Issued by English study program of IAIN Palopo

Promoting the Students Speaking Skill
by Implementing Collaborative Learning Method
in Teaching Speaking Skill

Ayyub B[*1], Erwin Akib[2], Bahrun Amin[3]

ayyub.bahar777@gmail.com

[1, 2, 3]Graduate Program Magister of English Language Education, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Abstract

This research was aimed at knowing the implementation of Collaborative Learning promotes students' speaking skill at the second semester English Education Department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar. This research applied a quasi-experimental design; the non-equivalent control group design. The sample was taken by using purposive random sampling technique. The total number of samples was 38 students of two classes consisting of class II G was experimental class and II C was the control class. There was speaking test as the instrument. The statistical result analysis of SPSS 25 showed that in accuracy sig 2-tailed = 0.000 is less than 0.05 and in fluency sig 2-tailed = 0.000 is less than 0.05. This result rejects the first null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between the mean score of pretests and posttest of the students' speaking skills. This research concluded that the use of Collaborative Learning in teaching speaking promote the students' speaking skills in terms of accuracy and fluency.

Keywords: *Collaborative Learning, speaking skill, quantitative research*

Introduction

International language learning, especially English, has become more popular in the 4.0 era due to advancements in science, technology, education, the arts, economics, and industry, among other fields. English, as a global language, plays a critical role in the advancement of science and technology. Numerous countries around the world use English to communicate with people from other countries (Trilling, 2009).

Communication refers to speaking, speaking is a critical component of second language learning and teaching. However, in today's world, the intention of teaching speaking should be to promote students' communication skills so that they can express themselves and learn how to use a language. The other argument from Shabani (2013) argued that speaking a foreign language has always been regarded as the most challenging skill to acquire in comparison to listening, reading, and writing. This is because it entails more than just studying the language's linguistic components. Vocabulary and grammatical constructs are essential but incomplete components of language. What differentiates speaking from other abilities is that the speaker must have direct access to all applicable material in order to produce the appropriate language in a finite amount of time, while in other skills, the learner has more time to either balance input with existing experience or develop the appropriate language.

In terms of teaching speaking, based on Nunan (2003), teaching speaking aims to teach English language learners how to produce English speech sounds and patterns, how to use the stress, intonation, and rhythm of the second language in words and sentences, how to choose adequate words or phrases for the appropriate social setting, audience, situation, and subject matter, and how to express their thoughts in a meaningful and logical manner.

Therefore, English teachers must recognize that speaking a language is challenging for foreign language learners since successful oral communication involves the ability to use the language correctly in social interactions. Not only verbal communication but also nonlinguistic elements of speech such as pitch, stress, and intonation contribute to contact diversity. Additionally, nonlinguistic elements such as gestures and body language, and facial expressions can accompany or convey a message without the use of words (Richard, 2002).

On the other hand, teachers should seek out more innovative and exciting ways to develop in the course of learning to talk in enhancing students' enthusiasm or encouragement to participate in the learning process. Thus, implementing Collaborative Learning in the classroom will provide organized opportunities for individuals assigned unique roles within their communities to work collaboratively to accomplish shared goals. When students study independently, their performances do not always have a positive or negative effect on one another.

The research would be conducted through Collaborative Learning, which enables teaching students' speaking skills more efficiently than the conventional method. The findings of this analysis will be compared which that significant or insignificant different.

According to Pierre Dillenbourg's 1999 research, collaborative learning occurs when two or more students learn something or attempt something together in a group setting. It can refer to several individuals or pairs, a group or small group, a population (a few hundred or thousands of people), a society (several thousand or millions of people), or any intermediate stage. The term "learn something" may refer to following a course, studying course material, and engaging in learning activities. It is evident when they collaborate or conduct the conversation as a team. Students should collaborate to solve their problems. When their peers are having trouble with their pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, or comprehension, the superior students may assist them.

Collazos (2002) notes in another research that collaborative learning is an instrumental process in which students work collaboratively on an assignment. Collaborative learning places the students at the forefront of the investigation, with the instructor serving as a facilitator. Collaborative learning divides students into multiple classes to complete a task assigned by the instructor. It is community learning rather than individual learning. Thus, one student's performance aids the success of other students. Additionally, this type of practice is referred to as cooperative learning, team learning, or community learning.

Additionally, According to Pattanpichet (2011) which focuses on the impact of collaborative learning on students' speaking achievement, several exercises can assist students in learning to talk. Collaborative learning is one of them. Collaborative learning is a style of instruction in which students work collaboratively on an assignment. These types of programs are intended to assist students in developing their self-esteem.

According to a previous interview with students in the second semester of the English Education Department Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, several lectures continue to teach speaking in a conventional method and with the same methodology year by year or semester. The lecturer introduces and discusses the subject, followed by an example and exercises. This method is ineffective because students become bored and require a significant amount of time to master English speaking, especially in communication and conversation.

As a result of the above, the researcher will employ collaborative learning to teach speaking to students at FKIP Muhammadiyah University of Makassar's English Education Department. This research is intended to aid students in enhancing their speaking skills. Additionally, it is expected that this research will facilitate students in developing their self-confidence and engaging them in successful classroom

activities. Therefore, the implementation of Collaborative Learning emphasized the integration of the strategy with the students' needs.

In order to achieve the purposes mentioned above, the research question focus on the implementation of Collaborative Learning promote students' speaking accuracy and fluency in speaking skills more than the use of conventional method. The novelty of this research refers to assess the students speaking skill in terms of accuracy covers grammar and vocabulary and fluency covers pauses and smoothness.

Method

This research used a quasi-experimental approach, especially one of non-equivalent control groups. It divided participants into two groups: experimental and control group. Collaborative Learning was used in the experimental group contained think pair share, group problem solving, and case study, while the lecturer used the conventional method (Individual Learning) in the control group. Pre-test and post-test were administered to both groups. The pretest was used to assess students' prior knowledge, while the posttest was used to assess the progress of Language teaching, which was focused on the students' speaking skills, which included speaking accuracy and fluency.

The population for this research was second semester students at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar's English department during the 2018-2019 academic years. The second semester consisted of eight classes, with a total enrollment of 228 students. Purposive sampling was used to determine the sample size based on the number of students above. The total sample size was 38 students drawn from two classes: class II G, which served as the experimental class, and class II C, which served as the control class.

The instrument was used speaking test to conduct pretests and posttests for each group. In this case, the process of data collected by transcribe the student's pre-

test and post-test, scoring the students' answer of pretest and posttest by using score

system of Heaton, 1998 and all the data using SPSS 25.0 to calculate the mean score.

Result

The data presented in the table below clearly demonstrate the Mean Score and Standard Deviation for the students' speaking Achievement Result in terms of Accuracy and Fluency.

Table 1. Students' Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the students' speaking Achievement Result in Pretest

	E		C	
	accuracy	**Fluency**	**Accuracy**	**fluency**
N	19	19	19	19
Mean	50.88	50.00	48.24	48.24
Std.Deviation	16.17	12.42	14.58	13.48

Table 1 above shows the Students' Mean Score and Standard Deviation for both two Classes in pretest. For Experimental class, the mean score of the students in term of accuracy that were 50.88 with Standard deviation 16.17 and the mean score of the students in term of fluency that were 50.00 with Standard deviation 12.42.

For Control class, the mean score of the students in term of accuracy that were 48.24 with Standard deviation 14.58 and the mean score of the students in term of fluency that were 48.24 with Standard deviation 13.48.

Table 2. Students' Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the students' speaking Achievement Result in Posttest

	E		C	
	accuracy	**Fluency**	**Accuracy**	**accuracy**
N	19	19	19	19
Mean	74.56	74.56	63.16	64.91
Std.Deviation	17.00	17.89	11.89	14.59

Table 2 above shows the Students' Mean Score and Standard Deviation for both two Classes in Posttest. For Experimental class, the mean score of the students

in term of accuracy that were 74.56 with Standard deviation 17.00 and the mean score of the students in term of fluency that were 74.56 with Standard deviation 17.89.

For Control class, the mean score of the students in term of accuracy that were 63.16 with Standard deviation 11.89 and the mean score of the students in term of fluency that were 64.91 with Standard deviation 14.59.

Table 3. Students' Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the students' speaking Achievement Result in Pretest and Posttest

	Pretest		Posttest	
	E	C	E	C
N	19	19	19	19
Mean	50.44	48.25	74.56	64.03
Std.Deviation	14.30	14.04	17.46	13.24

The table 3 above shows the different students' score for both two Classes in pretest and posttest. For Experimental class, the mean score of the student improved from 50.44 with standard deviation 14.30 to 74.56 with standard deviation 17.46. For Control class, the mean score of the students also improved from 48.25 with standard deviation 14.04 to 64.03 with standard deviation 13.24.

The data indicated that initial treatment, the experimental class's mean score was higher than the control class. Then, following treatment, the mean score on the posttest improved significantly over the pretest. However, after implementing Collaborative Learning in the experimental class, the findings indicate that the experimental class's students scored higher than the control class's students (74.56>64.03). This indicates that collaborative learning is an effective method for improving students' speaking skills in terms of accuracy and fluency.

Table 4. The t-test Posttest for Experimental Class and Control Class In terms of Accuracy
Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test									
Accuracy	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.460	.502	4.578	36	.000	16.6647	3.6399	9.2826	24.0469

Equal variances not assumed			4.578	35.466	.000	16.6647	3.6399	9.2788	24.0507

As seen in Tables 4, the amount of t-observed for the effect of application of collaborative learning on promoting the students' speaking ability as sig 2-tailed = 0.000 is less than 0.05, so the first null hypotheses is rejected and also a statistically significant difference between the two groups is revealed. In other words, the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group. This result contradicts the first null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference between the mean score of pretests and posttest of the students' speaking skills. It can conclude that the use of Collaborative Learning is more effective to promote students' speaking skills in term of accuracy.

Table 5. The t-test Posttest for Experimental Class and Control Class In terms of Fluency

Independent Samples Test									
Fluency	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3.539	.068	4.179	36	.000	16.6647	3.9875	8.5778	24.7517
Equal variances not assumed			4.179	30.847	.000	16.6647	3.9875	8.5306	24.7988

As presented in table 5 the amount of t-observed for the effect of application

of collaborative learning on promoting the students' speaking ability as sig 2-tailed = 0.000 is less than 0.05, so the first null hypotheses is rejected and also a statistically significant difference between the two groups is revealed. In other words, the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group. This result rejects the first null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between the mean score of pretests and posttest of the students' speaking skills and it can be can conclude that the use of Collaborative Learning is more effective to promote students' speaking skills in term of fluency.

DISCUSSION

The Students' speaking achievement who were taught by implementing Collaborative Learning.

Along with Collaborative Learning activities like think pair share, Group Problem Solving, and Case Study, the students indicated significant progress in improving their speaking accuracy and fluency. Collaborative learning shows that it can bring advantages for learners in some aspects. One of the proofs was the research that employed collaborative learning to improve learners' English skills. Research conducted by Pattanpichet (2011) demonstrated that collaborative learning positively affected students' speaking skills. Another proof of the success of collaborative learning implementation was revealed in Fakomogbon and Bolaji's experimental research (2017). They utilized collaborative learning with their control group, which massively increased their scores following treatment. This research also revealed that collaborative learning styles were more effective for learning.

Additionally, collaborative learning demonstrates that it is not only effective in terms of academic achievement. . This was shown by Laal and Ghodsi (2011) in their research that studied in what way collaborative learning benefited the students. The research proved that besides giving academic benefits, collaborative learning also contributed social, psychological, and assessment benefits for students. The aims of this research also focused on two things: students' perceptions and experiences on collaborative learning when implemented in their speaking class and

the effects of collaborative learning implementation on' the students.

The improvement of the students' speaking accuracy

The mean score of students in term of accuracy in the experimental class that was 50.88 in pretest become 74.56 in posttest with a score improvement 46.54%. Based on the previous data, there was any improvement of the students in terms of the students' speaking accuracy because collaborative learning helps each other to find out their learning styles and patterns. These include how to solve problems in groups, how to get along and communicate with other group members, and how to reach the group goals by working together. However, it cannot be ignored that the second semester students of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar's English department also made some errors during the research. The mistake faced in the teaching and learning process influenced by the mother tongue, with errors causing a breakdown in communication and a few grammatical and lexical errors causing confusion.

But in the control class the mean score of the students in term of accuracy that were 48.24 in pretest become 63.16 in posttest with a score improvement 30.92%. Based on the previous data, there was also any improvement of the students in terms of the students' speaking accuracy along with the individual learning in the control class. However, it is irrelevant how they advanced. The previous data indicated that students made more errors in vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. Students' most frequently occurring errors during those speaking components are inappropriate vocabulary, mispronunciation, and grammatical errors.

The improvement of the students' speaking Fluency

The mean score of students in term of fluency in the experimental class that were 50.00 in pretest become 74.56 in posttest with the score improvement 49.12%.

Based on the previous data there was any improvement of the students in terms of the students' speaking fluency by implementing collaborative learning. The students worked together to solve problems and to trigger confidence which led to more opportunities to practice speaking. However, the researcher discovered that students' limited English vocabulary and lack of command of their grammar made it difficult for them to speak fluently. They used excessive pauses, halting, and repetitions of words. This condition had an automatic effect on the rhythm of their speech. They appeared to be stammering, which detracted from their speaking performance. However, when it came to implementing collaborative learning, the students spoke courageously and expressively. They exchanged ideas and information with their other friends.

But in control class the mean score of the students in term of fluency that were that were 48.24 in pretest become 64.91 in posttest with the score improvement 34.55%. Based on the previous data there was also any improvement of the students in terms of the students' speaking fluency along the individual learning in control class. However, the researcher discovered that students' limited English vocabulary and lack of command of their grammar made it difficult for them to speak fluently. They used excessive pauses, halting, and repetitions of words. This condition had an automatic effect on the rhythm of their speech. They appeared to be stammering, which detracted from their speaking performance. However, when it came to implementing individual learning, the students were expressive and courageous. The students complete their exercise independently of one another.

Conclusion

Implementing Collaborative Learning to teach speaking promotes students' accuracy and fluency. It can be demonstrated that the mean score on the students' posttest is higher in the experimental group that implements Collaborative Learning than in the control group that implements Conventional Method (Individual

Learning).

Collaborative Learning encourages students to share their ideas because they constantly practice speaking and use self-correction to promote their speaking. Students are free to discuss with their friends. As a result, if students have difficulty comprehending, they will consult their peers and collectively discuss it. By practicing frequently, students' speaking skills will promote.

Additionally, the teacher should be considering the different background knowledge each individual when divided the students into the group. Because teaching speaking does not always go smoothly, teachers should be more creative in creating enjoyable and effective learning environments and motivating students.

References
Arnold, J., & Brown, H. D. (1999). A map of the terrain. In J. Arnold (eds.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Basic, L. (2011). *An obstacle to second language learning? Speaking Anxiety*, Hogskolan, Sweden University.

Bayraktar, G. (2011). *The effect of cooperative learning on students' approach to general gymnastics course and academic achievements Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(1), 1990-3839. Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals.org

Brown, K.W., Poul, C. C, & Kee. D. W. (1999). *Research methods in human development* (2nd ed.). California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices* (3rd edition). Pearson Education, Inc.

Cambridge University Press. Lyman, F.T. (1992). *Enhancing Thinking through Cooperative Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Crawford, Michael J. 2004. Journal of the Language Teacher (13-16): *Trivia as a Bridge to Content in CBI Classes.* Hokkaido: Japan Association of Language Teaching. Retrieved from http://jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/725-trivia-bridge-content-cbi-classes

Collazos, C., Guerrero, L. A., Pino, J., & Ochoa, S. (2002). *Evaluating Collaborative Learning Processes*. Lectures Notes in Computer Science, 2440, 203-221.

Collazos, C., Guerrero, L. A., Pino, J., & Ochoa, S. (2003a). *Collaborative Scenarios to promote positive interdependence among group members*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2806, 356-370.

Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and Computational Approaches*. (Pp.1-19).

Ellis, A. (2001). *Students-Centered Collaborative Learning. Monash University*: FLITE Centre.

Fakomogbon, M.A., and Bolaji, H.O. (2017). *Effects of Collaborative Learning Styles on Performance of Students in a Ubiquitous Collaborative Mobile Learning Environment.* Contemporary Educational technology Journal. Vol 8(3).

Gay, L. R, et, al. 2006. *Education Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application. Eight. Edition.* Columbus. Ohio: Charles E, Merril Publishing.

Graham DC (2005). *Cooperative learning methods and middle school students*. Doctoral Dissertation, Capella University.

Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as Second Language*. New Delhi: McgrowHill.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Person: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3d ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test.* New York: Longman Group UK limited

Jamatlou, Farzin. 2011. *Revisiting the Temporal Measures of L2 Oral Fluency: A Case of Iranian EFL Learners*: University of Groningen. Retrieved from http://irs.ub.rug.nl/dbi/4ed5f51f45523

Jonathan. 2013. *Learn English Teens. British council.* Retrieved from http://learnenglishteens.britishcouncil.org/exams/speaking-exams/fluency

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1987) *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1989) *Cooperation and competition: theory and research*, Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1998) *An overview of cooperative learning, in J. Thousand, R. Villa & A. Nevin (eds.) Creativity and collaborative learning: a practical guide to empowering students and teachers*, Baltimore: P.H. Brookes Publishing Co.

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

Kessler, J. B. (2003) *A survey of faculty experience using cooperative learning in teacher education*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Temple University.

Kormos, Judit and Dennes, Mariann. (2004). *Exploring Measures and Perceptions of Fluency in the Speech of Second Language Learners.* Budapest: Euotuos Lorand University. Retrieved from http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/10747/

Laal, M., and Ghodsi, S.M. (2011). *Benefits of Collaborative Learning.* in Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences Journal. Vol 31, Pp.486-490

Lutters, W. G. (2002). *Storytelling in Collaborative Work:Design Challenges for Capturing and Representing Sensitive Interactions*. Baltimore: Department of Information Systems.

Luoma, S (2004). *Assessing speaking*. Cambrigde.Cambridge University Press.

Masruddin, M. (2019). Omission: Common Simple Present Tense Errors in Students' Writing of Descriptive Text. Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature, 6(1), 30-39. https://doi.org/10.30605/ethicallingua.v6i1.1114

Masruddin, M, Karmila, K. (2018). Constructing WH-Questions throung An Error Analysis at Junior High School of Indonesia. Langkawi: *Journal of The Association for Arabic and English 4 (2), 123-137*.

Masruddin, M., & Kurnia, K. (2018). Improving Students Writing Skill by Using Picture at the Twelfth Year Students of SMA Pesantren Modern Datok Sulaiman Putra Palopo. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 3(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v3i2.152*

Meier, D. (20). *The Accelerated Learning Handbook*. McGraw-Hill books.

North Central Regional Education Laboratory. (2018). *What Is the Collaborative Classroom?.* Retrieved from http://methodenpool.uni koeln.de/koopunterricht/The%20Collaborative%20Classroom.htm

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. McGraw-Hill Companies.

Pattanpichet, F. (2011). *The Effects Of Using Collaborative Learning To Enhance Students' English Speaking Achievement*. Journal of College Teaching & Learning , 8, 1-10.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy* (Vol. 20). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollard, L. (2008). *Teaching English: A Book to Help You through Your First Two Years in Teaching*.

Richards J. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., Platt, J., Weber, H., & Inman, P. (1986). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. RELC Journal, 17(2), 105-110.45

Riggenbach, H. (1991). *Toward an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversations*. Discourse processes, 14(4), 423-441.

Roschelle, J., & Teasley, S. D. (1994). *The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving*. NATO ASI Series F Computer and Systems Sciences, 128, 69-69.

Shabani, M. B. (2013). *The Effect of Background Knowledge on Speaking Ability of Iranian EFL Learners International SAMANM*. Journal of Marketing and Management ISSN 2308-2399 Vol. 1, No.1, 2013.

Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigation of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/ EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts communication in the target language.*University of Glasgow.

Teach Thought Staff. (2018). *20 Collaborative Learning Tips and Strategies for Teachers*. Retrieved from https://www.teachthought.com/pedagogy/20-collaborative-learning-tips-and-strategies/

Tough, A (1979). *The Adult's Learning Projects: A Fresh Approach to Theory and Practice in Adult Learning, 2nd edn*. University Associates (Learning Concepts), San Diego, and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario

Tuckman, B. (1965) *Developmental Sequence in Small Groups. Psychological Bulletin*, 63, 384-399.

Vygotsky, L. (1962) *Thought and language*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in society*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Van Boxtel, C., Van der Linden, J., & Kanselaar, G. (2000). *Collaborative learning tasks and the elaboration of conceptual knowledge. Learning and instruction*, 10(4), 311-330.

Wolf, J. P. (2008). *The effects of backchannels on fluency in L2 oral task production. System*, 36(2), 279-294.

Young, D.J. (1991). *Creating a low- Anxiety classroom Environment: what Does Language Anxiety Research Suggest?*. The Modern Language Journal, 75(4), 426-439.