

BRIDGING THE GAP IN STUDENTS' SPEAKING COMPETENCE THROUGH A COLLABORATIVE LEARNING APPROACH

Sahrul^{*1}, Lalu Thohir², Sartika Hijriati³

sahrul@unram.ac.id^{*1}, thohir@unram.ac.id², sartika.hijriati@staff.unram.ac.id³

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education ^{*1,2,3}

University of Mataram ^{*1,2,3}

Received: June 3, 2026

Accepted: September 24, 2026

Published: September 25, 2026

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the effectiveness of collaborative learning combined with the Test–Teach–Test (TTT) approach in enhancing students' speaking competence. The study involved 30 eleventh-grade students from SMA 1 Gerung. The sample was purposively selected during the 2024/2025 academic year. The design used was a pre-experimental one-group pretest–posttest. Students took an initial speaking test, attended four sessions of collaborative instruction that included group discussions, role plays, debates, and joint tasks, and afterward took a post-test. Speaking performance was evaluated based on fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary, while classroom observations recorded participation, interaction, and confidence. The average score rose from 61.7 on the pretest to 78.3 on the post-test, yielding a mean gain of 16.6 points. A paired-samples t-test revealed a statistically significant improvement, $t = 9.24$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.68$). Fluency demonstrated the largest proportional gain. Observations further showed that collaborative interaction motivated students to express and defend ideas, respond to peers, and speak more confidently. These results indicate that collaborative learning within the TTT framework can offer productive opportunities for enhancing speaking competence.

Keywords: *Collaborative Learning, Speaking Competence, Test–Teach–Test, EFL Speaking*

DOI: 10.31943/wej.v10i2.711

INTRODUCTION

Speaking skills are crucial for acquiring English as a Foreign Language (EFL) because they enable students to convey thoughts, engage in discussions, participate in class activities, and utilize the language for both academic and social interactions. However, in the context of EFL in Indonesia, simply understanding English does not guarantee strong verbal communication. Students may have an adequate vocabulary and grammatical understanding but still find it difficult to produce

spoken language in real-time. Effective speaking requires the simultaneous coordination of linguistic knowledge, pronunciation, fluency, and choices about how to interact, making it particularly tough for those who have limited opportunities to practice English beyond the classroom (Jaya et al. , 2022).

At SMA 1 Gerung, the problem addressed in this study was reflected in students' limited fluency, hesitation when expressing ideas, pronunciation difficulties, restricted vocabulary use, and lack of confidence during oral activities. Before the intervention, students did not always participate actively in speaking tasks and often needed additional encouragement before expressing their opinions. These conditions indicated a gap between what students knew about English and what they were able to perform orally. The instructional challenge was therefore not simply to provide additional explanation, but to create structured opportunities in which students could speak repeatedly, receive support, interact with peers, and use English for meaningful purposes.

Previous studies published in the Wiralodra English Journal (WEJ) show that problems with speaking can stem from both linguistic and affective aspects. Muklas et al. (2024) pinpointed affective elements like motivation and willingness to take risks, alongside linguistic elements such as grammar and vocabulary, as factors in students' speaking proficiency. In a similar vein, Rizanti et al. (2024) reported that learners faced issues with pronunciation, grammatical knowledge, vocabulary, fear of making mistakes, anxiety, and low confidence, and that they required additional practice, appropriate speaking activities, and helpful feedback. Noerilah and Puspitaloka (2022) likewise discovered that weak pronunciation, a limited vocabulary, nervousness, and a shortage of confidence played a role in speaking anxiety. These results are pertinent to the current study, since students at SMA 1 Gerung showed similar difficulties, especially hesitation, limited fluency, pronunciation issues, and inadequate confidence.

Collaborative learning is one instructional approach to addressing these problems. Collaborative learning is an instructional setup in which students work together toward a common learning objective, sharing ideas, responding to one another, negotiating meaning, and taking responsibility for finishing a task. It involves far more than merely putting students into groups. For collaboration to be effective, it needs purposeful interaction, well-defined task goals, individual contributions, peer support, and chances to exchange feedback. In a speaking classroom, these elements can boost the amount of student talk, since learners are not relying only on teacher–student exchanges. Rather, they interact with multiple peers, practice ideas, compare expressions, and polish their spoken output as they carry out the task.

The collaborative learning model is anticipated to enhance pupils' capacity for critical thought because it is a process of discussing in groups to elicit diverse opinions and perspectives from each individual. (Hobri, 2020). Collaborative learning is especially pertinent to the teaching of speaking, since oral proficiency is built through use. Whether students are discussing a problem, acting out a role play,

debating an issue, or working together on a project, they must put their ideas into words in real time and react to what their classmates say. Such interaction can generate frequent chances for meaningful language production. It can also ease the pressure that comes with speaking alone in front of the entire class. Peer interaction offers a smaller and possibly more encouraging environment where students can try out expressions, take note of language others use, get immediate responses, and attempt to rephrase when communication is unclear.

Research has reported positive relationships between collaborative or cooperative learning and speaking development. Namaziandost et al. (2019) discovered that cooperative learning enhanced both speaking ability and motivation in EFL learners. In WEJ, Pratiwi (2022) found that role-play activities were linked to gains in students' speaking performance, particularly in pronunciation and vocabulary. More recently, Aprianto and Sutarman (2025) showed that speaking performance can differ considerably depending on how intensively learners engage, evaluating fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, coherence, and task fulfillment. Even though these studies employed various instructional designs, they reinforce the wider pedagogical principle that frequent, purposeful, and interactive practice matters for speaking development.

In the present research, cooperative learning was integrated with the Test–Teach–Test (TTT) methodology. TTT is organized around an initial assessment phase, targeted teaching, and a subsequent assessment phase. The initial test provides valuable information about students' current skills and the challenges they face. The teaching stage then focuses on addressing the needs revealed by the initial assessment. The concluding test serves as an opportunity to evaluate progress after the instruction has taken place. This sequence is consistent with the concept of intentional practice, where progress is enhanced through concentrated effort, feedback, and chances to improve performance (Ericsson et al. , 2006).

The teaching phase of this study operationalized collaborative learning through group discussions, role plays, debates, and joint tasks. These activities were chosen because they obliged students to exchange information and opinions instead of simply repeating isolated language forms. Group discussion called on students to construct and defend their viewpoints. Role play offered a communicative setting in which students could practice language for specific purposes. Debate pushed students to engage with opposing arguments and generate ideas while under interactional pressure. Joint tasks called for students to coordinate their contributions and share responsibility for a common outcome. Throughout these activities, the teacher guided interaction, offered support, and addressed problems that had been identified during the first test.

The integration of TTT and collaborative learning is important because the two components serve different but complementary functions. TTT provides a structured approach for recognizing needs, offering targeted teaching, and assessing results (Karjagdi Çolak, 2024), while collaborative learning facilitates the engagement that occurs during the instruction phase and encourages active

interaction among peers in EFL education (Alzubi et al. , 2024). In simpler terms, the initial assessment identifies the gaps in speaking abilities, collaborative activities provide multiple opportunities to address those gaps, and the subsequent assessment reveals the extent of performance change post-intervention. This combination allows for tracking numerical changes in speaking scores along with classroom insights regarding participation, interaction, and confidence levels.

Speaking skills are essential and must be mastered by learners in an educational context (Monny, 2021). When teaching speaking competence, sometimes students have to get a good stimulus, and then they want to convey their idea or share something like an experience in the classroom. So, a good way to create good confidence is to present a lesson through group discussion.

Even though collaborative speaking tasks hold promise, a number of questions still need to be examined through empirical research. Gains in speaking ability ought not to be assumed simply because students seem more engaged in class. They should also be backed by evidence from performance data. On the other hand, an increase in numbers by itself does not reveal how classroom interaction might bring about change. Therefore, this study employed speaking tests to compare performance before and after the intervention, along with observation sheets to record students' participation and interaction during collaborative activities. The speaking assessment covered fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary, whereas the observations offered additional insight into engagement and confidence.

This study likewise fills a gap related to context. Earlier research has looked into speaking anxiety, role play, learning intensity, cooperative learning, and general speaking difficulties, yet only a limited number of studies have explored collaborative learning in particular within a TTT instructional sequence for senior high school students at SMA 1 Gerung. Consequently, this research examines not only whether students' scores change, but also which areas of speaking demonstrate improvement and how collaborative interaction appears in classroom participation. This localized emphasis matters because how an instructional approach is carried out with a specific group of learners, and within the limits of a real classroom, determines its effectiveness.

Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine how eleventh-grade students' speaking competence improved once collaborative learning was incorporated into the TTT approach, and to describe the classroom factors linked to that improvement. More precisely, the study looked at shifts in overall speaking scores as well as in fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary, while also taking into account students' participation, interaction, and confidence during collaborative activities. Two questions directed this study: (1) To what extent does students' speaking competence improve following the implementation of collaborative learning within the TTT approach? and (2) Which classroom interaction factors seem to support the improvement observed in students' speaking competence?

Fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary were chosen as the main performance dimensions since they reflect complementary facets of spoken communication in this study. Fluency relates to the capacity to keep speech going with fewer needless pauses and interruptions. Accuracy relates to how appropriately language is formed while speaking. Pronunciation relates to how intelligible and clear spoken words are, whereas vocabulary relates to the range and suitability of lexical choices used to convey ideas. Progress in one dimension does not automatically ensure comparable progress in the others; thus, looking at each aspect individually can offer a richer picture of students' development than depending solely on an overall score.

Collaborative learning may affect these dimensions via various classroom processes. Repeated turns in discussion can foster fluency, as students get more chances to put ideas into spoken form. Peer responses and teacher feedback can highlight inaccurate forms. Listening to classmates and repeating expressions during role plays can supply further pronunciation models, while group projects and debates may establish a communicative need for a broader range of vocabulary. These mechanisms ought to be interpreted with caution, since the current design does not isolate each mechanism experimentally; nonetheless, they offer a pedagogical foundation for examining the patterns observed in the speaking scores and classroom observations.

The study is anticipated to make a practical contribution to speaking instruction at the senior high school level. For teachers, the findings can guide how speaking lessons are organized, combining diagnostic assessment with focused collaborative practice. For students, structured group interaction can offer more chances to use English, respond to peers, and build confidence through repeated participation. Academically, the study contributes context-specific evidence to research on collaborative speaking instruction by examining a TTT-based sequence with eleventh-grade EFL learners and by linking overall score changes to aspect-level performance and classroom observations.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study implemented a pre-experimental design featuring a one-group pretest and post-test. The instructional framework used was the Test–Teach–Test (TTT) model, which comprised an initial evaluation, focused teaching, and a follow-up assessment of the students' achievements (Rahman Niaghi, 2022; Keto & Badie, 2025). Initially, a speaking assessment was administered to gauge the students' starting abilities, followed by collaborative teaching, and a post-assessment was performed after the instructional intervention. Classroom observations were also done to enrich the quantitative test results, capturing details regarding participation, interaction, engagement, and confidence during group

activities. Therefore, this design aimed to quantitatively evaluate speaking skills before and after teaching, supported by qualitative observational insights.

Participants and Setting

The research was carried out with 30 eleventh-grade students at SMA 1 Gerung in the 2024/2025 academic year. The participants were chosen purposively since the class reflected students with diverse learning backgrounds and varying levels of speaking competence. The study examined the speaking problems seen in this group, such as hesitation, limited fluency, pronunciation difficulties, restricted vocabulary use, and low confidence during oral communication.

Instructional Procedure

The TTT method was executed in three phases, beginning with a preliminary assessment to uncover the needs of learners, followed by focused teaching that tackles the identified challenges, and concluding with a task that allows learners to put their knowledge into practice (Anderson, 2024). At the first Testing phase, learners engaged in a diagnostic speaking activity to establish a reference point for their abilities. In the Teaching phase, the lessons concentrated on the challenges revealed during the initial evaluation. Cooperative learning was implemented through group discussions, role enactments, debates, and collaborative assignments. Within their teams, learners exchanged thoughts, responded to one another, justified their viewpoints, and honed their spoken English, while the instructor facilitated engagement and provided feedback. The initiative was conducted over four instructional sessions. During the concluding Testing phase, students participated in a follow-up assessment to measure their speaking abilities after the group-focused instruction.

Instruments

Two main instruments were employed. First, speaking performance tests were given both before and after the intervention. The aspect-level analysis presented in the study examined four components: fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Second, observation sheets were employed to document students' participation, peer interaction, engagement, and observable confidence during collaborative activities. Confidence was regarded as an observational outcome rather than one of the four numerical speaking components, thereby ensuring consistency between the instrument description and the reported aspect-level results

Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to analyze the quantitative data. Pretest and post-test performance was summarized through mean scores and standard deviations. The two measurements were compared using a paired-samples t-test with an alpha level of .05. Cohen's d was used to report the size of the pretest–post-test difference, with the manuscript reporting $d = 1.68$. Pretest and post-test means at the aspect level were also compared descriptively, and percentage

improvement was reported for fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Observation data underwent thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns in participation, interaction, willingness to speak, peer support, and confidence. The observational findings served to interpret the quantitative results rather than replace them.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

Pretest and Post-test Speaking Competence

The study included 30 eleventh-grade students from SMA 1 Gerung, who took a speaking pretest prior to the collaborative TTT intervention and a post-test following four instructional meetings. The overall mean rose from 61.7 on the pretest to 78.3 on the post-test, resulting in a mean gain of 16.6 points. The standard deviation declined from 8.7 to 6.9. From a descriptive standpoint, these findings suggest that students achieved better results after the instructional sequence and that post-test scores were somewhat less spread out than pretest scores. The decrease in score variability should not be taken as evidence that every student improved to the same degree, but it does imply that performance became more concentrated around the higher post-test mean.

Table 1. Pretest and Post-test Speaking Scores

Assessment	Mean	SD	Mean Gain	N
Pretest	61.7	8.7	—	30
Posttest	78.3	6.9	16.6	30

Statistical Difference in Speaking Performance

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the difference between the two measurements reached statistical significance. The analysis yielded $t = 9.24$ with $p < .001$, using an alpha level of .05. Consequently, the difference between pretest and post-test scores proved statistically significant. Cohen's d was reported as 1.68, which points to a large standardized effect. Considered together, the mean gain, the paired-samples t-test, and the effect-size estimate reveal a substantial change in speaking performance following the intervention. However, since the study employed a one-group pretest–posttest design with no control group, the statistical result should be viewed as evidence of improvement linked to the instructional period rather than as conclusive proof that collaborative learning by itself produced the change.

Table 2. Paired-Samples Comparison of Speaking Scores

Comparison	T	p	Cohen's d	Interpretation
Pretest–Posttest	9.24	< .001	1.68	Significant; large effect

Improvement Across Speaking Aspects

The results at the aspect level indicated gains across all four components evaluated in the speaking test. Fluency rose from 57.8 to 77.2, which corresponds to a reported gain of 33.5%. Accuracy rose from 63.1 to 78.8, representing 24.9%. Pronunciation rose from 64.2 to 79.1, or 23.2%, while vocabulary rose from 61.8 to 78.9, or 27.7%. Of the four dimensions, fluency displayed the greatest proportional gain, with vocabulary, accuracy, and pronunciation following in that order. These findings indicate that the most pronounced change took place in students' capacity to sustain spoken production, even though every dimension assessed improved.

Table 3. Speaking Performance by Aspect

Speaking Aspect	Pretest	Post-test	Improvement (%)
Fluency	57.8	77.2	33.5
Accuracy	63.1	78.8	24.9
Pronunciation	64.2	79.1	23.2
Vocabulary	61.8	78.9	27.7

Pattern of Score Dispersion

The decrease in standard deviation, from 8.7 on the pretest to 6.9 on the post-test, offers further descriptive information. The greater dispersion on the pretest suggests that students began the intervention with more widely varying levels of speaking performance. Following the four meetings, scores were spread more tightly around the post-test mean. This pattern is consistent with the possibility that collaborative tasks gave lower-performing students access to peer models and repeated practice, while also enabling more proficient students to contribute to group interaction. The current data, however, do not contain individual gain profiles by proficiency level, so this interpretation remains descriptive and ought to be examined more directly in future research

Classroom Participation and Interaction

Data from observations supplemented the test results by revealing shifts in the way students took part in collaborative activities. In group discussions, students had to express opinions, reply to their peers, and give reasons for their positions. In activities centered on debate, students seemed especially motivated to defend the arguments of their group. This responsibility generated a communicative need to construct responses instead of staying passive. Students likewise received frequent

chances to hear different ways of expressing things from their classmates and to rework their own contributions. As a result, the classroom interaction offered a context in which speaking was practiced as part of finishing a shared task, not as a standalone performance.

Fluency and Willingness to Speak

The observational results aligned with the fairly substantial gain in fluency. When interaction took place within groups, students seemed more inclined to take speaking turns. Working in smaller groups lessened the pressure of speaking alone in front of the entire class and gave students the chance to rehearse their ideas through repeated exchanges. As the discussions went on, students hesitated less often and replied to their classmates more quickly. The data offer no direct measure of speaking rate, so the result is better characterized as greater fluency and diminished hesitation rather than merely "speaking faster." This distinction tackles speaking performance in a manner that is more academically precise.

Accuracy, Pronunciation, and Vocabulary

Collaborative tasks also gave students chances to notice and revise their language. By exchanging ideas, students encountered different sentence structures, word choices, and pronunciations. Feedback from peers and teacher guidance during group work helped students spot certain errors and try to correct them. Accuracy rose by 15.7 points, pronunciation by 14.9 points, and vocabulary by 17.1 points. Vocabulary showed the second-largest improvement in proportional terms. Group projects and discussions pushed students to search for words that conveyed their intended meanings, while role plays and repeated oral exchanges offered chances to reuse vocabulary in context. These observations align with the direction of the quantitative results, even though the study did not separately measure the amount or type of peer feedback.

Relationship Between Quantitative and Observational Results

The quantitative and observational results aligned in a number of areas. The greatest numerical gain appeared in fluency, whereas observations revealed that students took part more often, hesitated less, and were given more chances to respond during group work. Vocabulary likewise showed considerable improvement, and collaborative tasks called on students to share ideas across multiple topics. Accuracy and pronunciation improved as students listened to their peers, got feedback, and repeated their oral output. The observational evidence does not prove a direct causal link for each rise in scores, yet it helps clarify why a collaborative setting may be pedagogically meaningful for the changes documented by the speaking tests.

Confidence as an Observational Outcome

Confidence was recorded by means of classroom observation instead of being counted among the four numerical speaking components in the aspect-level table. Students seemed progressively more inclined to share ideas and less hesitant to take part in group interaction. A supportive group setting enabled them to try speaking, make errors, and get responses from peers rather than depending solely on teacher evaluation. This trend indicates that collaborative activities may have fostered students' willingness to communicate. Since confidence was not assessed using a separate validated scale, it is presented here as an observational classroom finding rather than a statistically tested outcome.

Summary of Findings

Overall, the results address the two research questions in ways that complement each other. First, speaking competence rose from a pretest mean of 61.7 to a post-test mean of 78.3, and this difference was statistically significant, with a large reported effect size. Gains were seen in fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary, and the largest proportional change was in fluency. Second, classroom observations showed that group interaction prompted students to exchange ideas, defend opinions, respond to peers, practice repeatedly, and take part with greater confidence. These patterns of interaction offer a classroom-level account of how the collaborative teaching phase may have contributed to the improvement that was observed.

Discussion

Taken as a whole, the findings suggest that students' speaking performance improved over the period when collaborative learning was combined with the Test–Teach–Test approach. The gain of 16.6 points in the overall mean, combined with the paired-samples t-test and the large effect size reported, indicates that the difference between the two assessment points was not insignificant. It seems that the instructional sequence gave students a structured progression from diagnosis to focused practice and reassessment. The initial test revealed performance gaps, the teaching phase offered chances to address these through interaction, and the final test captured change following the four meetings.

The most notable finding at the aspect level was the gain in fluency. This outcome makes pedagogical sense, since collaborative tasks raised the number of occasions on which students had to produce spoken English. Activities such as group discussion, debate, and role play require learners to react to other speakers instead of waiting for a turn controlled by the teacher. Regular participation can shorten the time required to formulate ideas and can make spoken production flow more continuously. Namaziandost et al. (2019) likewise found positive effects of cooperative learning on speaking ability and motivation. The current finding thus lends support to the view that interactive group structures can be valuable when the instructional aim is to boost students' active oral production.

The fluency result also aligns with recent evidence from WEJ. Rizanti et al. (2024) reported that learners required more speaking practice and appropriate activities, whereas Aprianto and Sutarman (2025) demonstrated that differing levels of learning intensity were linked to differences in EFL speaking performance. Even though their designs and populations differ from those of the present study, both studies highlight the value of sustained engagement in speaking practice. In this classroom, collaborative activities expanded the chances for students to take turns, exchange arguments, and keep discussions going beyond brief teacher-directed responses. This pattern helps account for why fluency showed the largest proportional improvement.

Vocabulary showed the second-largest proportional improvement. Collaborative tasks can generate an immediate communicative need for lexical resources, as students must state positions, clarify meaning, and respond to their classmates. When a learner is missing a word, peers may offer an alternative expression or model vocabulary that can later be reused. The rise from 61.8 to 78.9 fits with this interactional function. Yet the study did not document the specific vocabulary items exchanged during group work, so it cannot establish how much of the vocabulary gain stemmed from peer modeling, teacher input, task preparation, or repeated exposure. Research on future classrooms could analyze interaction transcripts to pinpoint these processes more directly.

Pronunciation and accuracy showed improvement as well. Collaborative interaction may be advantageous for these dimensions, since students encounter many examples of spoken language and can get instant responses when an utterance is unclear or incorrect. Similarly, Pratiwi (2022), in a WEJ study of role play, documented gains in speaking-related outcomes such as pronunciation and vocabulary. This study builds on that practical insight by placing role play together with discussions, debates, and joint tasks inside a TTT sequence. Instead of depending on one type of activity, the teaching phase offered multiple forms of interaction that called on students to use spoken English for varied communicative purposes.

The classroom observations also indicate that collaboration shaped students' willingness to take part. Speaking anxiety and low confidence are persistent issues in EFL settings. Noerilah and Puspitaloka (2022) pinpointed lack of confidence and nervousness as causes of speaking anxiety, whereas Rizanti et al. (2024) documented fear of mistakes, shyness, anxiety, and inadequate confidence among learners. In this study, students seemed more inclined to speak when responsibility was shared throughout a group and when they could build an argument collectively. This supportive environment may lower the perceived risk of errors, since students are not expected to perform entirely on their own.

An important aspect of the interaction observed was the students' obligation to defend their group's opinions. Competition among groups should not be seen as the essential characteristic of collaborative learning, yet in this classroom it seemed to strengthen the communicative purpose of discussion. Students had to listen, get

responses ready, and clearly state the reasons behind their positions. The interaction that resulted was thus not just social participation; it demanded language use to complete a task. This distinction matters because effective collaborative learning rests on purposeful interdependence and individual contribution, not merely on placing students together.

The TTT framework added another layer of instructional structure. Ericsson et al. (2006) stress how crucial focused practice and feedback are for developing skilled performance. In this study, the diagnostic test assisted in identifying areas that needed attention, and the teaching stage supplied focused chances to practice those areas via collaborative activities. After instruction, the post-test then provided a comparable point of performance. This structure can be helpful for teachers since it connects assessment directly to instructional choices rather than treating testing as something separate from teaching.

However, the results should be understood within the constraints of the research design. The study involved a single group of 30 students chosen purposively and lacked a control group. As a result, the statistically significant pretest–post-test difference shows improvement over time but cannot exclude every alternative explanation for that improvement. The intervention also spanned only four meetings, so the study cannot determine whether the gains would persist over a longer period. In addition, confidence was noted in classroom behavior but was not assessed using a validated confidence or anxiety scale. These limitations do not undermine the observed improvement, but they set the strength and scope of the conclusions that can be drawn.

Several pedagogical implications arise from this study. First, speaking instruction can be arranged so that assessment pinpoints specific needs before the teacher chooses collaborative activities. Second, group work should have a clear communicative purpose, assigned responsibilities, and enough chances for every student to participate. Third, teachers can mix activity types such as discussion, role play, debate, and joint tasks to offer varied speaking demands. Fourth, feedback should be supportive and selective so that attention to accuracy does not remove students' willingness to speak. Finally, teachers should note not only test scores but also participation patterns, hesitation, peer support, and students' willingness to communicate.

For future research, a quasi-experimental or true experimental design with a comparison group would offer stronger evidence about the specific contribution of collaborative learning within TTT. A larger sample drawn from more than one school would enhance the generalizability of the findings. Longer interventions and delayed post-tests could reveal whether speaking gains are retained. Researchers could also employ validated instruments for speaking anxiety or confidence, analyze recorded group interaction, and study individual gain patterns. Such data would help clarify which collaborative processes contribute most strongly to fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and willingness to communicate.

Overall, the discussion indicates that the value of the approach lies in combining diagnostic assessment, targeted teaching, repeated interaction, and reassessment. The quantitative improvement and classroom observations point in the same direction: students performed better after receiving structured opportunities to speak collaboratively. Thus, the results back the use of collaborative learning as a practical element of TTT-based speaking instruction, while also pointing to the need for stronger comparative research before broader causal claims can be drawn.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The study revealed that the speaking competence of 30 eleventh-grade students at SMA 1 Gerung improved once collaborative learning was incorporated into the Test–Teach–Test approach. The overall mean rose from 61.7 to 78.3, representing a mean gain of 16.6 points. The paired-samples t-test revealed a statistically significant difference, $t = 9.24$, $p < .001$, and the reported Cohen's d of 1.68 pointed to a large effect. Gains were seen in fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary, and fluency displayed the largest proportional increase. Classroom observations also showed that group discussions, role plays, debates, and joint tasks motivated students to exchange ideas, defend opinions, respond to peers, and take part with greater confidence.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the findings suggest that teachers can use collaborative learning within a TTT sequence to link diagnostic assessment with focused speaking practice and reassessment. Teachers should design group tasks with clear communicative purposes, ensure every student has a chance to contribute, and offer supportive feedback that balances fluency and accuracy. Since this study relied on a single group, a purposive sample, and a four-meeting intervention, future research should incorporate comparison groups, larger samples, longer instructional periods, delayed post-tests, and validated measures of speaking confidence or anxiety. Additional research could also examine recorded group interaction to establish more precisely how peer feedback and collaborative dialogue shape different aspects of speaking development.

REFERENCES

- Alzubi, A. A., Nazim, M., & Ahamad, J. (2024). Examining the Effect of a Collaborative Learning Intervention on EFL Students' English Learning and Social Interaction. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 8(2), 26–46. DOI: 10.33902/JPR.202425541.
- Anderson, J. (2024, May 30). On the Origins, History and Understanding of Test-Teach-Test in English Language Teaching. Jason Anderson: Teacher Educator & Author.

- Aprianto, D., & Sutarman. (2025). The Impacts of Different Learning Intensities on Kinesthetic EFL Students' Speaking Performance. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 9(1), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v9i1.374>.
- Ericsson, K. A., Charness, N., Feltovich, P. J., & Hoffman, R. R. (Eds.). (2006). *The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hobri. (2020). *Lesson Study for Learning Community: Penerapan dan Riset dalam Pembelajaran Matematika*. LaksBang PRESSIndo.
- Jaya, H. P., Petrus, I., & Pitaloka, N. L. (2022). Speaking Performance and Problems Faced by English Major Students at a University in South Sumatera. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 8(1).
- Karjagdi Çolak, M. (2024). Enhancing Speaking Skills Through Task Repetition and ChatGPT Integration in Remedial EFL Lessons: An Action Research Approach. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 6(4). DOI: 10.14744/felt.6.4.1.
- Keto, M. N., & Badie, M. M. (2025). The effect of Test Teach Test (TTT) strategy on Improving EFL Pupils' Achievement. *Journal of Language Studies*, 9(4), 473–496. [https DOI: 10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.21](https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.9.4.P2.21).
- Monny. (2021). The Role of Collaborative Learning in Improving Speaking Competence. *Journal of English Language Teaching Research*, 10(2), 45–57.
- Muklas, M., Yuliana, R., Nurkhasanah, E., Fahriza, L. N., & Yulianda, S. Z. (2024). An Analysis of the Factors Affecting Students' English Speaking Proficiency. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 8(1), 154–164. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v8i1.275>.
- Namaziandost, E., Shatalebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The Impact of Cooperative Learning on Developing Speaking Ability and Motivation Toward Learning English. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(3), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9809>.
- Noerilah, A. R., & Puspitaloka, N. (2022). Identifying the Main Factor of Students' Anxiety in Limited Face-to-Face Learning English Speaking During COVID-19. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 6(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v6i1.157>
- Pratiwi, T. L. (2022). The Use of Role Play Through IGTV to Improve Students' Speaking Skill of Harapan Utama Senior High School at Batam. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 6(1), 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v6i1.159>.
- Rahman Niaghi, M. (2022). Promoting EFL Learners' Pragmatic Awareness Through Test-Teach-Test (TTT) Method via “Telegram” and “Edmodo.” *MEXTESOL Journal*, 46(4).
- Rizanti, B. R., Thohir, L., & Aprianto, K. (2024). Problems and Practical Needs in Learning Speaking in Higher Education. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 8(2), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v8i2.296>.