

# The Effects of Cooperative Interactive Learning Strategies to Improve Undergraduates' Speaking Skills

<sup>1\*</sup>Charanjit Kaur Swaran Singh, <sup>2</sup>Tarsame Singh Masa Singh, <sup>1</sup>Ong Eng Tek, <sup>3</sup>Melor Md Yunus

**Abstract**---This research presents the findings of a study relating to the effect of cooperative interactive learning strategies to improve undergraduates' speaking skills in one of the selected public universities in Malaysia. The study was also carried out to find out the students' attitudes towards cooperative interactive learning strategies. Participants included one hundred and fifty-two undergraduates taking Diploma in English Program. A pre-posttest survey research design was employed for the data collection and also to find out whether there was a significant difference between the speaking scores for the four groups after exposing students to the cooperative interactive learning strategies. The data obtained from the pre and posttests was analyzed with paired sample t test. The findings revealed that there was a statistically significant increase in pretest scores to posttest scores. The findings from the survey showed that the students' exhibit positive attitudes towards the cooperative interactive learning strategies employed to improve their speaking skills. The findings implicate that cooperative interactive learning strategies may be beneficial for educators to nurture undergraduates' motivation and confidence for speaking.

**Keywords**---Cooperative interactive learning, speaking skills, undergraduates

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Educators in the higher learning institutions have come to realize the importance of mastering English language among the undergraduates in Malaysia (Asmah, 2012). English is also widely used among undergraduates in higher learning institutions. Undergraduates in Malaysia are expected to master English language so that they can use the language in everyday situations, for learning purposes and also for workplace communication. The new paradigm of education 4.0 era demands a shift in second language pedagogy from a teacher-centered learning model to a learner-centered model. This shift signals a new era in which English-speaking instruction must create opportunities for undergraduates to express themselves in speaking the language. Before the undergraduates pursue their studies at the tertiary education, they had been exposed to English language since pre-school, primary and also secondary levels. The students are exposed to Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking skills and as a matter of fact, the students focused more on Reading and Writing skills for examination purpose. Listening and Speaking are scarcely used during English periods because the teachers paid more emphasis on Reading and Writing as the teachers have to complete the syllabus (Kandasamy & Habil, 2018). At the secondary school level, the students geared their focus on

---

<sup>1</sup>English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Languages & Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, 35900, Tanjong Malim, Perak Darul Ridzuan, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>English Language Unit, Language Department, Institute of Teacher Education, Tuanku Bainun Campus, 14000 Bukit Mertajam, Penang, Malaysia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), 43600, Bangi Selangor

\*Corresponding email: charanjit@fbk.upsi.edu.my

Listening and Speaking skills because they need to prepare for the high stake examinations including Lower Secondary Examination (PT3), Malaysia Examination Certificate (SPM), Malaysia Higher Examination Certificate (STPM) and also the Malaysian University English Test (MUET). The examination-oriented education system in Malaysia contributed to the development of rote-memorization whereby the students failed to use English language for communication purposes (Singh & Samad, 2012). Speaking is viewed and known as the basis of literacy and communication (Bertram, 2002) and is considered the most important language skills (Urr, 1999). Students were not given the opportunity to practice their speaking skills at the school levels and this resulted in their inability to communicate well in the English language (Mohtar et.al, 2015). Speaking is one of the language skills that is emphasized in the English Language Malaysian School Syllabus (English Language Syllabus, 2003). Undergraduates in Malaysia face some difficulties in expressing themselves in English language and show lack of competency in speech (Singh et.al. 2019). The undergraduates' inability to engage in speaking make them lose interest to converse with academicians and friends. It is generally accepted that speaking is a difficult task to master (Urr, 1999). This view has also been expressed by (Rodrigues, 2006) who states that the problem is exacerbated when the language is only heard in the classroom and not practiced. The problem is also intensified when there is no support for its use outside the classroom. This has been attested to by a report which claims that students scored distinctions in the written English Language paper but failed at interviews (Rodrigues, 2006). Hence, many undergraduates of English as a second language, especially at Malaysian higher learning institutions perform poorly in the language during examination held in the university (Singh et. al., 2019). Employers have expressed their dissatisfaction in all areas of the work force concerning the poor speaking abilities of the undergraduates (Kandasamy &Habil, 2018). The Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025 aims to produce Malaysian graduates who are competent users of the English language. Based on the speaking problems faced by the undergraduates as discussed, it was deemed necessary to provide some form of guidance to enable the undergraduates to speak confidently. The guidance comes in the form of a cooperative interactive learning strategies to improve undergraduates' speaking skills in one of the higher learning institutions in Malaysia. Considering all the above into account, there appears to be an urgent need to infuse the cooperative interactive learning strategies in the higher learning institution in Malaysia to improve undergraduates' speaking skills as to speak confidently.

The present study attempts to investigate whether cooperative interactive learning strategies could improve undergraduates' speaking skills not just for communication purposes but also for workplace needs. The study was also carried out to find out the students' attitudes towards cooperative interactive learning strategies. The major research questions addressed in this study were:

1. Is there a difference between the pretest posttest scores that cooperative interactive learning strategy have been applied in the speaking skills?
2. What is the relationship between students' attitude towards cooperative interactive learning strategy towards speaking skills?

The Null Hypothesis

On the basis of the above-mentioned research questions, the following null hypothesis will be tested: -

Ho There is no significant difference between the achievement means of undergraduates taught using the cooperative interactive learning strategy to improve speaking skills.

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The use of cooperative interactive learning strategy has not been investigated in the Malaysian context. The development of the cooperative interactive learning strategy was prompted by the Niche Research Grant Scheme (NRGS). Under the NRGS grant, the modules namely cooperative learning and interactive learning modules were developed to assist the educators in higher learning institutions to improve their teaching strategies as to provide more opportunities for the undergraduates to communicate effectively. These modules were then validated by experts and stakeholders from the Ministry of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Malaysian Examination Syndicate, lecturers from higher learning institutions, lecturers from private learning institutions, principals from schools and also teachers. One recommendation was made specifically referring to transformative pedagogy whereby the researchers from group two were asked to propose the uniqueness of the modules developed. The uniqueness proposed was in the form of a teaching strategy that merged both strategies namely cooperative interactive learning strategy. The researchers from the NRGS group developed fundamental steps to carry out the cooperative interactive learning strategies to assist the undergraduates to improve their speaking skills. Analyses carried out by the researcher on the related prior studies revealed that most studies were merely concerning with (a) the importance of cooperative learning and interactive learning, (b) improves not only learning but also social development skills and communication, (c) encourages simultaneous interaction, (d) interactive learning enables students to strengthen their critical thinking and enhance their problem-solving skills using a much more holistic approach to learning and (e) interactive learning helps students to collaborate and work successfully in groups. Less attention was given to the development of a tool in the form of a teaching strategy and combination of these learning approaches namely cooperative and interactive learning to improve students' speaking skills.

### **Cooperative learning strategy**

Cooperative Learning (CL) is a learning process that warrants students to work and learn together. In a cooperative learning environment, students are expected to be accountable and responsible not only towards their own learning orientation, but also gearing the learning towards their friends. The implementation of cooperative learning gives credits of learning or acknowledgements or rewards to ensure the students experience fun learning. In other words, cooperative learning encourages and motivates students. The idea of rewarding students is in line with the behaviorism theory that emphasizes and strongly agree that rewards presented to a student by the teacher truly encourages and motivates the students to learn better (Cohen, 1994; Johnson, Johnson and Anderson, 1976; Slavin, 1990). This is further supported by Long (2010), cooperative learning is different from the traditional approach because it provides opportunities to stimulate students' thinking capability and creates space for the infusion of higher order thinking skills. Liao (2009) divulged that cooperative learning demands students to share their views and produce ideas to relate ideas related to the issues that is being discussed and learnt. Cooperative learning strategy is very practical and effective in producing students who can learn enthusiastically, and this would increase the students' self-confidence and make learning more meaningful.

### **Interactive learning strategy**

Interactive learning strategy is a learning process that allow students to communicate actively through role-play activities during lectures. The literature in interactive learning strategy have shown that students improve and learn better when they are actively engages in the learning process (Bonwell&Eison, 1991; Hake, 1998; Prince, 2004;

National Survey of Student Engagement, 2006). It was reported that student learning is largely influenced by students' communication ability and interaction with their peers (Terenzini et al. 1999). This was supported by Feiertag and Berge (2008) and Bracy et.al. (2010) that students now are familiarized and comfortable to interactivity and teamwork. Students placed in an interactive learning environment are often linked to improving critical thinking skills, which refines analytic reasoning. Students in an interactive learning environment help their peers to collaborate and ensure goals are obtained successfully. As lecturers are well known to the needs and different learning styles of their students, they can always choose substitute strategies or be creative to deliver the instruction.

### **Cooperative interactive learning strategy**

Cooperative interactive learning strategy infused the following techniques for example, a think-pair-share, K-W-L chart, group discussion and peer-assessment to increase interaction among the students. Cooperative interactive learning strategy promotes learner-centred model for teaching and learning purpose as opposed to the traditional teaching method (Singh et.al, 2019). Cooperative and interactive learning strategies have been acknowledged as a promising tool to facilitate speaking skills (Singh et.al, 2019). It serves as an alternative approach of teaching for promoting speaking and social interaction among students (Gomleksiz, 2007; Ning, 2011).

Ezeudu et. al (2019) conducted a study to investigate the effects of cooperative learning and analogy methods on secondary school student's achievement and interest in chemistry. A quasi-experimental design was employed in four schools. The results showed that both cooperative learning and analogy methods brought about significant shift in achievement and interest of Senior Secondary School 2 (SSS2) chemistry students.

Kandasamy and Habil (2018) investigated how cooperative learning could assist and guide students in speaking skills. Their study focused on Form 1 students at the lower secondary school level. Cooperative learning and the Interaction Theory and group work were used to promote speaking among the students. The students were required to discuss, rephrase, explain, and elaborate with peers before the speaking session. Their findings showed that students enjoyed and had fun throughout the learning session. It was also reported that students depended on each other to complete the tasks given to them. The study promoted student-centred learning as the teacher did not interfere during the learning session.

Altamimi and Attamimi (2018) carried out a study using the cooperative learning strategy to enhance Yemeni students' speaking skills and attitude. For the purpose of their study, a quasi-experimental research design was employed with sixty undergraduates. A survey was also administered to the sample before and at the end of the course to look at the students' attitudes towards the use of the cooperative learning. Their findings showed a significant improvement in the students' speaking skills and attitudes upon the introduction of the cooperative learning strategy. Their study implicates that teachers should introduce students to the cooperative learning as it benefits them. Malaysia's Ministry of Education (2002) put emphasis on the proper planning of teaching and learning activities by teachers and educators must consider factors such as opportunities to involve and elicit feedback from students, guide students towards thinking, study students' needs and their learning styles or preferences and also ways to cultivate habits of mind among the students. This is further supported by Lasvani and Khandan (2011) to redesign teaching strategies to create an impact on teaching and learning. The term cooperative language learning is not a new idea, teachers have resorted to apply cooperative learning strategies not just to improve students' participation in the classroom but also to teach the four main skills, grammar, and vocabulary in their classroom. There are several

cooperative learning strategies developed and established by main researchers in this area (Kagan, 1985; Sharon, 1990; Slavin, 1995; Johnson & Johnson, 1999). According to Slavin (1995), cooperative learning strategies comprise of teaching strategies in which students are given an opportunity to assist one another to master knowledge in a classroom setting. In a cooperative learning environment, the students are encouraged to discuss, share and argue with each other so that they can assess each other's understanding of the topic or issue that is being discussed as to fill in gaps in learning (Slavin, 1995).

Liang (2002) investigated the effects of cooperative learning on EFL junior school learners' language learning, motivation toward English. The main results recommended that cooperative learning enhanced the high school learners' oral communicative competence and their motivation toward learning English. Students will benefit in cooperative learning classes because the activities planned entails the development of not only interesting but also supporting as it assists students to focus on learning (Bahrun, Ong & Samngani, 2018). Therefore, cooperative learning is highly recommended as it will be able to solve the problem of disturbance in the classroom. This is further supported by Johnson and Johnson (1989), teaching using the conventional approach is a passive and dull for the students. Conventional teaching approach does not facilitate learning as students get bored easily and show less interest towards continuing their studies as they find it difficult to understand and comprehend the subject matter taught. Burton (1987) divulged that students can master the subject matter successfully through cooperative learning strategy as compared to the conventional approach. Burton (1987) reported that students showed excitement in learning after being exposed to the cooperative learning strategy approach. According to Meh (2008), cooperative learning instills high social skills, learners are taught not to be selfish and accelerates mastery of the subject matter in depth.<sup>4</sup>

Bahrun, Ong and Samngani (2018) carried out a study on the effectiveness of cooperative learning STAD (Student Teams Achievement Division) among form two students in Islamic Religious Education (IRE). A quasi-experimental pretest posttest was used, and the data was analysed using Analysis of Variance (ANCOVA). Findings revealed that the achievement in Islamic Religious Education of form two students who have been taught using the STAD cooperative learning is statistically higher than their counterparts who were taught using the traditional method. Cooperative learning can aid students to have a sense of accountability as in the students will take charge of being responsible for their own learning and teachers on their hand will facilitate students' learning as a facilitator observer. Bilen and Tavil (2015) conducted to find out the effects of cooperative learning strategies on the vocabulary skills of 4<sup>th</sup> grade students. The study employed a mix-method research design and the respondents of the study were interviewed to obtain their feedback on the cooperative learning strategy used to improve vocabulary. The findings revealed that students who were exposed to the vocabulary items using the cooperative learning strategy score significantly higher on the post-test as opposed to students who were taught using the traditional approach. The researchers concluded that cooperative learning strategy created a positive learning environment for the students.

Bayat (2004) investigated the effect of cooperative learning on reading skills and student attitudes and found that cooperative language learning impacted on learners' language learning process in terms of motivation. Ghorbani (2012) discovered that cooperative language learning has positively affected for the teaching of grammar. The findings revealed that the learners' interaction during the grammar sessions depended on their learning environment as well. Zarei & Gilani (2013) examined the effects of selected collaborative techniques on second language (L2)

vocabulary comprehension and production. Their findings showed that word webbing was the most appropriate technique for both vocabulary comprehension and production. Tekeli (2013) discovered that cooperative learning strategy improved students' writing performance and that they were able to produce grammatically coherent work. This is further supported by Hui & Wei (2013) cooperative learning can support students' motivation and interest as they must make their own decisions about the learning pace for any kind of difficulties that may arise. Lim & Mohtar (2011) shared that undergraduates must be proficient in second language in order to use the language in different contexts.

Zakaria et al. (2010) carried out a study comparing traditional method of teaching mathematics against cooperative learning method of learning mathematics. The study was conducted with 61 Form three subjects using questionnaire. Findings showed that students maintain new concepts longer in their memory when peers explain to each other. Not only that, other related findings include the element of accountability and interdependence embedded in a structure that is not found in traditional classroom teaching. Nelson (2014) conducted a study investigating the outcome of English reading comprehension to 150 senior secondary students using cooperative learning and traditional method. The researcher used questionnaires for the study. The findings revealed that the English reading comprehension achievement was higher than the controlled group. Moreover, the cooperative Integrated Reading & Composition helped low achievement students to improve their ability & opinions. Al-Tamini (2014) studied the effect of cooperative learning on speaking skills. The findings showed that cooperative learning attributed significantly towards speaking skills and students showed more positive attitude and less stress towards speaking skills. Talebi & Sohmani (2012) did an experimental design study on 40 students taking a Speaking Course. The study revealed that the score on speaking proficiency for cooperative learning was higher compared to the controlled group. Kan (2011) did a research on cooperative learning and the findings revealed that it was a fun way of learning.

Analyses carried out by the researcher on related prior research studies revealed that most of these studies were merely concerned with (a) effects of cooperative learning and analogy methods on secondary school student's achievement in Chemistry studies, (b) cooperative learning and the Interaction Theory and group work were used to promote speaking among form 1 students, (c) cooperative learning strategy to enhance Yemeni students' speaking skills and attitude, (d) effects of cooperative learning on EFL junior school learners' language learning, motivation toward English, (e) excitement in learning after using the cooperative learning, (f) effectiveness of cooperative learning STAD (Student Teams Achievement Division) among form two students in Islamic Religious Education, (g) effects of cooperative learning strategies on the vocabulary skills of 4th grade students, (h) the effect of cooperative learning on reading skills and student attitudes, (i) the effects of selected collaborative techniques on second language (L2) vocabulary comprehension and production, (k) the effects of cooperative learning in developing students' writing performance, (j) comparing traditional method of teaching mathematics against cooperative learning method of learning mathematics, (l) a study investigating the outcome of English reading comprehension to 150 senior secondary students using cooperative learning and traditional method, (m) the effect of cooperative learning on speaking skills, (n) an experimental design study on 40 students taking a Speaking Course and (o) cooperative learning is fun. Less attention was given in investigating the effect of cooperative interactive learning strategies to improve undergraduates' speaking skills in the Malaysian context. Developing an understanding of undergraduates' views of what constitutes a successful learning and speaking confidently, particularly from a Malaysian perspective can assist

lectures to understand cooperative interactive learning strategies to help the undergraduates to perform better in speaking.

### III. METHOD

Since the main objective of this study was to investigate the effect of cooperative interactive learning strategies to improve undergraduates' speaking skills in one of the higher learning institutions in Malaysia, the most suitable research design is that of use quasi-experimental pretest posttest control group design. The target population of this study was the population consisting of undergraduates Diploma in English programme in one of the selected universities in Perak. In this study, four Diploma in English programme groups were selected to conduct such definitive study to illuminate the research question. In this study, the sample of the study consists of one hundred and fifty-two Diploma in English students from four separate classes (as experiment respectively) and these classes are English-based classes. The experimental groups consist of 42, 39, 36 and 35 students respectively. Konting(2005) recommends the use of intact classes as the sample selection using existing classes benefit in terms of cost reduction, energy and time of study, while not disturbing the university ecosystem. The research instrument fundamentally comprises of two

Speaking test papers namely pretest and posttest. Pretest was used to decide if there is any initial difference between the four groups in terms of their speaking performance in English. Posttest was measured to test the effect of cooperative learning strategy on students' speaking performance. The questions designed and tested in the pretest and posttest are the questions that are in line with Course Proform a of the Diploma in English Programme. The pretest was administered to the students before the intervention was carried out to estimate the students' initial level of speaking. Posttest was administered after the four-week intervention. A pilot test was carried on 25 students who were not involved in the actual study by using the split-half method to determine the reliability coefficient for the speaking test used. The analysis of the correlation between the scores obtained from the first measurement (speaking test) and the second measurement (repeat speaking test) were analyzed using the Spearman correlation and it generated a coefficient of 0.83, signifying that the speaking test has high reliability (Konting, 2005). Pretest and posttest data were analyzed inferentially for the analysis. Both pretest and the posttest data were analyzed using the independent samples t-test.

### IV. FINDINGS

**Table 1:** Findings from the independent samples t-test for pretest and posttest data

Pair	Mean	SD	t value	df	sig
Pre	20.74	3.50	13.12	151	0.00*
Post	22.62	4.19			

\* sig at  $p < 0.05$

Table 1 shows the result of the analysis using the independent samples t-tests for the pretest and posttest on speaking test. As shown in Table 1, the independent samples t-test yield a t-value of 13.12 which is statistically significant ( $p = 0.00 < .05$ ). There was a statistically significant increase in pretest scores ( $M=20.74$ ,  $SD=3.50$ ) to post test ( $M=22.62$ ,  $SD=4.19$ ),  $t(151) = 13.12$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . The eta squared statistic ( $\eta = .53$ ) indicated a large effect size.

Table 1 shows that the speaking ability mean scores of the posttest was higher as compared to the scores obtained in the pretest. This result shows positive indication of a clear increase in the post-test mean score of speaking skill in favour of the posttest.

**Descriptive findings**

No	Item	Mean	SD
1.	When I work in a group, I do better quality work.	3.88	.78
2.	When I work in a group, I end up doing most of the work.	3.15	1.01
3.	When I work with other students, I am able to work at my own pace.	3.24	.76
4.	When I work in a group, I want to be with my friends.	3.78	1.06
5.	The work takes longer to complete when I work with other students.	2.76	1.10
Total		3.36	.94

**Table 2: Group work**

As shown in Table 2, the overall mean for group work is 3.36 (SD = .94). Item 1 recorded the highest mean 3.88 (SD = .78) as students opined that when they work in group, they are able to produce better quality work. This is followed by Item 4 which has recorded the second highest mean 3.78 (SD = 1.06) where student divulged that when they work in a group, they prefer to be with their friends. Item 5 recorded the lowest mean 2.76 (SD = 1.10) as students felt that the work takes longer to complete when they work with others. Item 2 recorded the second lowest mean 3.15 (SD = 1.01) as students mentioned that when they work in group, they would end up doing most of the work.

**Table 3: Positive Interdependence**

No	Item	Mean	SD
1.	My group members do not respect my opinions.	3.86	.95
2.	I enjoy the material more when I work with other students.	2.43	.89
3.	My group members help explain things that I do not understand.	4.19	.84
4.	I become friends with my group members.	4.21	.81
5.	When I work in a group, I am able to share my ideas.	3.97	.89
Total		3.73	.87

As shown in Table 3, the overall mean for positive interdependence is 3.73 (SD = .87). Item 4 recorded the highest mean 4.21 (SD = .81) as students shared that working in a group provided the opportunity to become friends with the members of the group. This is followed by Item 3 which has recorded the second highest mean 4.19 (SD = .84) where students divulged that when they work in a group, the group members help explain things that they do not understand. Item 5 recorded the third highest mean 3.97 (SD = .89) on students working in groups are able to share their ideas.



Item 2 recorded the second lowest mean 2.43 (SD = .89) as students do not enjoy the material more when they work with other students. Item 1 recorded the second lowest mean 3.86 (SD = .95) as students mentioned that when they work in group, they realized that their group members do not respect their opinions.

**Table 4:** Resources for discussion

No	Item	Mea n	SD
1.	My group members make me feel that I am not as smart as they are.	3.51	1.21
2.	The material is easier to understand, when I work with other students.	3.73	.88
3	My work is better organized, when I am in a group.	3.65	.89
4	My group members like to help me learn the material.	3.75	.91
5.	My group members get a good grade even if they do not do much work.	3.05	1.10
6.	The workload is usually less when I work with other students.	3.56	.98
7.	I feel I am part of what is going on in the group.	3.97	.89
8.	One student usually makes the decisions in the group.	2.79	1.14
9.	Our job is not done until everyone has finished the assignment.	1.82	.88
Total		3.31	.99

As shown in Table 4, the overall mean for resources for discussion is 3.31(SD = .99). Item 7 recorded the highest mean 3.97 (SD = .89) as students shared that working in a group provided the opportunity to be apart of what is going on in the group. Item 4 recorded the second highest mean 3.75 (SD = .91) on how the group members like to help each other to assist learn the material. Item 2 recorded the third highest mean 3.73 (SD = .88) as students felt that the material is easier to understand when they work with other students. Item 3 recorded the fourth highest mean 3.65 (SD = .89) as students felt that their work is more organized when they are put to work in groups. Item 6 recorded the fifth highest mean 3.56 (SD = .98) on the workload is usually less when the students work with other students. Item 9 recorded the lowest mean 1.82 (SD = .88) as students divulged that the job is not done until everyone has finished the assignment. Item 8 recorded the second lowest mean 2.79 (SD =.1.14) on only one student usually makes the decision in the group. Item 5 recorded the third lowest mean 3.05 (SD = 1.10) on students sharing that their group members will get good grades even if they do not do much work.

**Table 5:** Peer assessment

No	Item	Mea n	SD
1.	I find it hard to express my thoughts, when I work in a group.	3.36	1.03
2.	I do not think a group grade is fair.	3.46	1.28
3.	I try to make sure my group members learn the material.	3.91	.80
4.	My grade depends on how much we all learn.	3.79	.87
5.	It is difficult to get together outside of class.	3.15	1.16
Total		3.53	1.03

As shown in Table 5, the overall mean for resources for discussion is 3.53 (SD = 1.03). Item 3 recorded the highest mean 3.91 (SD = .80) as students shared that working in a group provided the opportunity to try to make sure each group member learns the materials. Item 4 recorded the second highest mean 3.79 (SD = .87) as students' grades will depend on how much they have learnt. Item 2 recorded the third highest mean 3.46 (SD = 1.28) as some students disagree and think that a group grade is fair. Item 5 recorded the lowest mean 3.15 (SD = 1.16) as students shared that it is difficult to get together outside of class. Item 1 recorded the second lowest mean 3.36 (SD = 1.03) on students finding hard to express their thoughts when they work in a group.

**Table 6: Interactive Learning**

No	Item	Mea n	SD
1.	I learn to work with students who are different from me.	3.68	1.02
2.	My group members do not care about my feelings.	3.86	1.16
3.	I do not like the students I am assigned to work with.	3.89	.96
4.	I let the other students do most of the work.	4.22	.87
5.	I get to know my group members well.	4.07	.87
6.	I feel working in groups is a waste of time.	4.16	.92
7.	When I work in a group, I get the grade I deserve.	2.33	.73
8.	My group members do not like me.	4.13	.92
9.	I have to work with students who are not as smart as I am.	4.14	.98
10.	When I work in a group, there are opportunities to express your opinions.	3.92	.82
Total		3.84	.92

As shown in Table 6, the overall mean for interactive learning is 3.84 (SD = .92). Item 4 recorded the highest mean 4.22 (SD = .87) as students shared that they let the other students do most of the work. Item 6 recorded the second highest mean 4.16 (SD = .92) on students feeling that working in groups is a waste of time. Item 9 recorded the third highest mean 4.14 (SD = .98) as students have to work with students who are not as smart as they are. Item 8 recorded the fourth highest mean 4.13 (SD = .92) on some students feeling how the other group members may not like them. Item 5 recorded the fifth highest mean 4.07 (SD = .87) as most of the students mentioned that via the group discussion, they can get to know their group members well. Item 7 recorded the lowest mean 2.33 (SD = .73) on students when they work in group, they feel that they do not truly get the grades that they deserved. Item 1 recorded the second lowest mean 3.68 (SD = 1.02) as students mentioned that they learn to work with students who are different from them. Item 2 recorded the third lowest mean 3.86 (SD = 1.16) on how the other group members do not care for group member's feelings. Item 3 recorded the fourth lowest mean 3.89 (SD = .96) on students do not like the students they are assigned to work with.

**Table 7:** Group work enhance communication

No	Item	Mea n	SD
1.	When I work with other students, the work is divided equally.	3.76	.93
2.	We cannot complete the assignment unless everyone contributes.	3.90	1.10
3.	My marks improve when I work with other students.	3.60	.91
4.	I help my group members with what I am good at.	4.19	.85
5.	My group members compete to see who does better work.	2.48	1.01
6.	The material is more interesting when I work with other students.	3.64	.94
Total		3.60	.96

As shown in Table 7, the overall mean for group work enhance communication is 3.60 (SD = .96). Item 4 recorded the highest mean 4.19 (SD = .85) as students shared that they help their group members with what they are good at. Item 2 recorded the second highest mean 3.90 (SD = 1.10) as students cannot complete the assignment unless everyone contributes. Item 1 recorded the third highest mean 3.76 (SD = .98) as some students when they work with other students, the work is divided equally. Item 5 recorded the lowest mean 2.48 (SD = 1.01) as students shared that their group members compete to see who does better work. Item 3 recorded the second lowest mean 3.60 (SD = .91) on students' mark improvement when they work with other students. Item 6 recorded the third lowest mean 3.64 (SD = .94) on the material is more interesting when the students work with other students.

**Table 8:** Fostering good habits

No	Item	Mea n	SD
1.	When I work in a group, my work habits improve.	3.85	.91
2.	I like to help my group members learn the material.	3.99	.80
3.	Some group members forget to do the work.	2.86	1.14
4.	I do not care if my group members get good grades.	3.32	1.11
5.	It is important to me that my group gets the work done on time.	4.36	.82
6.	I am forced to work with students I do not like.	3.72	1.07
Total		3.68	.97

As shown in Table 8, the overall mean for fostering good habits is 3.68 (SD = .97). Item 5 recorded the highest mean 4.36 (SD = .82) as students shared that they it is important to them that their group gets the work done on time. Item 2 recorded the second highest mean 3.99 (SD = .80) as students like to help their group members learn the materials. Item 1 recorded the third highest mean 3.85 (SD = .91) as some students when they work with in group, their work habits improve. Item 3 recorded the lowest mean 2.86 (SD = 1.14) as students shared that some of their

group members forget to do the work. Item 4 recorded the second lowest mean 3.32 (SD = 1.11) on students as they care less if the group members get good grades. Item 6 recorded the third lowest mean 3.72 (SD = 1.07) as students divulged that they are forced to work with students they do not like.

**Table 9:** Students Taking Ownership of Learning

No	Item	Mea n	SD
1.	I learn more information, when I work with other students.	3.96	.90
2.	It takes less time to complete the assignment, when I work with others.	3.58	1.13
3.	I also learn when I teach the material to my group members.	4.10	.89
4.	I become frustrated when my group members do not understand the material.	3.33	1.03
5.	When I work in a group, I get the grade I deserve.	3.66	.89
6.	Everyone's ideas are needed if we are going to be successful.	4.47	.71
7.	When I work with other students, we spend too much time talking about other things.	3.00	.98
8.	I prefer to choose the students I work with.	1.75	1.10
Total		3.48	.95

As shown in Table 7, the overall mean for students taking ownership of learning is 3.48 (SD = .95). Item 6 recorded the highest mean 4.47 (SD = .71) as students shared everyone's ideas are needed if we are going to be successful. Item 3 recorded the second highest mean 4.10 (SD = .89) as students also learn when they teach the materials to their group members. Item 1 recorded the third highest mean 3.96 (SD = .90) as some students shared that they learn more information when they work with other students. Item 5 recorded the fourth highest mean 3.33 (SD = .89) on how the students become frustrated when their group members do not understand the material. Item 8 recorded the lowest mean 1.75 (SD = 1.10) as students shared that they preferred to choose the students to work with. Item 7 recorded the second lowest mean 3.00 (SD = .98) on students when they work with other students, they spend too much time talking about other things. Item 4 recorded the third lowest mean 3.33 (SD = 1.03) on students becoming frustrated when they their group members do not understand the material. Item 2 recorded the fourth lowest mean 3.58 (SD = 1.13) as it takes less time to complete the assignment, when the students work with others.

## V. DISCUSSION

In summary, the achievement of the undergraduates' speaking skills who have been exposed to the cooperative interactive learning strategy is statistically higher as compared to their pretest scores. The findings of the present study may have theoretical as well as practical implications. The findings of this study are in line with other studies such as of Ercan (2009) and Çokparlamış (2010). The findings of this study also create a place for future research on the effects of cooperative interactive learning in English language. The cooperative interactive learning pedagogical

strategy deemed to be a successful teaching strategy that provide more opportunities for the students to be more actively engaged during lectures (Singh et. al., 2019). Many studies have revealed that students learn better when they are actively involved in the process of learning (Bonwell&Eison, 1991; Hake, 1998; Prince, 2004; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2006).

## VI. CONCLUSION

The higher institutions of learning should consider implementing the cooperative interactive learning strategy in selected Diploma programs so that the undergraduates will get the chance to interact well with one another without feeling inhibited. Proper planning and training should be carried to equip the educators with some of the fundamental concepts of cooperative interactive learning in their everyday teaching. Cooperative interactive learning strategy evidenced to benefit the students specifically in the mastery of speaking skills in English language. Also, cooperative interactive learning strategy is an established learning technique which can bring about effective positive impact among educators at the tertiary level and help the students to perform better in English language.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We acknowledge with great appreciation the kind gesture of Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris for providing us the University Research Grant Scheme (Coded: 2018-0106-10601). Equally, we would like to express our gratitude to all the participating Diploma in English students for their willingness to participate and share their views on the use of the Cooperative Interactive Learning strategy developed to improve their speaking skills.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Altamimi, Nasser &Attamimi, Rais. (2014). Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in Enhancing Speaking Skills and Attitudes towards Learning English. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 6. 27. 10.5296/ijl.v6i4.6114.
- [2] Asmah, H. O. (2012). Pragmatics of maintaining English in Malaysia's education system. In E.-L. Low Esc A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, policy and language in use* (pp. 155-176). Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins
- [3] Bahrun., S. M., Ong. E. T., &Samngani, M. Z, (2019). The Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Stad Method (Student Teams-Achievement Division) On the Achievement in Islamic Religious. *Education Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 239
- [4] Bayat, Ö. (2004). *The Effects of Cooperative Learning Activities on Student Attitudes Toward Reading Courses and Cooperative Learning*. Ankara: Bilkent University.
- [5] Bertram, G. (2002). *The importance of oral language in the school curriculum*. Effective Communication. Ministry of Education, New Zealand Government.
- [6] Bilen, Didem&Tavil, Zekiye. (2015). The Effects of Cooperative Learning Strategies on Vocabulary Skills of 4th Grade Students. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*. 3. 10.11114/jets.v3i6.1062.
- [7] Bonwell, C. C. &Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom*. *ASHEERIC Higher Education Report No 1*, George Washington University, Washington DC.
- [8] Burton, J. (1987). *Implementing the Learner-Centred Curriculum: NCP Seminar Plenary Papers*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- [9] Bracy, C. Bevil, Sand Roach, T (2010). *The Millennial Generation: Recommendations for Over coming Teaching Challenges*. *Proceedings of the Academy of Educational Leadership*, Volume 15, Number2.
- [10] Cohen, E.G. (1994). "Restructuring the Classroom: Conditions for Positive Small Groups." *Review of Educational Research* 64, (1): 1-35.
- [11] Ercan, E. (2009). *Teaching Vocabulary through Cooperative Learning*. Konya.
- [12] Ezeudu, O.B.; Agunwamba, J.C.; Ezeasor, I.C.; Madu, C.N. (2019). Sustainable Production and

- Consumption of Paper and Paper Products in Nigeria: A Review. *Resources*, 8, 53.
- [13] Effandi Zakaria, Lu Chung Chin and Md. Yusoff Daud. (2010). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Students' Mathematics Achievement and Attitude towards Mathematics. *Journal of Social Sciences* 6 (2): 272-275.
- [14] Feiertag, J and Berge, Z. L. (2008). Training Generation: how educators should approach the Net Generation. *Education & Training* Vol. 50 No.6, pp. 457-464
- [15] Florence Obiageli Ezeudu, Rachael Folake Ameh, Priscilla Dave-Ugwu, Constance Uju Chukwuka, Uzoamaka P. Egbukwu and Bukar A. Umate, 2019. Effects of Cooperative Learning and Analogy on Secondary School Student's Achievement and Interest in Chemistry. *Asian Journal of Information Technology*, 18: 106-115.
- [16] Ghorbani, M. R. (2012). Cooperative Learning Boosts EFL Students' Grammar Achievement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1465-1471. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1465-1471>
- [17] Gomleksiz, M. N. (2007). Effectiveness of cooperative learning (jigsaw II) method on teaching English as a foreign language to engineering students (Case of Firat University, Turkey). *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 32(5), 613-625.
- [18] Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. *Am. J. Phys.* 66, 64 – 74.
- [19] Hui, H. & Wei, W. (2013). A Study on Formative Assessment of EFL in the Multimedia-based Environment in China. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*. (3), 1-14.
- [20] Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. J., Johnson, J., & Anderson, D. (1976). Effects of cooperative versus individualized instruction on student prosocial behavior, attitudes toward learning, and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 446-452.
- [21] Kandasamy, C., & Habil, H. (2018). Exploring Cooperative Learning Method to Enhance Speaking Skills Among School Students. *LSP International Journal*.
- [22] Kagan, S. (1985). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, California: Kagan Publishing.
- [23] Konting M. M. (2005). *Kaedah Pengkajian Pendidikan Edisi Ke-7*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- [24] Liao, H. C. (2009). Cooperative learning and EFL education: The past, the present, and the future. *Journal of National Taichung University: Humanities & Arts*, 23(2), 87-108.
- [25] Lavasani, M. G., & Khandan, F. (2011). Mathematic anxiety, help seeking behavior and cooperative learning. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences* 2, 61-74.
- [26] Liang, X., Mohan, B. A., & Early, M. (1998). Issues in Cooperative Learning in ESL Classes: A Literature Review. *Tesl Canada Journal*, 13-23. <http://teslcanadajournal.ca/index>
- [27] Lim, J. & Mohtar, T. M. T. (2011). The Use of Cloze Test to Determine the Proficiency Level of ESL Students. *Asian Journal of Assessment in Teaching and Learning*. (1), 77-93.
- [28] Malaysia Education Blueprint, M. (2013). *Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013 - 2025*. Education, 27(1), 1–268. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007>
- [29] Meh H. C. (2008). Kesan Pembelajaran Terhadap Prestasi Kemahiran Berfikir Kritis dalam Penulisan Rumusan bagi Subjek Bahasa Melayu di kalangan Pelajar Tingkatan Satu yang Berbeza Pencapaian
- [30] National Survey of Student Engagement (2006). *Engaged learning: Fostering success for all students*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning . Retrieved October 13, 2014, from [http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE\\_2006\\_Annual\\_Report/index.cfm](http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2006_Annual_Report/index.cfm).
- [31] Nasser Omer M. Al-Tamimi. (2014). Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning In Enhancing Speaking Skills and Attitudes Towards Learning English. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 6 (4)
- [32] Ning H., & Hornby, G. (2010). The effectiveness of cooperative learning in teaching English to Chinese tertiary learner. *Effective Education*, 2(2), 99-116.
- [33] Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning works: A review of the research. *J. Engr. Educ.* 93 (3). 223 – 231.
- [34] Rodrigues, S. (2006, September 5). 'A' in exam, 'F' in interview. *The Star*, N47.
- [35] Sharon, S. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory and research*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- [36] Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [37] Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative learning theory, research and practice*. Massachusetts: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- [38] Swaran Singh, C. K. & Jageer Singh, A. K. & Abdul Razak, N. Q., & Ravinthar, T. (2017). Grammar Errors Made by ESL Tertiary Students in Writing. *English Language Teaching*. 10. 16. 10.5539/elt.v10n5p16.
- [39] Swaran Singh, C. K., & Samad., A. A. (2013). Portfolio as an Assessment Tool and Its

- Implementation in Malaysian ESL Classrooms: A Study in Two Secondary Schools. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*. 21 (4): 1255 - 1273 (2013).
- [40] Swaran Singh., C.C., Masa Singh., T. S., Ong, T. E., Abdullah, M. S. H. (2018). Developing a Cooperative Interactive Learning Module for Improving Speaking Skills of Graduate Students. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*. 8 (7S2).
- [41] Talebi, F. &Sobhani, A. (2012). The impacts of cooperative learning on oral proficiency. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 75-79.
- [42] Terenzini, P., Rendon, L., Upcraft, M., Millar, J., Allison, K., Gregg, P., &Jalomo, R. (1994). The transition to college: Diverse students, diverse stories. *Research in Higher Education*,30, 301–315.
- [43] Tekeli, S. (2013). The effects of cooperative learning on students' writing performance. Unpublished MA theisis, Çağ University, Mersin.
- [44] Urr, P. (1999). A course in language teaching. Cambridge University Press. English Language Syllabus, M. (2013). *Education*, 27(1), 1–268. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007>
- [45] Zarei, A. A. & Gilani, M. S. (2013). L2 Vocabulary Learning Through Collaborative Techniques. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*. 4 (1);71-84.