

REALIZATION OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING IN SPEAKING SKILL

Wienny Ardriyati

Fakultas Bahasa dan Ilmu Budaya Universitas Stikubank

e-mail: wiennya@edu.unisbank.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The aim was to find out the use of collaborative learning was effective or not to teach speaking skill and what problems occur through teaching collaborative learning. The subjects were 36 students. In this research it used pre-test and post-tests. Based on the result of pre-test which was carried out in pre-cycle, the subjects' speaking skill was low (43.75). The result of mean score of post-test in cycle I was 56.81 and post-test of cycle II was 71.11. These findings showed the fact that the mean score of pre-test was lower than the mean scores of cycle I and cycle II. The significance difference figures further suggest that cycle II was more effective than cycle I. These findings clearly discovered that the students' speaking skill was successfully effective through collaborative learning. The effectiveness of this strategy was supported by the data of the questionnaires which clearly showed that 35.71% of the subjects didn't strongly agreed of this strategy. These findings showed 62.71 of the subjects' attitude and motivation in speaking about the expression of four types of pollution through collaborative learning were very positive.

Key words: *collaborative learning, effective, cycle*

1. INTRODUCTION

English is one of the important means which has a necessary role to some extent. Now it is important to have good knowledge of English in the modern world which demand internet link and media communication, especially in using spoken English. A student without oral communication skill may find it difficult to achieve a final education. For going on his study he cannot evade studying and practising speaking English. Students only get some opportunities either in the classroom or outside to speak English. Learning to speak requires a lot of practice and attention. The teacher can implement an approach in the normal way by listening, repeating and imitating. Yet, the students still face problems, especially the problem of oral communication. The problems of communication have not yet been solved. Some researchers like Bailey (2005) and Goh (2007) have proposed methods to improve speaking skills by means of teaching principles, types of tasks and materials, and speaking assessment. The students need to study a language of communication because the importance role of speaking classroom interaction is necessary to improve speaking skills. Classroom interaction involves verbal exchanges between students and teachers. Teachers should know that the students need to do most of the talk to activate their speaking, since speaking skills require practice and exposure.

Practice accomplishment and exposure sometimes cause difficulties since the students' environments do not support to get English language exposure. That's why this article tries to propose collaborative approach of teaching speaking.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous Study

There are some researches that discuss about collaborative method. Elizabeth G. Creamer (2012) did a research about collaborative approach to teaching grounded theory research method.

Another research on collaborative method was done by Allison Andrew and Dr. Caster (2008). They discussed about collaborative writing in composition. By using collaborative method in writing it gives benefits, such as increased productivity, differing points of view, and experience in the world of academic writing and publication for students and junior faculty.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

Population

The subjects of this research were the economic students of Stikubank University. There are 36 students involved in this research.

In this research the method had some activities that could be described as follow:

Selecting the subject of the study that were the students of non English department and asking some questions to the students about the difficulty faced in speaking.

Seeking and preparing project materials which were appropriately used in realization of collaborative learning to improve speaking skill of students.

Preparing and conducting pre-tests to measure the real pre-existing speaking skill. In the pre test, the students performed in the group to introduce the topic chosen and describe one of their friends. The students' speaking skill was scored by using rational scoring method of 1-5 that had four criterions of test performance.

Designing lesson plans or setting up the teaching scenarios of the present classroom action study before teaching.

Constructing and administering reflection or post-test which was given at the end of every cycle. Constructing and administering questionnaires. Questionnaires were given to know the students' response after the technique applied.

3.1. Procedures .

Pre - Activities

In pre-activities, this research was started by greeting and checking the students' attendance then continued by giving some questions which were related to the material. It was directed to make the students focus and pay attention to the lesson. The students also tried to answer some question about the material taught. This continued for about 10 minutes.

Whilst-Activities

In whilst activity, there consisted of exploration, elaboration and confirmation. In exploration activities the researchers asked the students to define the collaborative learning that used in teaching learning process. In elaboration, the researcher asked the students to divide themselves into several groups. Then, the researcher handed out and explained the topic for discussion. After they finished the task, the researcher asked to each group to perform the topic given in front of the group to confirm activities whether all the group of the students had performed, the researcher fixed the mistake and emphasized the right one.

Post-Activities

Post-activities was the end of the session, in which the researcher concluded the material and asked about the students' problems that were faced during the teaching and learning process. Then, close the meeting and it was around 10 minutes.

3.2. Observation

In this research, the researcher observed with the aim to know how far the students got and improved their speaking after the implementation of collaborative learning. There were two kinds of observations that have been done here. First, observing the student' attitude toward the teaching learning process and finding out the progress of the students, especially those who still had problems in speaking. Second, the using of questionnaires, it was used to measure or in order to know the students' responses about the interest, motivation, and creativities when the teaching learning process applied of the students' toward the implementation of collaborative learning.

3.3. Reflection

Reflections were given to the students on the basic of improving speaking through collaborative learning. Each reflection was done during the post activities of the session based on the clue which had been given. The result of the whole reflections is evaluation in a group discussion. There were two session of discussions which consisted of two groups unite in one group discussion;

First, one group discussed the topic given. The other group observed and took notes of each members who were speaking during the discussion. After that each group took turn to discuss the different topic given and observed the group in discussion.

The second, one member of the group presents the result of their discussion in a paired group. Each group presented each own topic. One student acted as an evaluator and gave evaluation to each member of the opposite group and vice versa. The reflection given by the end of each lasted for 15 minutes.

Research Instrument

Test.

There were pre-test and post-test. At the preliminary stage, the researcher used a pre-test. Pretest was given in order to find out the real problems, which were faced by the students and was used to know the speaking skill of the students before applying the technique. Post-tests were given in order to know how far the improvement of students' speaking skill after the strategy was applied. For scoring the speaking skill the researcher used scale 1-5 that were adapted from Brown which consisted of grammar, comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary. The scoring of the students' speaking according to Brown (2004: 172)

Scores were given based on the student's ability to speak, with scores of 1, 2, 3,4, 5. The highest score obtained by the students using the standard score of Brown 20. However, to get the value of a scale of 100 students obtained and calculated with the following formula:

$$\text{Student score} = \frac{\text{Student obtained}}{\text{Maximum Score}} \times 100$$

Questionnaire

In this research, it was administered ten questions with a choice of four items (A, B, C, and D) in each question . Furthermore, the questionnaire used to determine students' responses about the interest, motivation, and creativity when collaborative learning is applied. The questionnaire was scored using a 3-0 grading scale (A = 3, B = 2, C = 1 and D = 0). Percentage comparison to score item questionnaire show the number of responses of the subjects' for each item A, B, C, and D. The data obtained from questionnaires were analyzed as a percentage of the item follows:

Total answer of each item

$$X = \frac{\text{Number of total answers of whole items}}{\text{Total number of items}} \times 100\%$$

Where: X = Total percentage of each item

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To answer the research questions, the data were collected from the subject through scoring. The data were collected in three research instruments that were administered to the subjects. Those three research instruments consisted of pre-test (cycle I), post-tests (cycle II) and questionnaires. In the pre cycle, the pre-test or IR (Initial Reflection) was directed to the subjects in order to get their pre-existing skill in speaking. To know the students' speaking skill, the students were asked to discuss the topic given and present it in front of the group in class. It was given before the treatment was applied. The purpose of giving pre-test was to know the initial problems faced by students and to measure the students' skill at first.

In this research the post-tests were done two times, there were one time in Cycle I and one time in Cycle II. Post-test was given at the end of every cycle. In cycle I, the post-test aimed to check the students' improvement in speaking skill after conducting teaching and learning process through collaborative learning. The last cycle was cycle II. In this cycle, the researcher revised the cycle before, because in the previous cycle the students' speaking skill needed more improvement.

Moreover, there were three sets of row scores showing the improvement of speaking skill of the students through collaborative learning. There were a pre-test score and reflection score for all sessions, those three sets of scores gathered were tabulated as follows:

Table 1. Scores of Pre and Post Test

Table Pre Test and Post test			
Subject	Pre- Test	Post test 1	Post test 2
1	50	70	80
2	45	65	75
3	35	45	70
4	45	50	65
5	50	60	65
6	50	65	70
7	40	55	75
8	55	60	80
9	55	65	70
10	35	50	65
11	50	60	80
12	50	65	80
13	45	50	70
14	35	45	65
15	50	65	80
16	40	50	65
17	35	50	70
18	50	60	70
19	50	65	70
20	45	55	65
21	45	50	70
22	40	50	65
23	35	50	80
24	50	60	70
25	55	65	75
26	40	50	65
27	50	60	70
28	50	60	75
29	45	55	70
30	40	50	65
31	35	50	60
32	45	55	65
33	55	60	75
34	60	80	85
35	50	60	75
36	40	50	65

Total	1575	2045	2560
-------	------	------	------

Table 1. shows there were three raw scores such as: pre-test, post-test 1, and post-test

In pre-test, the students' score of 36 students in speaking skill was 1575 and it was the score of pre-existing mastery students in individual before collaborative learning implemented. The calculation score of students' speaking skill in post-test 1 was 2045. The last was post-test 2, the total scores of students' speaking skill was 2560. The improvement of students' speaking skill in post-test 2 showed that the implementation of collaborative learning was successful to improve their speaking skill.

To know the students' skill in speaking in pre-cycle, the students were asked to describe the given topic to their friends and come in front of the class to present it individually. This was aimed to know the individual' speaking skill before collaborative learning was implemented. In addition, the results of the pre-cycle tabulated could be seen in table 2. Based on the tabulation of data presented in table1, the mean score of the pre-cycle scores could be computed as follows: The mean score of pre test:
$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{1575}{36} = 43.75$$

This result showed that the students' speaking skill was low and it needed to be improved with a new strategy. The first meeting in pre-cycle, the researcher dealt with some problems faced by the students while they were speaking. The students were brave enough to make mistakes in speaking individually in front of the class. The problems that they had were lack of vocabularies.

Based on the observation above, the students showed their improvement in speaking after collaborative learning was implemented. In addition, based on the tabulation data that could be seen in table 2 the mean scores of the post-test in cycle I could be computed as follows:

The mean score of Cycle I:
$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{2045}{36} = 56.81$$

The result of the data analysis of the post-test scores in cycle I showed the increasing mean scores 56.81. It was higher than the mean score of the pre-cycle that was 43.75. The mean score for cycle I showed that the speaking skill of the students got an improvement after they had been taught through collaborative learning. Thus when collaborative learning was realized, the students felt comfortable to join the class, especially in speaking skill.

From the observation above, the students showed their improvement from cycle I to cycle II. In addition, based on the tabulation data that could be seen in table 2 the mean scores of the post-test in Cycle II could be computed as follows:

The mean score of Cycle II:
$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N} = \frac{2560}{36} = 71.11$$

The result of the data analysis of the post-test scores in cycle II showed the increasing mean scores 71.11. It was higher than the mean score of the cycle I. The mean score for cycle II showed that the speaking skill of the students got an improvement after they had been taught through collaborative learning. There was a significant difference of the mean score of Cycle I between Cycle II. It showed that Cycle II which was started with revised new planning was more effective and encouraging than Cycle I. It also showed that the speaking skill of the students improved significantly after they had been taught speaking skill through collaborative learning.

The additional data required for the research were collected through questionnaires to the non language department students at the end of Cycle II. Furthermore, the questionnaires consisted of ten questions. Each question had four options, which were A, B, C, and D the answers of the questionnaires were scored using scale 3-0 (A=3, B=2, C=1, and D=0). The score collected from holding questionnaires showed the students' responses and motivation in learning speaking through collaborative learning. The obtained data showing the subjects total scores for items of the questionnaires were tabulated as following:

Table 2. Scores of Questionnaire
Tabulation of Questionnaire Data through Collaborative Learning

Subject	SCORE			
	A	B	C	D
1	4	5	1	
2	7	3	-	--
3	2	8	-	-
4	3	7	-	-
5	4	6	-	-
6	4	6	-	-
7	1	9	-	-
8	-	10	-	-
9	1	9	-	-
10	1	9	-	-

11	7	3	-	-
12	3	6	1	-
13	2	6	2	-
14	3	7	-	-
15	10	-	-	-
16	1	7	2	-
17	-	8	2	-
18	2	8	-	-
19	2	8	-	-
20	-	10	-	-
21	-	10	-	-
22	1	9	-	=
23	2	7	1	-
24	1	9	-	-
25	4	6	-	-
26	1	8	1	-
27	2	7	1	-
28	3	7	-	-
29	1	9	-	-
30	1	9	-	-
31	3	7	-	-
32	6	4	-	-
33	2	7	1	-
34	4	5	1	=
35	6	4	-	-
36	3	7	-	-
	95	259	13	0
	295	518	13	
Total				826

Table 2 above shows that the total of option A is 95 and the scale is 3 so the score is 295. Option B is 259 and the scale is 2 so the total score is (259 times 2) 518. Option C is 13 and the scale is 1 so the total score is 13. Therefore the total scores of options A, B, C and D is 826.

The questionnaires were scored by using the rating scale 3-0 (A=3, B=2, C=1 and D=0). The comparative percentages for the score of questionnaire items showing the subjects’ total responses for respective item of A, B, C, and D. The supporting data were collected by means of administering questionnaires by the end of cycle II. Questionnaires were given to find out the students’ responses when they were taught using collaborative learning. Based on the tabulation data that could be seen in table 3, the computation of the comparative percentage for the scores of the items of the questionnaires showing the subjects total answer for item A, B, C and D were shown as follows:

$$\text{Total percentage of item A} = \frac{295}{826} = 35.71$$

$$\text{Total percentage of item B} = \frac{518}{826} = 62.71$$

$$\text{Total percentage of item C} = \frac{13}{826} = 1.57$$

$$\text{Total percentage of item D} = \frac{0}{826} = 0$$

It can be concluded that the questionnaires result showed that the motivation and responses of the subject had been increased after the implementation of collaborative learning in teaching learning processes.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

After analyzing and interpreting the data , this research can be concluded that the students’ speaking skill can be effective through collaborative learning:

1. The students’ improvement in speaking skill can be seen clearly by the comparing the students’ mean score of pre-test and post-tests in cycle I and cycle II. The mean score of pre-cycle or pre-test was 43.75. The mean score of cycle I was 56.81 and the mean of cycle II was 71.11. This score of 71.11 according to score standard of Stikubank University the student passes in taking each subject. He or she gets score B (the range 71 up to 75). It is categorized that the criteria of cycle II is successful in improving students’ speaking skill. From cycle

I to cycle II the main score is gradually improved. The established mean figures from cycle I to cycle II is significantly getting higher. It is proved that the strategy work effectively due to the results of post-tests in every cycle.

2. The problems that the students face in this research are the followings:
 - a. Fear and confidence. English languages have very distinct sounds that the students of non language department are not used to speak. They are not confident when it comes to pronunciation. They must focus on the differences and practice until feeling confident.
 - b. Shyness. Students are often restrained about trying to say thing in foreign language and worried about mistakes or simply shy of the attention that their speech attracts to those who listen.
 - c. Lack of vocabularies. Students sometimes complain that they cannot think of anything to say: they have no motive and not know how to express themselves that they should speak.

Suggestion

There are some suggestions that could be described as following:

1. It is hoped that the English teachers are able to implement the collaborative in the class especially for speaking skill.
2. It is hoped that the students are able to maintain what they have already had now. Therefore, the students must improve their speaking skill by more frequently practicing listening the real English from the native speaker and practicing to communicate with friends in the classroom in English.
3. It is also hoped that collaborative learning can be applied in other skills not only for speaking skill.

REFERENCE

- [1] Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- [2] Burns.A. (2010).*Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [3] Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2005).*Research Methods in Education* (Fifth Edition). London: Routledge Falmer.
- [4] Collazos, C. A., Guerrero, L.A., Pino, J. A., & Ochoa, S. F. (2002).*Evaluating Collaborative Learning Processes*. In J.M. Haake & J.A. Pino (Eds.), *Department of Computer Science* (pp. 203–221). Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- [5] Costello, P. J. M. (2003). *Action Research*. New York: British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data.
- [6] Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by collaborative learning?. In P. Dillenbourg (Ed) *Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and Computational Approaches*. (Pp.1-19).
- [7] Donald, A., Jacobs, C. L., Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Wadsworth.
- [8] Farida, D. (2011). Developing Students' Retelling Story Ability through Collaborative Learning. *Language Circle Journal of Language and Literature*. Vol. V (pp 13-22).
- [9] Ferrence, E. (2000). *Action Research*. New York: Brown University.
- [10] Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- [11] Louma, S. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. England: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Pollard, L. (2008). *Guide to Teaching English*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- [13] Purnaya, I N. Subawa, I K. & Koriani, Ni M. (2013). *Buku Pengayaan Materi: Bahasa Inggris*. Denpasar: CaturWangsaMandiri.
- [14] Roberts, T. S. (2004). *Online Collaborative Learning Theory and Practice*. London: Idea Group.
- [15] Ratnawati, A. (2010). *Improving Students' English Speaking Ability through Role Play*. Thesis. Surakarta: SebelasMaret University.
- [16] <http://www.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class/coopcollab/> retrieved 20kt 2016 jm 12.35
- [17] http://www.uscupstate.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Undergraduate_Research/Reseach_Journal/005_ARTICLE1.pdf
- [18] <http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/>