

Teaching English Through Collaborative Learning: An Experimental Study

Stephene Mark H. Coresis¹ and Dhan Timothy M. Ibojo²

¹ Faculty member, Monkayo National High School, DepEd-Division of Davao de Oro, Philippines

² Professor, Graduate School, Assumption College of Nabunturan, Davao de Oro, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore the use of collaborative learning as a teaching strategy in teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10 and to compare it to the traditional way of teaching. This study was conducted at Monkayo National High School at Magysaysay Street, Poblacion, Monkayo Davao de Oro, wherein the grade 10 students were the subjects of the study. Two groups, the control, and the experimental group, were subjected to comparison. The control group used the traditional way of teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10, while the experimental group was taught using collaborative learning in teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10. Collaborative learning is a process whereby a group of learners acquires knowledge from one another by working together to solve a certain problem, complete a given task, create a product, or share individual perspectives. This study is a quasi-experiment pretest-posttest nonequivalent group design, where each group was given a pretest and posttest to determine the impact of the intervention on the development of the learner's academic performance before and after the intervention was conducted. The result of the study shows that there is no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group. However, it is visible in the mean scores of the two groups that the experimental group is slightly greater than the control group's mean score, which means that it is an effective teaching strategy to improve the learners' academic performance in Grade 10. This study's findings would benefit the students, teachers, school administrators, and future researchers by allowing them to use the information to address the issue of academic performance.

Keywords: - Collaborative Learning, Traditional Way of Teaching, Teaching Strategies, Quasi-Experiment Design

1. INTRODUCTION

The English language is rooted in the long history of the Philippines. The Thomasites were the volunteered American soldiers who became the first English teacher of the Filipinos. From the American colonization up to the present, Filipinos have been using English as a secondary language for communication. It became one of our official languages in the Philippines (Salazar, 2022). However, many learners were struggling to read and comprehend a written text and using the English language as a medium in communication. According to Ryan (2022), the Philippines English proficiency level is one of the lowest level in Asia.

In Indonesia, a study by Mukarromah (2022) at Universitas Islam Malang (Islamic University of Malang) aimed to discover the students' difficulties in learning English. The study showed that students encounter both psychological and linguistic obstacles. Psychological challenges encompass anxiety, difficulty maintaining focus, and lack of concentration. Linguistic hurdles involve limited vocabulary, mispronunciation, and insufficient grasp of grammar principles.

In Region three of the Philippines, Separa et al. (2020) conducted a study at the Polytechnic University of the Philippines Bataan about the difficulties of English as a Secondary language (ESL) learners. The study findings indicated that the challenges in English speaking proficiency arise from factors such as speaking skills, time constraints, and pressure from the influential people, and society.

Most learners do not like the English subject because nowadays, learners are struggling to use the English language as a medium in communication, and some learners are having difficulties reading and comprehending the text. This study aims to explore the use of collaborative learning as a teaching strategy in teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10 and to compare it to the traditional way of teaching.

Collaborative learning is a term used to denote a variety of educational approaches involving a combined intellectual effort by either students or both students and teachers. Typically, this collaborative endeavor entails students actively collaborating in small groups comprising two or more individuals as they collaboratively seek comprehension, solutions, or significance (Smith & MacGregor, 2009).

Furthermore, according to Laal and Laal (2012); Lew (2020), the theory of collaborative learning embodies a mechanism in which a collective of individuals, either as a group or multiple groups, engage in a collaborative endeavor to acquire knowledge from one another. This collaborative effort encompasses problem-solving, task completion, product creation, and exchanging one's thoughts and perspectives. Collaborative learning theory is based on the work of Lev Vygotsky's social development theory and zone of proximal development. Vygotsky's work emphasized the significance of communication and social interaction in learning. Moreover, collaborative learning is group-structured, wherein students collectively assemble to organize and distribute tasks among themselves. Each student assumes individual responsibility for their own assigned work while also taking collective responsibility for the overall progress and outcomes of the team. (Lew, 2020).

In addition, collaboration is a way of interaction and personal attitude where individuals are accountable for their peers' actions, learning, personal capabilities, and contributions (Chandra, 2015). Nguyen (2020) added that collaborative learning generally refers to students' joint efforts to construct knowledge and attain shared learning objectives, which scholars have recognized as an auspicious pedagogical approach in higher education. This instructional approach exhibits favorable outcomes for students, including heightened academic accomplishments, enhanced aptitude for knowledge transfer across diverse contexts, and the capacity to generate novel ideas.

Effective collaboration requires an environment that promotes positive interdependence and facilitates each group member's contribution. One way of enhancing collaborative learning is to structure student interaction through scripting (Morris et al., 2010). An extensive body of existing empirical research confirms that scripting of collaborative learning facilitates interaction (Weinberger et al., 2010), knowledge construction (Buder & Bodemer, 2008), and awareness of both social and cognitive learning activities (Phielix et al., 2011).

To succeed in their collaboration, learners need to focus on task-related and cognition-focused interactions for task completion while maintaining positive socio-emotional interactions relevant to self-expression (Kreijns et al., 2003). Kwon et al. (2014) found that positive socio-emotional interactions were associated with intensive collaboration, while collaborative learning remained dormant among groups exhibiting little socio-emotional interaction. Furthermore, Järvelä et al. (2016) noted that socio-emotional interaction between the participating students increased in the early phases of collaborative learning.

According to Yasmin and Naseem (2019), collaborative learning promotes active learning, student empowerment, and cognitive enhancement as students construct knowledge collaboratively. In addition, Several meta-analyses show that students working in small groups indeed achieve higher learning outcomes than students working on a task individually, like increased learning gains and increased performance on standardized or teacher-made tests (Rohrbeck et al., 2003; Roseth et al., 2008; Kyndt et al., 2014; Chen et al., 2018;).

While students collaborate, teachers must monitor which problems students encounter and intervene when necessary (Van de Pol et al., 2015). In collaborative learning, the role of the teachers is to orient students to the principles involved in collaborative learning by guiding the latter on how to work in groups, express ideas, and seek assistance from each other to facilitate themselves to produce new ways of thinking and doing tasks and thereby play a constructive role in learners autonomy development (Gillies, 2006).

Many researchers are interested in studying the effect of the collaborative learning approach. One is the study of Arta (2018) in Australia, which is about the collaborative learning approach as one suitable solution to solve the obstacles of sharpening English speaking skills due to its benefits. The study results show that there are

three main benefits of CLA, whose implementation can reduce language anxiety, raise students' participation, and increase students' self-confidence. Next, the study conducted by Fatimah (2019) about collaborative learning in Malaysia. The study's findings show that these collaborative learning activities have shown positive major impacts, two of which are students' increased engagement and decreased speaking anxiety.

Another study was conducted at Bangkok University by Pattanpichet (2011) to investigate the effects of using collaborative learning to enhance students speaking achievement in English. The findings reveal the improvement in the students speaking performance and positive feedback from the students on the use of collaborative learning activities. Moreover, according to Chen (2018), through collaborative learning, the students quickly realize that they can solve problems as a group that they would not be able to solve as individuals. Students were satisfied by peer coaching and peer review. Students worked together and brought effective strategies into the classroom activity. Moreover, collaborative learning can ignite opportunities for changing traditional teaching and learning practices where both teachers and students take different roles, thus balancing classroom relations and interaction among participants and promoting students' empowerment (Contreras León & Chapetón Castro, 2017). Additionally, according to Judy Shih (2021), collaborative learning is more emotionally supportive to the learner, which brings more benefits in assisting their learning.

1.1 Research Problem

1. What is students' academic performance in English as reflected in their pretest and posttest scores?
2. Is there a significant difference in the academic performance between the experimental and control group before and after the experiment, as reflected in their pretest and posttest scores?
3. Is there a significant difference in academic performance between the experimental and control group, as reflected in the posttest scores?
4. Which teaching strategy, collaborative learning or traditional way of teaching, is best used in teaching English to Grade 10 students?

1.2 Null Hypothesis

With the problem stated in the study, the following null hypotheses would be tested at a 0.05 level of significance:

- Ho₁ There is no significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and posttest of the Grade-10 students taught using the traditional way of teaching English.
- Ho₂ There is no significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and posttest of the Grade-10 students taught using collaborative learning as a teaching strategy in teaching English.
- Ho₃ There is no significant difference between the students taught using the traditional way of teaching and those taught using the collaborative learning strategy.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Design

This study was a quasi-experiment pretest-posttest nonequivalent group design served as an empirical study investigating an intervention's causal influence on the target population. This design typically enabled the researcher to regulate the allocation of participants to the treatment condition, albeit through a criterion other than random assignment (Dinardo, 2010). The treatment group was given a pretest, received treatment, and then was given a posttest. However, at the same time, a nonequivalent control group was also given a pretest and posttest exam but did not received the treatment.

2.2 Research Subjects

The subjects of this research were the two sections in the Grade-10 Level of Monkayo National High School, where each section consisted of 39 learners. The subjects of this study were selected through a universal sampling technique. All selected respondents were enrolled in the school year 2022-2023. One of the two sections in the Grade-10 Level was the experimental group which received the treatment using collaborative learning as a strategy in teaching 3rd quarter modules in English, and the other one was the control group which was taught using the traditional way of teaching and did not receive any treatment of the experiment. Both groups were composed of 39 grade 10 students.

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher was responsible for all verifications and confidential information gathered from this study. The researcher would also be the one to work on all the processes of this research, specifically on the following: research design, statistical treatment, selection of the respondents, saving data, and analysis. To facilitate the conduct of the study, the researcher did the following: First, the researcher submitted a written permission that was approved by the Schools' Division Superintendent of Davao de Oro and then to the School Principal of Monkayo National High School, Purok 3 Magsaysay Street, Poblacion, Monkayo, Davao de Oro. Second, the researcher would coordinate with the English coordinator and other English teachers to implement the intervention. Third, in the session, the researcher used collaborative learning as a strategy in teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English to the experimental group, while the control group would be taught in the traditional way of teaching. And lastly, after conducting the intervention, the experimental group and the control underwent a posttest to determine if the intervention in the experimental group brought about any change.

2.4 Statistical Treatment of Data

The following statistical tools were used in this research to test the formulated null hypothesis:

1. **Mean.** This would be used to measure students' academic performance in English as reflected in their pretest and posttest scores. It would answer problem 1.
2. **Paired T-test.** This would be used to test the significant difference between the experimental and control groups' pretest and posttest mean scores. It would answer problems 2 and 3.
3. **Independent T-test.** This would be used to test the significant difference between the experimental and control groups' posttest mean scores. It would answer problem 4.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table - 1: Competency Level of the Pretest Scores of Control and Experimental Group

Pre-test	No. of Students	Mean	Class Proficiency	Competency level
Group A (Control)	39	14	35%	Low
Group B (Experimental)	39	14.9	37.25%	Low

Table 1 shows the class proficiency of the control group is 35% means that the competency level of the learner is low, which implies that the academic performance is low. The experimental group is 37.25%, which means that the learners' competency level is low, implying that their academic performance is low. This result indicates that before the intervention was conducted, both the control and experimental group lacked background knowledge about the 3rd quarter module in English 10 since both got a low level of competency. Pan and Sana (2021) supported the results of the study since pretest allows teacher to identify gaps in learners understanding and provide targeted instruction based on the results, and also it helps teachers to track the progress of their students over time and make sure they are on the right track. Furthermore, James and Storm (2019) added that Pretesting is an integral part of the learning process as it helps educators assess their students' knowledge and skills.

Table - 2: Competency Level of the Posttest Scores of Control and Experimental Group

POSTTEST	No. of Students	Mean	Class Proficiency	Competency level
Group A (Control)	39	20	50%	Average
Group B (Experimental)	39	22	55%	Average

Table 2 shows the class proficiency of the control group is 50% which means that the competency level of the learner is average; this implies that the academic performance of the learners is good, and the experimental group is 55% which also means that the competency level of the learner is average which also implies that the academic performance of the learners is good. This data indicates that after conducting the intervention, both the control and experimental group improved their competency level from low to average; therefore, Grade 10 learners truly learned from the discussion of the 3rd quarter modules in English 10 since there is improvement in their competency level before and after conducting the intervention. In support to the result of the study Armstrong (2020) and Baker (2023) stated that every teaching strategy is effective and it can create a supportive and engaging

learning environment that encourages students to reach their full potential. Alam (2023) added that different teaching strategies have a positive impact on student learning outcomes in different learning environments.

Table - 3: Comparison of the Pretest and Posttest of the Control Group

Control Group	Mean	t-value	p-value	Remarks
pretest	14	-5.490	0.000	Significant
posttest	20			

Table 3 shows the result of the paired t-test that the p-value is 0.000, which is less than the significance level, 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the p-value is less than 0.05, meaning there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and the posttest of the Grade-10 students who were taught using the traditional way of teaching the English subject. This result indicates that learners who were taught using the traditional way of teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10 genuinely learned from the discussion since there is an improvement in their mean score from the pretest to posttest. This result is supported by the idea of Todorovic (2020) that this teaching method has advantages, such as providing structure and effectively allowing teachers to convey their knowledge. Moreover, according to Graphy (2022), Traditional teaching methods focused on the teacher as the only source of information in the classroom.

Table - 4: Comparison of the Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental Group

Experimental Group	Mean	t-value	p-value	Remarks
pretest	14.9	-11.647	0.000	Significant
posttest	22			

Table 4 shows the result of the paired t-test that the p-value is 0.000, which is less than the significance level, 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the p-value is less than 0.05, meaning there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and the posttest of the Grade-10 students who were taught using collaborative learning as a teaching strategy in teaching the English subject. This results indicates that collaborative learning is an effective teaching strategy to improve the learning of the learners in the English subject since that there is an improvement in the mean score in the pretest and posttest of the learners who were taught using collaborative learning as a strategy in teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10 since there is an increase in the mean score of pretest and posttest form 14.9 to 22. Qureshi et al. (2021) supported the result of this study that Collaborative learning effectively engages students in the classroom. It encourages students to work together, share ideas and resources, and build on each other's knowledge. In addition, Collaborative learning has encouraging effects in enhancing students' knowledge, competence, satisfaction, and problem-solving skills (Männistö et al., 2020).

Table - 5: Comparison of the Academic Performance of the Control Group and Experimental Group

Post-test	Mean	t-value	p-value	Remarks
Control	20	1.521	0.132	Not Significant
Experimental	22			

Table 5 shows the result of the independent t-test wherein the p-value is 0.132, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted since the p-value is greater than 0.05, indicating that there is no significant difference between the students who are taught using the traditional way of teaching and the students who are taught using the collaborative learning strategy. However, the mean score of the control and experimental group in table 5 shows that there is a slightly difference between the control group and experimental group since the mean score of the control group is 20 and the experimental group is 22. This result indicates that collaborative learning as a teaching strategy is slight better compare to the traditional way of teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10. Alam (2023) supported the study's results that different teaching strategies positively impact student learning outcomes in different learning environments. However, the effectiveness of each theory may depend on the specific context in which it is being applied. Zhou et al. (2019) added that although students have some difficulties, they gain much in collaborative learning. Moreover, collaborative learning fosters responsibility, motivation,

confidence, skills, and a positive interdependence among learners and provides learners with an opportunity to learn from each other (Yasmin & Naseem, 2019).

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study shows that both collaborative learning and the traditional way of teaching were effective teaching strategies in teaching 3rd quarter modules in English 10 since it can be seen in Table 3 and Table 4 that there is an improvement in the competency level of the learners before and after the study was conducted. Although, based on the result in Table 5, there is no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group however based on the mean score in the posttest in Table 5 shows that there is a slight difference between the mean score of the control and experimental group which means that collaborative learning is slightly better compared to the traditional way of teaching in improving the learning of the learners in the English subject. Therefore, this study proves that collaborative learning is a slightly more effective teaching strategy in teaching the 3rd quarter modules in English 10 compared to the traditional way of teaching.

4.1 Implications of Future Research.

Based on the conclusions derived from the findings of the study, the following recommendations are hereby presented:

1. Teachers, especially English teachers, can utilize the information from this study to reevaluate their teaching strategies to meet the needs of their students and create learning activities that are interesting, meaningful, and applicable to their students' daily lives.
2. The school administrator should encourage and support their teachers to explore different teaching strategies and consider collaborative learning as a teaching strategy to address the learning needs of the students.
3. The use of collaborative learning as a teaching strategy is recommended for the future researcher to further study its impact on the students to collaborate with the other learners in the learning process

5. REFERENCES

- [1]. Alam, M. A. (2023). *From Teacher-Centered To Student-Centered Learning: The Role Of Constructivism And Connectivism In Pedagogical Transformation*. *Journal Of Education*, 11(2). <https://www.cjoe.naspublishers.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Afroz-Alam.pdf>
- [2]. Armstrong, S. (2020). *The 10 most important teaching strategies*. *Innovate my School*. <https://www.innovatemyschool.com/ideas/the-10-most-powerful-teaching-strategies>
- [3]. Arta, B. (2018). *Multiple studies: the influence of collaborative learning approach on Indonesian secondary high school students' English-speaking skills*. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 1(3), 149-160. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1288197.pdf>
- [4]. Baker, J. (2023). *6 Best Teaching Strategies for 2023*. *Splash Learn*. <https://www.splashlearn.com/blog/best-teaching-strategies-to-help-students-maximize-their-learnings/>
- [5]. Buder, J., & Bodemer, D. (2008). *Supporting controversial CSCL discussions with augmented group awareness tools*. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative learning*, 3(2), 123-139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-008-9037-5>
- [6]. Chandra, R. (2015). Collaborative learning for educational achievement. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 5(3), 2320-7388. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-05310407>
- [7]. Chen, J., Wang, M., Kirschner, P. A., & Tsai, C. C. (2018). The role of collaboration, computer use, learning environments, and supporting strategies in CSCL: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 88(6), 799-843. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543187915>
- [8]. Chen, Y. (2018). *Perceptions of EFL College Students toward Collaborative learning*. *English Language Teaching*, 11(2), 1-4. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n2p1>
- [9]. Contreras León, J. J., & Chapetón Castro, C. M. (2017). *Transforming EFL Classroom Practices and Promoting Students' Empowerment: Collaborative learning from a Dialogical Approach*. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(2), 135-149. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1147210.pdf>
- [10]. Dinardo, J. (2010). *Natural Experiments and Quasi-Natural Experiments*. In: Durlauf, S.N., Blume, L.E. (eds) *Microeconometrics*. The New Palgrave Economics Collection. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230280816_18

- [11]. Fatimah, S. (2019). *Collaborative learning Activities through MoE in Engaging EFL Learners and Diminishing their Speaking Anxiety*. English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 2 (1), 39-49. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1282901.pdf>
- [12]. Gillies, R. M. (2006). *Teachers' and students' verbal behaviours during cooperative and small-group learning*. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(2), 271-287. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709905X52337>
- [13]. Graphy (2022). "What is the traditional method of teaching?". Graphy.com. <https://graphy.com/blog/traditional-method-of-teaching/>
- [14]. James, K. K., & Storm, B. C. (2019). Beyond the pretesting effect: What happens to the information that is not pretested? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 25(4), 576–587. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000231>
- [15]. Järvelä, S., Malmberg, J., Sobocinski, M., Haataja, E., & Kirschner, P. (2016). What multimodal data tell about selfregulated learning process. *Learning and Instruction*.
- [16]. Judy Shih, H. C. (2021). The use of individual and collaborative learning logs and their impact on the development of learner autonomy in the EFL classroom in Taiwan. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(3), 195-209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1737703>
- [17]. Kreijns, K., Kirschner, P. A., & Jochems, W. (2003). Identifying the pitfalls for social interaction in computer-supported collaborative learning environments: a review of the research. *Computers in human behavior*, 19(3), 335-353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632\(02\)00057-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(02)00057-2)
- [18]. Kwon, K., Liu, Y. H., & Johnson, L. P. (2014). Group regulation and social-emotional interactions observed in computer supported collaborative learning: Comparison between good vs. poor collaborators. *Computers & Education*, 78, 185-200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.06.004>
- [19]. Kyndt, E., Raes, E., Lismont, B., Timmers, F., Cascallar, E., & Dochy, F. (2013). A meta-analysis of the effects of face-to-face cooperative learning. Do recent studies falsify or verify earlier findings?. *Educational research review*, 10, 133-149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.02.002>
- [20]. Laal, M., & Laal, M. (2012). Collaborative learning: what is it?. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 491-495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.092>
- [21]. Lew, G. K. (2020). *An Introduction to Collaborative learning Theory*. Pressbooks. <https://pressbooks.pub/elearning2020/chapter/collaborative-learning-theory/>
- [22]. Männistö, M., Mikkonen, K., Kuivila, H. M., Virtanen, M., Kyngäs, H., & Kääriäinen, M. (2020). Digital collaborative learning in nursing education: a systematic review. *Scandinavian journal of caring sciences*, 34(2), 280-292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12743>
- [23]. McLeod, S. (2020). Lev Vygotsky's sociocultural theory. *Simply Psychology*. https://www.simplypsychology.org/vygotsky.html?ezoi&fb_comment_id=500779888714_15217241
- [24]. Morris, R., Hadwin, A. F., Gress, C. L., Miller, M., Fior, M., Church, H., & Winne, P. H. (2010). Designing roles, scripts, and prompts to support CSCL in gStudy. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 815-824. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.12.001>
- [25]. Mukarromah, I. (2022). A Study on Speaking Difficulties Encountered by Third Semester of English Department Students of University of Islam Malang. <http://repository.unisma.ac.id/handle/123456789/3408>
- [26]. Nguyen, N. (2020). "What exactly is Collaborative learning?". *Feedback Fruits*. <https://feedbackfruits.com/blog/what-exactly-is-collaborative-learning>
- [27]. Pan, S. C., & Sana, F. (2021). Pretesting versus posttesting: Comparing the pedagogical benefits of errorful generation and retrieval practice. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 27(2), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000345>
- [28]. Pattanpichet, F. (2011). The Effects Of Using Collaborative learning To Enhance Students English Speaking Achievement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 8(11), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v8i11.6502>
- [29]. Phielix, C., Prins, F., Janssen, J., & Kirschner, P. (2011). Using a Reflection Tool to Increase Reliability of Peer Assessments in a CSCL Environment. <https://repository.isls.org/handle/1/2465>
- [30]. Qureshi, M. A., Khaskheli, A., Qureshi, J. A., Raza, S. A., & Yousufi, S. Q. (2021). Factors affecting students' learning performance through collaborative learning and engagement. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1884886>
- [31]. Rohrbeck, C. A., Ginsburg-Block, M. D., Fantuzzo, J. W., & Miller, T. R. (2003). Peer-assisted learning interventions with elementary school students: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 95(2), 240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.2.240>
- [32]. Roseth, C. J., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2008). Promoting early adolescents' achievement and peer relationships: the effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures. *Psychological bulletin*, 134(2), 223. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.223>

- [33]. Ryan, (2022). Why Filipino Students Struggle to Speak English. English Raven. <https://www.englishraven.com/why-do-filipino-students-have-difficulty-speaking-in-english-pdf/>
- [34]. Salazar, D. (2022). Introduction to Philippine English. Oxford English Dictionary. <https://public.oed.com/blog/introduction-to-philippine-english/>
- [35]. Separa, L. A. C., Generales, L. J., & Medina, R. J. S. (2020). Situational Speaking Difficulties of English as Second Language Learners in the Philippines. JATI-Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, 25(1), 144-167. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol25no1.8>
- [36]. Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. (2009). Learning communities and the quest for quality. Quality Assurance in Education. Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 118-139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09684880910951354>
- [37]. Todorovic, I. (2020). Importance of New Class Teaching Methods in Curricula Development in Developing Countries. In Handbook of Research on Enhancing Innovation in Higher Education Institutions (pp. 408-427). IGI Global. 10.4018/978-1-7998-2708-5.ch018
- [38]. Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., Oort, F., & Beishuizen, J. (2015). The effects of scaffolding in the classroom: support contingency and student independent working time in relation to student achievement, task effort and appreciation of support. Instructional Science, 43(5), 615-641. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-015-9351-z>
- [39]. Weinberger, A., Stegmann, K., & Fischer, F. (2010). Learning to argue online: Scripted groups surpass individuals (unscripted groups do not). Computers in Human behavior, 26(4), 506-515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.08.007>
- [40]. Yasmin, M., & Naseem, F. (2019). Collaborative learning and learner autonomy: Beliefs, practices and prospects in Pakistani engineering universities. IEEE Access, 7, 71493-71499. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=8733805>
- [41]. Zhou, X., Chen, L. H., & Chen, C. L. (2019). Collaborative learning by teaching: A pedagogy between learner-centered and learner-driven. Sustainability, 11(4), 1174. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041174>

BIOGRAPHIES

	<p>Stephen Mark H. Coresis earned his MAED ELT From Assumption College of Nabunturan in 2023. Respectively, He is currently working as an English Teacher in Junior High School at Monkayo National High School since 2021</p>
	<p>Dhan Tumothy Mahimpit Ibojo, PhD. Graduate school and College Professor in English Language Education - Assumption College of Nabunturan. Thesis Panelist Assumption College of Nabunturan Member Philippine Association for Teachers and Educators Member -Association of Deans for Arts and Sciences</p>