

The Effect of Cooperative Learning Towards Students Learning Achievement of English Course 1 (Case Study in STIT Al Urwatul Wutsqo Jombang)

Khudriyah
STIT al Urwatul Wutsqo Jombang
e-mail: azkiabilqis.@gmail.com

Abstract: *Teaching English in private college needs hard effort to reach the learning goal, because most of students are not interested in English. That is why the instructors have to make effort to be succeed in the teaching and learning process. This research is quantitative research using two- way anova as analysis. This research purpose is to know whether or not the cooperative learning models effective to teach English course 1. The result are: from three classes and three learning models there is one class who has low learning achievement after treating by three learning models. The students English Course 1 score based on classes interaction and treatments are equal. Based on the treatment given, there is equal of student's English course 1 score who had treated by debate and role play or role play and game as model. However, it is significance difference of student's English course 1 score who had given debate and game as model. It means that cooperative learning is effective to teach English course 1 in STIT al Urwatul Wutsqo.*

Keyword : *Cooperative Learning, Learning Achievement*

Background of Study

The globalization era requires people around the world to master English. English is one of the communication tools to interact with others in the world. The people have to interact with the world population to develop and progress. Even now Indonesia has been in ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) era.

There will be very tight of skilled labor competition in AEC era, many workers and businessman from ASEAN will come to Indonesia, on the other hand Indonesia have also opportunity to go to ASEAN freely to compete in those professions. And the skill must be owned is English. Without having English, the people will get difficulty either in communication and socialization.

Teaching English for foreign language needs big effort to reach the target language and to be succeeded, even for non English department. The students mainly ignore it, most of them do not have motivation to speak up. So the lecturer have to change the method, strategy or learning model to persuade students to be actively involved in the teaching and learning process.

The Indonesia government has prepared educational institution to develop English skill to face global competition. Such as adding English skill on all majors, besides emphasis the excellence possessed by the college. The most important skills of the English is speaking. According to Richards mastering speaking skill is important for many second or foreign language learners¹. Oral communication is the most effective communication, because the interlocutor will be easily to catch meaning. And the language learners will be very strange without producing oral communication or speaking of that language.

Learning to speak is learning to communicate orally, the activities should involve the learners to speak up individually. It means that skill must be prioritized. The fact, many Indonesian learners note language knowledge as grammar, making example of conversations, then read the note, even just read in their heart, then they practice it. When this habit is continued, the learning speaking will not be succeeding.

In general, people's assessment of the foreign language learner is their mastery of speaking, as if people who are able to speak have mastered the language. It is related to the Ur concern "that people who know a language are referred to, as speakers of that language, as if speaking included all other types of skills"².

Learning speaking, however, is very hard. According to

¹ Richards, J. *Teaching Listening and Speaking from Theory to Practice*. (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 19.

² Ur, P. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and theory* (13th Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006, 120.

Cunningham (1999) in Murad that learning speaking required the learners to know linguistic competence, such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary, but also understand the socio linguistic competence, such as when, why and in what ways to produce language³. In line with Cunningham, Brown says that Speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information⁴. Speaking is productive and oral skill. Speaking is cognitive skill, is the idea that knowledge becomes increasingly automated through successive practice⁵.

Aspects of production skills are fluency, accuracy, and complexity, and this may also involve a greater willingness to take risks, and use fewer controlled language subsystems⁶. In line with Skehan, Brown explain that that in teaching speaking will help to provide some perspective to moral practical considerations as conversational discourse, pronunciation, accuracy and fluency, affective factors, and interaction effect⁷.

Learning speaking can be started from bottom up or top down. The bottom up is started from smallest unit of the language such as individual sounds, then mastery of words and sentences to discourse. The top down on the other hand starting from the larger chunk of the language which are embedded in meaningful context, and use their knowledge to comprehend and use the smaller language elements correctly⁸.

Language learners should know that speaking involves three areas of knowledge, such as mechanics which is containing pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. In this sense, the learners should use the right words in the right order with the correct pronunciation. The second is functions, the transaction and

³ Murad, The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Developing Speaking Skills among the Palestinian Secondary EFL Students in Israel and Their Attitudes towards English. <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>

⁴ Brown, H. D. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Longman, 2001.

⁵ Thornbury, Scoot. *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow, England. (Longman, 2005), 79.

⁶ Skehan, P. *Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction*. In Willis, J. and D. Willis (Eds). *Challenges and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

⁷ Ibid, 230.

⁸ Nunan, D. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

interaction. In this case the students should know that clarity of message is essential whether transaction or information exchange and precise understanding is not required in interaction or relationship building. And the last is social and cultural rules and norms (turn-taking, rate of speech, length of pauses between speakers, relative roles of participants)⁹. Here, the students should understand how to take into account who is the speaker, to whom, in what circumstances, what about, and for what the reason is.

The above explanation can be said that teaching speaking especially for EFL learner is consider difficult. As stated that there are four problems related to speaking activities which derived from the students themselves, namely; inhibition, nothing to say, uneven participation, and mother tongue used. First; learners are often shy to say something using foreign language in the classroom, they are worried about making mistakes, they are frightened of criticism or losing face, or simply bashful to the attention that their speech attract. The second, the learners complain they cannot think of anything to say, they have no motivation to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling. The third is there is tendency that some learners dominate the activity, while others say a little or even nothing. And the last in the class which all learners share the same mother tongue, they tend to use it since it is easier to say, and they feel that it is unnatural to speak one another using foreign language. They also feel less exposed if they are speaking in their mother tongue¹⁰.

Based on the importance of speaking, and the difficulty of teaching speaking, it needs the learning which involved a comfort by using strategy or method in teaching of speaking. Some interesting teaching methods are debate. According to Tournament "Competitive debating uses the skills of argument to debate and discuss important issues. In this case the students are freely in choosing famous and interesting issue¹¹. The issue that is famous and interesting can build students motivation in the learning; of course it will increase the students' ability of that subject. So the debate can be implemented as

⁹ Burkart, G.S. *Spoken Language: What it is and how to teach it* Modules for the professional preparation of teaching assistants in foreign languages. An article (<http://www.nclrc.org/essentials/speaking/spindex.htm>), 1998 .

¹⁰ Ibid, 21.

¹¹ Thournament, D. (2011). What is debating? World Schools Debating Championship. Reviewed from <https://wsdctournament.wordpress.com/about/what-is-debate/>

an alternative way to teach speaking.

Debate encourages class participation among those students that typically do not talk in class. It offers an opportunity for students to move beyond the acquisition of basic knowledge in a subject matter and progresses into the types of higher order critical thinking skills that good debate requires¹².

Debate can help people develop their investigation and analysis skills, develop critical thinking skills, develop effective speaking skills. Develop organization skills, develop team work skills, and debate helps develop communication skills. It means that debate is very effective to increase speaking skill, since it has characteristics which support more about mastering speaking skill.

There are many kinds of debate, they are parliamentary, mace, public, Australasia, presidential, online, comedy. All of the kinds can be implemented based on the needs and students characteristics, for example the material, the purpose of learning speaking, etc.

However, debate also has disadvantages, for instance when the class do not have character needed in debate method, the class will get nothing, because the debate method does not work at all. On the other hand, when the teacher can minimize the disadvantages by maximizing learning process, there will be succeed in the teaching of speaking.

Role play is also one of the interesting methods in teaching speaking. It is the act of imitating the character and behavior of someone others. Minimally role play involves of giving role to one or more members of the group, and assigning an objective that participants must accomplish¹³.

There are many advantages of role play such as: provides students wide variety of experience and improving speaking skill, second; the students are able to use and develop phatic forms of language which are often neglected by the language teaching. The third; students can make interaction in variety of situation, fourth role play can minimize the students who are not confident, and the last role play can develop a whole gamut of communicative technique¹⁴.

¹² Elliot, L. Using debates to teach the psychology of women. *Teaching of Psychology*", 1993.

¹³ Ibid, 183

¹⁴ Ladousse, G. P. *Role Play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

The explanation shows that role play is very effective in improving speaking ability especially for students who have low self confidence, because it can be covered by the acting done by students.

According to Tompkins, in terms of theory of language learning, role-play is related to the theory of how language is acquired. Learners acquire language when they are exposed to the comprehensible inputs, they are actively involved, and the students have positive affects such as desire, feeling and attitude¹⁵. Not all students can speak confidently in front of the class, by implementing role play as teaching technique; the students will be actively involved in playing the role.

Some research about the effectiveness of role play in the teaching of speaking are mostly role is very effective, role play can increase students speaking ability, role play can increase students motivation, reducing the students self esteem, role play can build students cooperation in the learning process.

The other common technique to increase students speaking ability is game. Game is one of entertainments, it is also playing. Learning by playing or amusement is very nice, the students will be entertained, and of course there will not be tension in the teaching and learning especially for lower learners.

A game is an activity with rules, a goal and element of fun¹⁶. It is any fun activity which give young learners opportunity to practice foreign language relax and enjoyable¹⁷. In line with Hadfield, Byrne says that a game is kind of activities that encourage learners to speak¹⁸. There are many rules in the game activities, such as guidance, procedure, practice, etc. All of these enable the learners to speak at least to read. So by using games, the learners have the opportunity to express their ideas, feelings, and thought, it means that games encourage students to interacts and communicate.

Teaching speaking will be difficult when the students are reluctant to speak. Games offer activity which avoid reluctance,

¹⁵ Tompkins, G. E. & Hoskisson, K. *Language Art: Content and Teaching Strategies*. New York: MacMillan, 1998. Publishing Company.

¹⁶ Hadfield, Jill. *Intermediate Vocabulary Games*. Harlow, Essex; Longman, 1999), 5.

¹⁷ Brewster, Jean, Gail Ellis and Dennis Girard. *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2000), 172.

¹⁸ Byrne, Donn. *Teaching Oral English*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1997), 100.

increase the students' motivation, since it is a play. A game is not only appropriate for young learners, the adults are very willing to play a game, and no one dislikes game. Games are effective and efficient, because games can be played individually, in pairs or in groups depends on the game characteristic, and the students need.

Research Method

This research was done in STIT al Urwatul Wutsqo. The research design was quasi experiment non equivalent group design with quantitative approach. Quasi experiment design is experiment treatment involving selecting groups, upon which a variable is tested without any random pre selection process.

The population of this research is the second semester students of STIT al Urwatul Wutsqo in year of 2017/2018, they are 180 students, and sample is students of A, B, C class, and the number is 90 students. There reason of taking the class, because the researcher teaches in that classes. The data collection technique was done by using oral test. The data then was analyzed by coding, and comparing the result of the test. The research involved dependent and independent variable. The dependent variable consist of three groups, they are class of A, B, and C, and the independent variables consisted of three learning model, such as debate, role play, and games. In this case, the researcher tried to implement these methods to all classes and looked for the difference result among them after giving the treatments¹⁹.

The score was gained using Analytical Scoring Rubric for Speaking adapted from O'Malley and Pierce with aspects of fluency, grammatical accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary. However, the researcher took the fluency and accuracy only, it was done because the students ability of speaking is very limited. So the maximal score will be 10 and the minimal is 2. The score is the student's score which is calculated from the score obtained by the student, divided with maximum score and multiplied by 100. the researcher then add the score if the students could improve their pronunciation or vocabulary.

To test the null hypothesis, the researcher used analyses of variance which involved two factors. The researcher then counted the

¹⁹ Muhid, Abdul. *Analisis Statistik*. 5 Langkah Praktis Analisis Statistik Dengan SPSS For Windows. Zifatama: Surabaya, 2012), 75.

data observed that grouped within group and between group using computers program of SPSS 16.0.

Result

The result of data analysis can be described as follows:

Table 1. The students English Course 1 of A Class after giving treatments of three models

Respondent of A Class	Students Score of Treatment		
	Debate	Role Play	Game
1	75	80	80
2	70	75	80
3	75	75	75
4	85	85	88
5	75	77	80
6	60	65	70
7	75	78	80
8	72	76	80
9	75	80	83
10	79	82	80
11	75	83	80
12	70	73	77
13	60	67	70
14	60	60	60
15	70	78	80
16	75	80	80
17	74	76	78
18	75	75	75
19	80	82	85
20	75	78	80
21	77	80	77
22	80	82	83
23	80	82	75
24	75	83	80
25	76	78	75
26	65	70	75
27	75	80	80

Respondent of A Class	Students Score of Treatment		
	Debate	Role Play	Game
28	60	60	60
29	70	70	75
30	65	70	73

Table 2. The students English Course 1 of B Class after giving treatments of three models

Respondent of B Class	Students Score of Treatment		
	Debate	Role Play	Game
1	60	70	70
2	60	70	75
3	66	70	75
4	75	75	80
5	70	70	75
6	80	80	85
7	60	70	70
8	60	70	75
9	65	65	65
10	75	75	75
11	65	65	75
12	66	67	70
13	60	65	70
14	80	70	65
15	80	80	75
16	60	70	75
17	80	85	85
18	75	80	85
19	70	70	75
20	65	70	70
21	60	65	60
22	66	70	75
23	70	70	72
24	65	70	70
25	70	75	78

Respondent of B Class	Students Score of Treatment		
	Debate	Role Play	Game
26	70	70	75
27	75	70	75
28	70	70	75
29	60	65	65
30	80	85	85

Table 3. The students English Course 1 of C Class after giving treatments of three models

Respondent of C Class	Students Score of Treatment		
	Debate	Role Play	Game
1	60	65	65
2	88	85	85
3	80	85	80
4	85	85	85
5	78	85	85
6	80	85	80
7	84	85	88
8	70	80	80
9	60	60	65
10	60	60	60
11	70	70	75
12	80	85	80
13	85	85	85
14	80	80	80
15	81	80	75
16	75	78	75
17	86	88	85
18	78	78	83
19	80	80	85
20	80	85	80
21	60	60	60
22	80	85	80
23	75	75	85

Respondent of C Class	Students Score of Treatment		
	Debate	Role Play	Game
24	80	78	80
25	70	80	75
26	85	85	80
27	80	80	85
28	75	78	70
29	65	60	65
30	70	75	70

The above tables are the students English Course 1 after giving treatment of debate, role play and games. B class has lower score of debate than role play or game.

Table 4 **Descriptive Statistics**

Dependent Variable: English Course 1

Kelas A, B, C	Learning Model	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Kelas A	Debate Learning Model	72.60	6.521	30
	Role Play Learning Model	76.00	6.576	30
	Game Learning Model	77.13	6.107	30
	Total	75.24	6.622	90
Kelas B	Debate Learning Model	68.60	7.166	30
	Role Play Learning Model	71.57	5.525	30
	Game Learning Model	74.00	6.125	30
	Total	71.39	6.621	90
Kelas C	Debate Learning Model	76.00	8.346	30
	Role Play Learning Model	78.00	8.730	30
	Game Learning Model	77.53	8.020	30
	Total	77.18	8.320	90
Total	Debate Learning Model	72.40	7.908	90

Kelas A, B, C	Learning Model	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
	Role Play Learning Model	75.19	7.495	90
	Game Learning Model	76.22	6.918	90
	Total	74.60	7.598	270

Table 4. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a
Dependent Variable:score of English Course 1

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.773	8	261	.083

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

Table 5. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: score of English Course 1

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2401.896 ^a	8	300.237	5.970	.000
Intercept	1502742.404	1	1502742.404	2.988E4	.000
Class	1563.430	2	781.715	15.543	.000
treatment	703.652	2	351.826	6.995	.001
class * treatment	134.815	4	33.704	.670	.613
Error	13126.700	261	50.294		
Total	1518271.000	270			
Corrected Total	15528.596	269			
a. R Squared = .155 (Adjusted R Squared = .129)					

Discussion

From above tables, it can be described as follows:

The students mean score of A class when using the debate learning models is lower than using role play and game, in which the mean score of debate is 72, 6. The students mean score using role play is 76, 00, and who had given game is 77, 13.

The Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a, the significant gained is 0, 83, it means that the significance is greater than 0, 05, so the null hypothesis is accepted, and the conclusion is that the variance of the students learning achievement is equal across groups.

The students mean score between classes can be seen from Tests of Between-Subjects Effects. Based on the table, F counted obtained is 15, 543 with significance is 0,000. Comparing with F table $f_{0,05(2;261)}$ that is 3, 03, shows that F counted is higher than F table ($15, 543 > 3, 03$), it means that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Besides, the significance found is lower than 0, 05 ($0,000 < 0, 05$), means the null hypothesis is rejected. It can be said that all or one of the students learning achievement that is the English course 1 score between A, B, and C class is different. In this case the mean of B class is lower than A or C class.

To proof whether or not the students learning achievement based on the learning model or treatment, the researcher see the table of Tests of Between-Subjects Effects, in which the F counted obtained is 6, 995 and significance is 0,001, it means that the significance is lower than 0, 05, so the null hypothesis is rejected, and the conclusion is that the students learning achievement viewed from the treatment of learning model is different, it can be said that there is different significantly of the students learning achievement who has given the learning models.

The students learning difference based on the interaction between the classes and treatments given can be seen the F counted on the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects table that is 0, 670, and the significance is 0, 613. The significance is higher than 0, 05 or null hypothesis is accepted. It can be described that the English Course 1 based on classes interaction and treatments are equal. There is no difference significantly between the students English Course 1 score based on the interaction between the class and treatment given.

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent variable : English Course 1 LSD

(I) Class A, B, C	(J) Class A, B, C	Mean Diff. (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
A Class	B Class	3.86*	1.057	.000	1.77	5.94
	C Class	-1.93	1.057	.069	-4.02	.15
B Class	A Class	-3.86*	1.057	.000	-5.94	-1.77
	C Class	-5.79*	1.057	.000	-7.87	-3.71
C Class	A Class	1.93	1.057	.069	-.15	4.02
	B Class	5.79*	1.057	.000	3.71	7.87
Based on observed means. The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 50.294.						
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.						

From the Post Hoc Test table shows that the first row, the significance is lower than 0,05 ($0,000 < 0,05$), it means that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted, and can be said that there is different students English Course 1 score between A and B class. The second row explains that the significance is higher than 0, 05 the meaning is the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected, or there is no different of students English Course 1 score between A and C class. The third row shows that the significance is lower than 0, 05, it means that the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected, and can be said that there is equal of students English Course 1 score between B and C class.

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent variable:: English Course 1 LSD

(I) learning model	(J) learning model	Mean Diff. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Conf. Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
learning model of Debate	learning model of Role Play	-2.79*	1.057	.009	-4.87	-.71
	learning model of Game	-3.82*	1.057	.000	-5.90	-1.74
learning model of Role Play	learning model of Debate	2.79*	1.057	.009	.71	4.87
	learning model of Game	-1.03	1.057	.329	-3.12	1.05
learning model of Game	learning model of Debate	3.82*	1.057	.000	1.74	5.90
	learning model of Role Play	1.03	1.057	.329	-1.05	3.12
Based on observed means.						
The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 50.294.						
*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.						

Based on above table can be explained as follows:

The first row which tested the difference mean between treatments of debate and of role play learning model shows that mean difference is - 2, 79 (72, 40 - 75, 19), the range of difference mean on confidence interval of 95% ranged between - 4, 87 to - 0, 71. The significance shows that 0, 09 is higher than 0, 05, it means that the students English course 1 score that given those models (debate and

role play) is equal, or there is no significance difference of students English course 1 who had given debate and role play as model.

The second row represents difference mean between treatments of debate and game learning model shows that mean difference is - 3, 82 (72, 40 - 76, 22), the range of difference mean on confidence interval of 95% ranged between - 5, 90 to - 1, 74. The significance shows that 0, 000 is lower than 0, 05, it means that the students English course 1 score that given those models (debate and game) is different, or there is significance difference of students English course 1 who had given debate and game as model.

The third row describes the difference mean between treatments of role play and game learning model which explains that mean difference is - 1, 03 (75, 19- 76, 22), the range of difference mean on confidence interval of 95% ranged between - 3, 12 to 1, 05. The significance shows that 0, 329 is higher than 0, 05, it means that the students English course 1 score that given those models (role play and game) is equal, or there is no significance difference of students English course 1 score who had given the model of role play and game.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis result is concluded that from three classes one of the students learning achievement of English course 1 score between A, B, and C class is different. The students learning achievement viewed from the treatment of learning model is different, it means that there is different significantly of the students English course 1 score who has given those learning models. The students English Course 1 score based on classes interaction and treatments are equal, or there is no difference significantly between the students English Course 1 score based on the interaction between the class and treatment given. The English Course 1 score between A and B class, and between B and C class is equal, however, there is deferent of students English Course 1 score between A and C class.

Related to the treatment given, there is equal of students English course 1 score who had treated by debate and role play or role play and game as model. However, it is significance difference of student's English course 1 score who had given debate and game as model.

Bibliography

- Brewster, Jean, Gail Ellis and Dennis Girard. *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.
- Brown, H. D. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Longman, 2001.
- Burkart, G.S. *Spoken Language: What it is and how to teach it*” Modules for the professional preparation of teaching assistants in foreign languages. An article (<http://www.nclrc.org/essentials/speaking/spindex.htm>), 1998.
- Byrne, Donn. *Teaching Oral English*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1997.
- Elliot, L. Using debates to teach the psychology of women. *Teaching of Psychology*", 1993.
- Hadfield, Jill. *Intermediate Vocabulary Games*. Harlow, Essex; Longman, 1999.
- Ladousse, G. P. *Role Play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Muhid, Abdul. *Analisis Statistik. 5 Langkah Praktis Analisis Statistik Dengan SPSS For Windows*. Zifatama: Surabaya, 2012
- Murad, The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Developing Speaking Skills among the Palestinian Secondary EFL Students in Israel and Their Attitudes towards English. <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Nunan, D. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Richards, J. *Teaching Listening and Speaking from Theory to Practice*. (Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Skehan, P. *Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction*. In Willis, J. and D. Willis (Eds). *Challenges and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Thornbury, Scoot. *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow, England. (Longman, 2005.
- Thournament, D. (2011). What is debating? World Schools Debating Championship. Reviewed from <https://wsdctournament.wordpress.com/about/what-is-debate/>

Tompkins, G. E. & Hoskisson, K. *Language Art: Content and Teaching Strategies*. New York: MacMillan, Publishing Company, 1998.

Ur, P. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and theory* (13th Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.