert E. Slavin “Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) originally developed by David De Vries and Keith Edward. It uses the same teacher presentations and teamwork as in STAD but replaces the quizzes with weekly tournaments, in which students play academic games with members of the teams to contribute points to their team score (Slavin, 2015).

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### A. *The General Concept of Cooperative Learning*

Cooperative learning is an interesting momentum learning in the early 1980s with the first meta-analysis involving 122 learners on the cooperative, competitive and individualistic goal structures on student achievement and productivity in the united states (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon, 1981). The results show that cooperative learning reserver the learning process more effectively than personal competition models. In addition, these results are consistent in all subject areas (language arts, reading, mathematics, science, social studies and physical education), for all age groups by involving conceptual understanding, problem-solving,

categorization, and reasoning (Karim, 2018; Slavin, 1983).

Cooperative learning is a term that describes teaching procedures in which students collaborate in small groups and are rewarded for achievement learners (Cruickshank, 1990). Cooperative learning also defines as an instructional technique in which learners work together in small groups to help one other achieve a common learning goal (Belward, Balatti, & Australasia, 2012; Killen, 2006; Mitra, 2019). It means that individual students get the beneficial outcomes of themselves in cooperative situations. Cooperative learning enhances students' enthusiasm for learning in order to get academic success. Slavin, one of the founders of cooperative learning, believes that the group focus of cooperative learning can change the norm of youth culture and make it more acceptable to excel in academic learning tasks (Slavin, 1983, 2015).

In addition, cooperative learning encouraged the students to work together and responsible for all comprehension of the groups' members. Cooperative groups must be heterogeneous in terms of gender, academic ability, race, and other traits (Cruickshank, 1990; Jenkins et al., 2003; Son & Metcalfe, 2000). Heterogeneity is

promoted for at least three reasons: First, cooperative learning is based partly on the humanistic school of thought about learning. One of its major objectives is to make students feel better about themselves and to be more accepting of others. A second reason to form heterogeneous teams is so that each member will have an equal opportunity to learn since "talent" is about equally distributed to each group. Finally, heterogeneity is fostered because students with lower abilities are more likely to improve their achievement in mixed group than in homogeneous groups (Bernal Castañeda, 2017; Cruickshank, 1990).

From the statements above, it can be said that members of groups in Cooperative Learning method consist of various background abilities. It conducted to make the students feel better and accept others. Moreover, students with lower abilities will improve their achievement because they will learn with the students of higher abilities in the same group.

### ***B. Characteristic of Cooperative Learning***

Cooperative learning has some characteristics. According to (Hegelheimer, Ware, & Kessler, 2009) the characteristics of Cooperative Learning are: First, Positive Independence; Positive independence occurs when the gains for one individual are

associated with gains for others: that is, when one student achieves, others benefit (Kessler, 1992). Second, Team Formation; Positive independence implies the grouping has occurred, either by assignment or by change. Students can group themselves: “leaders” can take turns selecting teammates or teachers can assign students to team (Costely, 2015). Informal or spontaneous grouping is less desirable in many situations than formal or planned grouping methods (heterogeneous, random, interest, and homogeneous/heterogeneous language ability).

Third, Accountability. Research shows that both individual and group accountability is important for achievement in Cooperative Learning setting (Slavin, 1983, 1988, 2015; Slavin Robert, 1995). Methods that use only a group grade or a group product without making each member accountable do not consistently produce achieving gains. Students may be made individually accountable by signing each student a grade on his or her own portion of the team project or by the rule that the group may not go on to the next activity until all the team members finish the task.

A primary way to ensure accountability is through testing. Forth, Social Skills: (Johnson & Johnson, 1990) include teaching social skills as a defining

characteristic of Cooperative Learning. Social skills teaching, however, are not always an element in some of the most widely researched Cooperative Learning procedures, such as Students Teams Achievements Divisions (STAD) discussed in (Slavin, 1983). And the last, Structuring and Structures. Structures are generic, content-free ways of organizing student interactions with content and with each other. For example, (Step 1) one student talks while others listen, the (Step 2) the next student talk, etc. structures describe different ways students are to interact (Hegelheimer et al., 2009; Kessler, 1992).

### C. *the Role of Teachers in Increasing Collaboration among Students*

There is no doubt that teachers play a key role in building cooperative learning experiences in their classrooms. This includes grouping and assignments so students understand what they are expected to do and how they are expected to behave. It also includes the teacher's understanding that they have a role in promoting student interaction during small group discussions. Helping students to interact and work together not only allows students to learn from each other but also to accept responsibility for the tasks they have to complete and the decisions they have to make.

Several studies have shows that high-level cognitive learning that combines facts, concepts, and thoughts only appears with low frequency when allowed to appear as a by-product of small group learning (Altun, 2017; Häkkinen et al., 2017; Meloth & Deering, 1999; Sencibaugh & Sencibaugh, 2016). Students do not decipher information, do not ask questions to stimulate thinking, and do not spontaneously utilize prior knowledge without some relevant external guidance (Gu, Shao, Guo, & Lim, 2015; King, 2002; Meloth & Deering, 1999). (Chinn, O'donnell, & Jinks, 2000; Hitt & González-Martín, 2015) also observed that students were rarely involved in high-level discourse or explanatory behavior that provided reasons for conclusions unless explicitly taught to do so. However, when students are taught to speak and reason together and apply these skills in their interactions with each other, (Gillies, 2016; Mercer\*, Dawes, Wegerif, & Sams, 2004) find that they can speak and reason effectively. Besides, this talk-based group activity helps in the development of reasoning, problem-solving and individual learning.

(Gillies, 2016) found that when teachers are taught how to mediate student learning by engaging in dialogical exchanges where they explore and clarify problems, deal with differences in student thinking,

offer temporary advice, and acknowledge and validate students. responses, children's responses to one another reflect the many responses they give to their teacher, that is, they are detailed or elaborated. In a study of the verbal behavior of teachers and students in the middle class, (Gillies, 2017) found that teachers who applied cooperative learning showed more mediated learning interactions than teachers who only applied group work. In addition, students in cooperative groups engage in more general verbal behavior that is seen as helping and supporting group efforts than their peers in working groups only (ie, ad hoc groups where students have not been taught to work together). Gillies argues that many of these verbal behaviors may, in part, arise from the type of reciprocal interaction that their teacher models when they interact with group members where students learn to provide more explanations and detailed responses to requests for help or other students' perceptions. need help. The frequency of multi-directional responses that occur in cooperative groups both among students and with their teachers may also have arisen from group assignments that are generally open and discovery-based and require students to exchange information and ideas to find solutions to these problems. In short, research (Altun, 2017; Gillies, 2016; Mercer et al., 2004) shows that teachers can

teach students how to talk and reason together to improve student interaction and learning

*D. The General Concept of Teams Games Tournaments (TGT)*

According to Roy Killen, “TGT was Slavin’s original version of cooperative learning (Slavin, 1983, 2015; Slavin Robert, 1995). It is similar to STAD in that teachers present information to learners and then they have one another learn. The difference is the quizzes are replaced with tournaments in which learners compete with members of other teams in order to gain points for their home team (Killen, 2006). So based on the Roy Killen definition, Teams Games Tournaments (TGT) has similarity with STAD but the quizzes that used in STAD are replaced with tournaments in TGT. In addition, Slavin stated that “TGT is the same as STAD in every aspect but one: instead of the quizzes and the individual improvement score system, TGT uses academic tournament, in which students compete as representatives of their teams with members of other teams who are like them in past academic performance (Slavin, 2015). In another word, TGT and STAD have the same several elements but different in using quizzes, STAD uses the simple quizzes, while TGT uses academic tournament.

*E. The Principles of Teams Games Tournaments (TGT)*

According to Slavin, TGT has five principles as follows; *Class presentation* (Slavin, 1983), what does mean class presentation in TGT is the same as a class presentation in STAD, materials are introduced here. Slavin said that this is often the direct instruction or a lecture-discussion conducted by the teacher. *Teams* (Slavin Robert, 1995), teams in TGT is also same as teams in STAD, teams are composed of four or five students who represent a cross-section of the class in terms of academic performance, sex, and race or ethnicity, the major function of the team is to make sure that all team members are learning, and, major specifically, to prepare its members to do well on the quizzes. After the teacher presents the material, the team meets to study worksheets or other material. Most often, the study involves students discussing problems together, comparing answers, and correcting any misconceptions if teammates make mistakes. *Games* (Slavin Robert, 1995), the games are composed of content-relevant questions designed to test the knowledge students gain from class presentations and team practice. Games are played at tables of three students, each of whom represents of a different team. Most games are simply numbered questions on the ditto sheet.

Students a numbered card and attempts to answer the question corresponding to the number. A challenging rule permits players to challenge one another answer. *Tournaments* (Slavin Robert, 1995), the tournament is the structure in which the games take place. It is usually held off the end of a week or a unit after the teacher has made the class-presentation and the team has had time to practice with their worksheet. Thus, the teams have proper preparation for the participation of the tournament. *Team Recognition* (Slavin Robert, 1995), team scores are computed based on team "members improvement scores, and individual certificated, a class newsletter or a bulletin board recognize the high-scoring team

### III. METHOD

This study used a pre-experimental study in one class of an experimental class. The writer takes the pre-test for the students at the beginning of the study. After giving a pre-test, the writer gives the treatment by using TGT method in the class, At the last step of the research, the writer gives a post-test in order to reach a result whether the students in that class have significant improvement in understanding narrative text or not. The formula one-Group pretest-post test design:

Pre-test	Independent Variable	Post-test
$Y_1$	X	$Y_1$

$Y_1$ : Pre-test and post-test

X : Independent of variable

#### A. *Participants*

The participants of this study are the second grade students of MA.Mambaus Sholihin Manyar Gresik. The writer specifies the sample by 18 students.

The student uses the purposive sample that included one class to be a sample of experiment. Fm the second grade that has 6 classes, the writer uses the C class to be subject of the experiment.

#### B. *Instrument*

The instrument of this research is a test. it is concluded of two tests which are pre-test and post-test.

1. A pre-test is used for observation before applying TGT Method in teaching the reading of a narrative text.
2. Post-test is used for observation after implement TGT Method in teaching reading of narrative text.



#### IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result shows that the average score of each group was different. The researcher found the difference in the average score between the pre-test and post-test. Several steps of t-test explained in the preceding chapter. The first step was an analysis of the pre-test. It presented as below:

The writer gets the result of the test from the student of C class at MA. Mambaus Sholihin Gresik as the table below:

*Table 1 The Result of Test*

No	Subject	Pretest	Post-test
1	S1	40	80
2	S2	40	70
3	S3	50	90
4	S4	60	90
5	S5	70	90
6	S6	40	80
7	S7	30	70
8	S8	50	90
9	S9	30	80

10	S10	30	80
11	S11	40	80
12	S12	40	80
13	S13	30	70
14	S14	30	60
15	S15	40	90
16	S16	40	70
17	S17	50	90
18	S18	50	90
	N= 18	y1=760	y2=1450

From on the table, the writer explains the resulting test achievement students before treatment and after treatment of TGT Method in reading comprehension skill at the second-grade students of MA. Mambaus Sholihin Gresik.

The data analysis form contents from research, with the data analysis that be intended to born out or “t” test propriety on hypotheses, have forward is for try propriety about the effectiveness of using TGT Method

in teaching reading of the narrative text at the second-grade students of MA. Mambaus Sholihin Gresik.

1. Alternative Hypotheses (Ha) that try building on research problem that explains as the following: the effectiveness of TGT Method in teaching reading.
2. Null Hypotheses (Ho) is not the effectiveness of TGT Method in teaching reading.
3. For the forward “t” test hypotheses as already forward, so the writer uses analysis statistics “t” test with table extrapolation the following:

*Table 2*

*The result pre-test and post-test pre-experiment*

No	Subject	Pretest	Post-test	D (Gain Pe-test and post-test)
1	S1	40	80	+40
2	S2	40	70	+30

3	S3	50	90	+40
4	S4	60	90	+30
5	S5	70	90	+20
6	S6	40	80	+40
7	S7	30	70	+40
8	S8	50	90	+40
9	S9	30	80	+50
10	S10	30	80	+50
11	S11	40	80	+40
12	S12	40	80	+40
13	S13	30	70	+40
14	S14	30	60	+30
15	S15	40	90	+50
16	S16	40	70	+30
17	S17	50	90	+40
18	S18	50	90	+40
	N= 18	y1=760	y2=1450	

NO	D (Gain Pe- test and post- test)	Xd	Dm (Md-d)
S1	+40	1,7	2,89
S2	+30	-8,3	68,89
S3	+40	1,7	2,89
S4	+30	-8,3	68,89
S5	+20	-18,3	334,89
S6	+40	1,7	2,89
S7	+40	1,7	2,89
S8	+40	1,7	2,89
S9	+50	11,7	136,89
S10	+50	11,7	136,89
S11	+40	1,7	2,89
S12	+40	1,7	2,89
S13	+40	1,7	2,89

S14	+30	-8,3	68,89
S15	+50	11,7	136,89
S16	+30	-8,3	68,89
S17	+40	1,7	2,89
S18	+40	1,7	2,89
			1050,02

$$Md = \frac{\sum d}{N} = \frac{690}{18} = 38,3$$

$$t = \frac{Md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 d}{N(N-1)}}}$$

$$= \frac{38,3}{\sqrt{\frac{1050,03}{18(17)}}}$$

$$= \frac{38,3}{1,85}$$

$$= 20,7$$

The finding showed that there was a significant difference on the English reading comprehension between the student's pre-test and post-test who were taught by using TGT method. There were some interpretative reasons to explain this problem.

First, it was related to the students' initial differences in the pre-test and post-test. Those were the differences in the students' ability based on the pretest scores. The pre-test is to measure the student's achievement.

The discussion from cost-effectiveness between result achievement pre-test and post-test not signed negative, the mean get to conclude that between two result achievement that signed correlation positive with analysis "t" test that procurable value 20,7. The strength of result data analysis the effectiveness student over have the conclusion that comprehension students about model cooperative learning typescript that is very big. Moreover, get acceptance by students and used as model learning.

So that alternative hypotheses ( $H_a$ ) that forward get to know that model TGT (team games tournaments) is very effective to increase in teaching reading; at the second-grade students of MA. Mambaus Sholihin Gresik.

From the finding over, so get to know the effectiveness of TGT Method in teaching reading very effective, because this method is correct for senior high school to coached students in exportable skill, although cost-effectiveness in learning until very increasing to reading comprehension in learning.

The finding showed that both group had a significant difference. It could be said that the pre-test and post-test value is increased. it was proven from the materials, scores and activities which were used in the C class that support students' interesting to learn more about reading topic.

In addition, Slavin stated that TGT is the same as STAD in every aspect but one: instead of the quizzes and the individual improvement score system, TGT uses academic tournament, in which students compete as representatives of their teams with members of other teams who are like them in past academic performance. Therefore, the research conducted by Slavin gave the researcher an inspiration to conduct a research on the teaching reading using TGT in student's reading comprehension. The researcher wants to know the effectiveness of TGT method in teaching reading at second-grade students of MA. Mambaus Sholihin Suci Manyar Gresik.

Finally, teaching reading by using TGT method is effective as interesting activities, because TGT is a simple method for improving students' reading skill comprehension. It also made students active and cooperative with their friends to find the solutions of problem they find. So that, they can increase their competence in learning reading skill.

## V. CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, the study concludes that the Teams Games Tournaments method is more effective than the conventional method in teaching reading. Then, Although this research is finished well and successfully, there are some flaws of this research which become the evaluation for the researcher. The reference books which the researcher got are too limited, so the theoretical review is felt insufficiently perfect. The treatments of teaching reading was also felt less because the time was limited. On the other hand, the scope of teaching reading is still general and it needs to be limited in order that the objective of the study can be achieved and answered clearly and specifically, and in order that it will not be extended. So, the writer took a limitation in teaching reading skills.

## VI. REFERENCES

- Altun, S. (2017). The effect of cooperative learning on students' achievement and views on the science and technology course. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 7(3), 451–468.
- Aziz, I. N., & Dewi, Y. A. S. (2019). The Effect of Contextual Teaching and Learning on Students' English Grammar Competance. *ALSUNA: JOURNAL OF ARABIC AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE*, 2(2), 3.
- Belward, S., Balatti, J., & Australasia, M. E. R. G. of. (2012). Doing It Differently: The Ups and Downs of Peer Group Learning. *Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia*. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.stir.ac.uk/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=ED573195&site=ehost-live>
- Bernal Castañeda, S. (2017). Affective Limitations in Second Language Acquisition by Spanish Adult Learners in Vocational Training Programs. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 10(1), 133–160. <https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2017.10.1.6>
- Chinn, C. A., O'donnell, A. M., & Jinks, T. S. (2000). The structure of discourse in collaborative learning. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 69(1), 77–97.
- Costely, K. (2015). Research Supporting Integrated Curriculum: Evidence for using this Method of Instruction in Public School Classrooms. *Arkansas Tech University*, 1–11.
- Cruickshank, D. R. (1990). *Research that Informs Teachers and Teacher Educators*. ERIC.
- Gibson, S. R. C. (2018). A Study Into the Effect of SQ3R with Cooperative Learning on the Reading Progress of Student Nurses. Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University.
- Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 3.
- Gillies, R. M. (2017). Promoting academically productive student dialogue during collaborative learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*.
- Gu, X., Shao, Y., Guo, X., & Lim, C. P. (2015). Designing a role structure to

- engage students in computer-supported collaborative learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 24, 13–20.
- Hakim, L. (2017). Analisis Perbedaan Antara Kurikulum KTSP dan Kurikulum 2013. *Didaktika*, 17(2), 280–292. <https://doi.org/10.22373/jid.v16i1.590.5>
- Häkkinen, P., Järvelä, S., Mäkitalo-Siegl, K., Ahonen, A., Näykki, P., & Valtonen, T. (2017). Preparing teacher-students for twenty-first-century learning practices (PREP 21): a framework for enhancing collaborative problem-solving and strategic learning skills. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(1), 25–41.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practical of English Language Teaching* (Third Edit). United Kingdom: (Longman) Pearson Education Limited.
- Hegelheimer, V., Ware, P., & Kessler, G. (2009). *TESOL technology standards framework* (First). Virginia, USA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. Retrieved from [https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/books/bk\\_technologystandards\\_framework\\_721.pdf](https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/books/bk_technologystandards_framework_721.pdf)
- Hitt, F., & González-Martín, A. S. (2015). Covariation between variables in a modelling process: The ACODESA (collaborative learning, scientific debate and self-reflection) method. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 88(2), 201–219.
- Jenkins, J. R., Fuchs, L. S., Van den Broek, P., Espin, C., & Deno, S. L. (2003). Sources of Individual Differences in Reading Comprehension and Reading Fluency. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 719–729. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.719>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1990). Cooperative learning and achievement.
- Johnson, D. W., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89(1), 47.
- Jolliffe, W. (2015). Bridging the gap: teachers cooperating together to implement cooperative learning. *Education 3-13*, 43(1), 70–82.
- Jong, B., Lai, C., Hsia, Y., Lin, T., & Lu, C. (2013). Using Game-Based Cooperative Learning to Improve Learning Motivation : A Study of Online Game Use in an Operating Systems Course. *IEEE Transaction on Education*, 56(2), 183–190.
- Karim, K. (2018). Cooperative Language Learning. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–5.
- Kessler, C. (1992). *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book*. Prentice Hall.
- Killen, R. (2006). *Effective teaching strategies: Lessons from research and practice*. Cengage Learning Australia.
- Kim, Y. J., Almond, R. G., & Shute, V. J. (2016). Applying Evidence-Centered Design for the Development of Game-Based Assessments in Physics Playground. *International Journal of Testing*, 00, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2015.1108322>
- King, A. (2002). Structuring peer interaction to promote high-level cognitive processing. *Theory into Practice*, 41(1), 33–39.
- Meloth, M. S., & Deering, P. D. (1999). The role of the teacher in promoting

- cognitive processing during collaborative learning.
- Mercer\*, N., Dawes, L., Wegerif, R., & Sams, C. (2004). Reasoning as a scientist: Ways of helping children to use language to learn science. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(3), 359–377.
- Mitra, S. (2019). Does Collaborative Use of the Internet Affect Reading Comprehension in Children?. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 6(1), 20–36.
- Oliveira, A. W., Meskill, C., Judson, D., Gregory, K., Rogers, P., Imperial, C. J., & Casler-Failing, S. (2015). Language repair strategies in bilingual tutoring of mathematics word problems. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 15(1), 102–115.
- Sencibaugh, J. M., & Sencibaugh, A. M. (2016). An analysis of cooperative learning approaches for students with learning disabilities. *Education*, 136(3), 356–364.
- Slavin, R. E. (1983). *Cooperative Learning. Research on Teaching Monograph Series*. ERIC.
- Slavin, R. E. (1988). Cooperative learning and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 46(2), 31–33.
- Slavin, R. E. (2015). Cooperative learning in elementary schools. *Education 3-13*, 43(1), 5–14.
- Slavin Robert, E. (1995). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Massachusetts: A Simon and Schuster Company.
- Son, L. K., & Metcalfe, J. (2000). Metacognitive and Control Strategies in Study-Time Allocation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 26(1), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1037/278-7393.26.1.204>